

**DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 29<sup>th</sup> March 2010. For further information see

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		30/03/2010	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		30/03/2010	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Elizabeth Beaumont				2009/5260/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
94 Hillway London N6 6DP				Please refer to decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>				
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Erection of single storey side extension, full width rear extension following part demolition of existing garage and workshop, four conservation rooflights in the front, rear and side roofslope, alterations to existing timber cladding, replacement of windows and raised patio to rear garden (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	00	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02	
			No. Electronic	00			

<p><b>Summary of consultation responses:</b></p>	<p><b>96 Hillway</b> – 2 responses - email dated 21.02.10 and consultation response on the 23.02.10 – strongly objects for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed new roof height is 1.5 m higher than the existing. The new roof height will be 4m from ground level. (Refer to 1.1)</li> <li>• The building line will abut my property and if granted my property will be boxed in. This will have a detrimental impact on my property – loss of light in my conservatory, kitchen and dining room. (Refer to 5.1-5.5)</li> <li>• Original garage has been high enough for over 50 years, no valid reason to raise it. (Refer to 1.2)</li> <li>• At present there is a garage extension at the rear and the roof height is 2.9m from ground level. My ground level is 1.6m higher than no, 94. (Refer to 3.4-3.5)</li> <li>• If the proposal was granted the rear extension by reason of the height, bulk and location will completely have an impact on light and outlook from my ground floor habitable conservatory to a detrimental effect on my residential amenity. (Refer to 5.1-5.5)</li> </ul> <p><u>Officer's comments</u> – these comments were received before the amendments to the height of the extensions. The increases in overall height are discussed below.</p>
<p><b>CAAC comments:</b></p>	<p><b>Holly Lodge CAAC</b> – Object and comment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The height of the proposed new side extension would be substantially more than the present one, and seems excessive. (Refer to 3.1-3.5)</li> <li>• The proposed ground floor extension also appears excessive. It combined with the proposed terrace would substantially reduce the garden area. (Refer to 4.2)</li> <li>• The proposed could affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, object to velux windows in front elevation would detract from the streetscape. (Refer to 3.6)</li> <li>• We understand there is a TPO in the garden (Refer to 4.1)</li> </ul>

### Site Description

The site is located on the east side of Hillway in the Holly Lodge Estate in a predominantly residential area. The site comprises a two storey detached single family dwelling house with large rear garden. The property has been extended in the past with an existing single storey conservatory that measures approximately 3.2m wide, 2.7m deep and 3.4m high sloping to 2.6m and an existing workshop building attached to the side garage which measures 2.9m wide, 8.2m deep and 2.9m high (to 3.5m due to sloping garden level). There is a covered porch in between the conservatory and the workshop building and an existing garage to the side of the property. The site is surrounded by similar large detached properties. The Holly Lodge Estate is located on a slope with the levels of the housing falling towards Oakeshott Avenue to the south of the application site.

The building is not listed but is located in the Holly Lodge Conservation Area.

### Relevant History

None relevant

## Relevant policies

### Camden UDP (2006)

SD8 (Amenity for occupiers and neighbours)  
B1 (General design principles)  
B3 (Alterations and extensions)  
B7 (Conservation areas)  
N8 (Ancient woodlands and trees)

### Camden planning guidance (2006)

### Holly Lodge Conservation Area Statement

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

1.1 Permission is sought for the following;

- A full width rear extension following the removal of the existing timber conservatory and lean-to. The proposed rear extension would measure approximately 6.5m wide, 2.9m high and 4m to 5.5m deep.
- The demolition of part of the existing garage/workshop which extends along the side of the house projecting 6.5m into the garden and replace it with a side extension. The proposed side extension (in place of the existing garage) would measure approximately 9.5m deep, 3.3 to 2.9m high (due to the slope) and 3.3m wide. The proposed side/rear extension (in place of the existing workshop) would measure approximately 3.6m wide, 6m deep and 2.9m high.
- The garage door would be replaced with a window to match existing with large glazed doors to the rear and the extensions will be finished in render to match the existing building.
- Removal of the timber cladding on the front elevation and replace with 'mock Tudor' detailing.
- Insert two conservation rooflights, one in the front and the other in the rear following the replacement on an existing rooflight in the front roof slope.
- Replace all the windows on the host building, which are mainly uPVC with aluminium clad timber casement window with glazing bars.
- In the rear garden it is proposed to install a raised patio area.

1.2 The existing side extension is in two parts (although attached) comprising the side extension in use as a garage and the workshop extension to the rear. The proposed side extension will be 0.4m higher than the workshop extension and 0.1m higher than the side extension, given the slope the side extension towards the front will be 0.2m higher than existing.

1.3 The floor levels of the main dwelling, garage and workshop vary due to the sloped nature of the site. It is proposed to create a ground floor which involves increasing the height of the extensions in comparison to the existing buildings in order to incorporate the side and rear extension without

any variations in levels.

## **2 Revision**

2.1 The scheme has been revised during the course of the application. The details include:

- The proposed first floor rear extension has been removed.
- Reduction in overall height of side and rear extension by 0.3m.
- Reduction in the extent of the glazing on the rear elevation of the extension.

