

**DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 30<sup>th</sup> November 2009. 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>	<b>01/12/2009</b>
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>11/11/2009</b>
<b>Officer</b>		<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Hannah Parker		2009/4436/P		
<b>Application Address</b>		<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
15 Chesterford Gardens London NW3 7DD		See 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>				
Alterations and extensions including erection of single storey rear extension (following the demolition of existing single storey rear extension) and replacement of rear window with door of ground floor flat, landscaping of rear garden and installation of roof light on north side roof slope to first and second floor maisonette (Class C3).				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Grant Permission</b>		
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Full Planning Permission</b>		

<b>Conditions:</b>						
<b>Informatives:</b>	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>18</b>	No. of responses No. electronic	<b>07</b> <b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>07</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>Objections were received from 13 Chesterford Gardens(x2), 21A Chesterford Gardens, 8 Chesterford Gardens, 17 Chesterford Gardens, 19 Frognal Lane, 24 Frognal Lane.</p> <p>Objections are summarised below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drawing lacks figured dimensions and scaled bar</li> <li>• Drawing shows incorrect levels in relation to adjoining properties</li> <li>• Information is incorrect or missing (party fence walls)</li> <li>• No tree survey submitted</li> <li>• Application should be invalid</li> <li>• Landscape details have been omitted</li> <li>• Work already has started - earth has been removed from the site</li> <li>• Flooding locations of underground streams – Flood 2003</li> <li>• Neighbours have not been written to</li> <li>• Design unsympathetic</li> <li>• Glass roof construction not welcome - light spillage</li> <li>• Construction noise. The noise is already disturbing</li> <li>• Existing extension to no.13 has not been shown on the drawings</li> <li>• Inaccurate drawings. Boundaries and levels not shown.</li> <li>• Speculation regarding proposed future works. Considerable lowering of the garden</li> </ul> <p><i>Councils Response :See Assessment</i></p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>	<p>Redington / Frognal CAAC - no objection</p> <p>The Heath and Hampstead Society - objection          “This dreadful little extension, displaying no vestige of context or respect for the architectural style of the existing house - or its neighbours- is just not good enough for the conservation area. Yes, it’s small and sited at the rear of the house, but we should not have to put up with this low standard of design. Please refuse”.</p>					
<b>Site Description</b>						
The proposal relates to a 3-storey semi-detached property which is recognised as making a positive contribution to Redington/Frognal Conservation Area. The property is currently being converted from 3 self-contained flats into 2.						
<b>Relevant History</b>						
2007/5689/P Conversion of two flats, at first and second floor level, into one flat, replacement of two front second floor level windows with doors, and installation of railings at front second floor level to allow access to, and use of, flat roof as a balcony. 25/01/2008						

## Relevant policies

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against. However it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations

### London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

- B1 – General Design Principles
- B3 - Alterations and extensions
- B7 - Conservation Areas
- SD6 - Neighbourhood amenity
- N8 - Ancient woodland

### Camden Planning Guidance 2006

#### Redington/Frogna Conservation Area Statement

## Assessment

The proposal is for the erection of a rear extension following the demolition of the existing original rear addition and a patio extension, which involves the loss of some garden earth due to the elevated garden level. The proposal also includes the introduction of a heritage rooflight onto the north roof slope. The extension will measure 4.6m in depth and is 6.1m in width. This replaces a smaller addition. The patio is being extended by approximately 2m.

### Main Considerations

- Impact on host building and the conservation area
- Neighbourhood Amenity
- Trees
- Other Issues

**Impact on host building and the conservation area:** The extension involves the demolition of the existing addition. The new extension is not full width, and does not dominate the façade. The height of the extension at 3.5m will not exceed the highest point of the existing rear addition. However, it may appear higher due to the loss of the pitched roof. The increase in bulk of the new extension is acceptable, as it stills reads as subordinate to the host dwelling. The roof of the extension will have a large roof light situated within a felt roof. This is not considered to be detrimental to the host building.

The choice of materials, which include brick to match the existing and aluminium framed windows, are considered acceptable in this instance. The aluminium frames will be between 20mm and 22mm, meaning the frames have a slim appearance. The use of aluminium is not considered to dominate the rear façade as the majority of the window configuration remains in timber.

The elongation of the central window into a door to match its existing pair will improve the symmetrical balance of the rear elevation preserving the character and appearance of the host building.

The enlargement of the patio area is considered acceptable as a reasonable sized lawn garden is maintained. The patio will be in york stone which is considered acceptable in this location.

The roof light to the north roof slope is unlikely to be visible due its position on the side elevation and its heritage style which lies flush with the roof slope.

The works will not harm the appearance of the host building or the character and appearance of the conservation area, and are considered to be compliant to the policies B1, B3 and B7 of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan.

**Neighbourhood Amenity:** The elevation facing towards no.17 Chesterfield Gardens will be constructed to the same point as the existing addition and will be built in reclaimed brick. Therefore, the amenity of no. 17 will not be significantly altered. The extension is not full width, and is located over 5m away from the boundary with no.13 Chesterfield Gardens. This distance, combined with the existing boundary treatment, is considered sufficient to preserve no.13's privacy.

The roof light, which measures approximately 2.5m by 2.8m, is not considered to be large enough to produce an adverse light spillage to the surrounding properties.

It is considered that the amenity to the flat on the upper level will not be adversely impacted. Works are considered compliant with policy SD6.

**Trees:** This application has been assessed by the Council's tree officer due to the objections received concerning the trees and the landscaping. It is considered that the plans for the extension and patio area will not have any impact on the trees in the garden of no. 15 Chesterford Gardens, provided that there is no further excavation of the raised lawn area. The tree officer has visited the site, and been advised that any further landscaping works and works to trees will be subject to a new application.

The applicants have appointed an arboriculturalist who has also confirmed that the excavations for the patio, which have already taken place, do not encroach on the Lime trees. A written Arboricultural Implication Assessment (AIA), Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) is being prepared and will accompany any further applications which may impact on the trees.

It should be noted that the works being considered in this application do not require the level of detail outlined above. This has been confirmed by the Council's tree officer.

**Other Issues :** The whole flat is under going revocation. Objectors have drawn the Council's attention to the fact that work has already started and that there have been a number of skip movements. This may be related to the internal works, which don't require planning permission, and the movement of earth to make way for the patio which forms part of this application.

The plans have been submitted at a scale of 1:50 at A1. Although it maybe preferable for lay people that a scale bar is put on each drawing it is not always practical, and cannot be required if the plans are drawn to scale. Objections regarding the quality and content of the drawings are acknowledged. However, the proposed scheme was able to be fully assessed based on the information provided, and through a site visit.

The comments made by the some of the objectors refer to underground streams and flooding. However, no evidence has been presented as to the existence of these streams. The increase in the patio gives an additional 2m in hard standing. A large lawn area of approximately 17m in length still remains. It is considered that the nature and scale of the proposed development does not warrant further detailed investigation of these matters.

Although it is acknowledged that noise can be disruptive during construction the applicants will be advised via informative of the acceptable construction hours under the Control of Pollution Act 1974.

The objectors have been talking to the workmen about potential works to the garden, which have included the lowering of the entire garden level. The applicants have been advised by the Council and their own

arboriculturalist that this will not be possible. As already stated, any further works to the garden which will impact on the trees will be subject to a new application.

18 neighbours were written to directly and a site notice was displayed from 21/10/09 to 11/11/09. This satisfies the consultation requirements for an application of this scale and nature.

**Recommendation Grant Permission**