## **3 Design**

### Rear extension

- 3.1 The proposed area where the rear extension will be positioned is currently enclosed by the flank wall of the ground floor extension at no. 92 and the workshop extension. The proposal would include a full width extension that would be constructed from brick with render to match existing.
- 3.2 The proposed has been revised to reduce the overall height of the rear extension by approximately 0.3m. Its height would be set down from the conservatory at no. 96 and above the extension at no. 94. There would be a gap between the extension and the neighbouring conservatory at no. 96 of 0.4m.
- 3.3 The proposal would now retain an improved physical break from the cills of the first floor windows in the rear elevation. It is considered that the use of glazing in the bi-folding doors with thin glazing bars on the rear elevation would serve to reduce its overall visual bulk while clearly setting the extension apart as a modern addition. The reduction in height of the extension and the removal of the proposed first floor extension would reduce the overall bulk of the rear extension.
- 3.4 It must be noted that the rear extension would replace a single storey timber framed conservatory extension and lean to and would match the depth of the neighbouring ground floor extension at 92 infilling the area in-between the existing workshop and the neighbouring extension. The revised height of the proposed rear extension and reduction in the extent of glazing on the rear elevation would not be considered to harm the character of the host building or the character and appearance of the wider conservation area.

### Side extension

- 3.5 The proposed side extension would be set back 4m from the front elevation of the property. It would include a flat roof with a parapet wall that would be 0.1m higher at the rear and 0.3m higher at the front than the existing single storey garage. The proposal would involve the removal of the terrace and timber balustrade set behind the parapet wall on the flat roof of the existing garage.
- 3.6 It is considered that the proposed extension would be sufficiently set back from the front building line and the proposed windows in place of the garage door would be subordinate to the windows on the remainder on the host property. It is considered that the proposal would not detract from the

character or appearance of the existing building or the Conservation area.

- 3.7 It must be noted that the side extension would replace a single storey garage and workshop building. The existing structure extends along the side of the building and project significantly into the garden with timber windows and rendered facades. The proposal would occupy a similar footprint as the existing structures and would be of a similar height. The revised height of the side extension together with its design would not be considered anymore harmful to the character or appearance of the host building as the existing garage and workshop building and would be considered acceptable.

#### Windows and conservation rooflights

- 3.8 It is proposed to insert conservation velux rooflights on the front, rear and side roofslopes following the removal of an existing rooflight on the front roofslope. The rooflights are conservation style and therefore would be flush with the roofslope. It is not considered that the proposed conservation rooflights would have a detrimental impact on the host building or the wider conservation area.
- 3.9 It is proposed to replace the existing uPVC windows with aluminium clad timber casement window with glazing bars. It is considered that timber windows would be the ideal replacement however given that the majority of windows in the host building are constructed from uPVC it would difficult to insist on timber replacements. It is considered that as the proposed replacements are an improvement to the uPVC windows with a detailed design they would be considered acceptable.

#### **4. Trees and hard landscaping**

- 4.1 An Arboricultural Report was submitted as part of the application. This report satisfactorily sets out measures to protect the large Plane tree during construction. It is considered that no further details are required. The proposal involves the removal of an Apple Tree close to the rear of the property. It is considered that as the garden is well planted with trees that its removal would not have a detrimental impact to the character of the conservation area and a replacement is not required. A condition is recommended to confirm that permission is only approved for the removal of the apple tree.
- 4.2 It is proposed to construct a raised patio area with steps down to the garden. It is considered that given the scale of the existing garden that the decking would be acceptable and would not detract from the character of the host building or wider conservation. It is considered that following the extension and the hard landscaping a reasonable area (approximately 200m<sup>2</sup>) of garden (soft landscaping) with a number of large trees would be retained.

#### **5. Loss of the garage**

- 5.1 The existing garage forms part of the ancillary floor space of the dwellinghouse. As the dwellinghouse was constructed prior to 1948 there are no requirements to retain the garage and its replacement with an extension to provide additional habitable space would be considered acceptable. There is currently sufficient space on the driveway within the front garden for vehicles to be parked.

#### **6. Amenity**

- 6.1 It must be noted that the garden levels of the properties within Hillway drop by approximately 1.5m

from nos. 96 to 94 and over 2m between nos. 94 and 92. There is a slight gradient across the site sloping west to east.

#### Side extension

6.2 The side extension would be 0.4m higher than the existing workshop building. The extension would be 0.1m higher (at the rear) - 0.3m (at the front) of the existing garage building due to the gradient across the site. The rear section of the side extension would be stepped away from the side elevation of the full width conservatory at no. 96. This conservatory has glazed side elevations. It is considered that the extension would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of no. 96 for the following reasons;

- Due to the slope along Hillway, the ground level of no. 94 is set down from no. 96.
- The proposed depth of the extension will be 0.7m less than the existing workshop building.
- The extension would be set away from the side elevation of no. 96 by 0.4m.
- The remainder of the conservatory at no. 96 is glazed therefore will receive sufficient sunlight/daylight.

It is considered that following the revision to reduce the overall height of the extension, the reduction in depth in comparison to the existing building, the proposed extension would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers with regards to the levels of sunlight or daylight in comparison to the existing situation.

6.3 Concerns have been raised that the proposed side extension will harm the outlook of the neighbouring occupiers at no. 96. The current outlook from the conservatory at no. 96 towards no. 94 looks out across part of the side elevation and the flat roof of the existing workshop. The proposed height of the extension will be higher than the existing but the depth of the extension is less than the existing building. It is considered that the resulting outlook – looking across and the side elevation of part of the flat roof - would be similar to the existing situation.

#### Rear extension

6.4 The proposed rear extension would not project further than the extension at no. 92 but would be 0.7m higher. The window on the first floor at no. 92 would not be affected by this extension. It is considered that the extension would have no impact on the amenity of the occupiers of this property.

6.5 It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers with regards to sunlight, daylight, outlook and privacy in comparison to the existing situation.

**7. Recommendation** – Grant planning permission subject to conditions.