

**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>30/11/2009</b>
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>09/11/2009</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin			2009/4686/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
13 Hollycroft Avenue London NW3 7QH			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>				
Erection of a single storey infill rear extension incorporating an extended roof terrace above and alterations to side and rear window openings of the dwelling house.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant Planning Permission		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission		

<b>Conditions:</b>	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>12</b>	No. of responses No. Electronic	<b>00</b> <b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	A site notice was displayed from 14/10/09 to 04/11/09.					
<b>CAAC comments:</b>	<p><b>Redington/Frognaal CAAC</b> consider the proposed mono-pitched roof in conjunction with openings on the ground floor creates a visual disaster and suggest that the proposal should be reconsidered.</p> <p><i>Response: The proposal does not include a mono-pitched roof. Please refer to the assessment part of the report regarding the concerns raised over the openings.</i></p>					
<b>Site Description</b>						
<p>The application relates to a 2-storey semi-detached (single family) dwellinghouse on the east side of Hollycroft Avenue in the Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area. The Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area Statement considers the application property to be a positive contributor to the conservation area.</p> <p>This part of the conservation area is characterized by modestly scaled semi-detached houses. The houses are of predominantly red/orange brick incorporating white rendered areas and bay windows. Many of the properties have external alterations and extensions including rooflights, new windows and doors and rear extensions.</p>						
<b>Relevant History</b>						
<p><u>Application property:</u>  <b>P9600519R1</b> – Planning permission was granted on 13/06/1996 for the enlargement of existing dormer window on side elevation and installation of 2 'velux' rooflights on front gable roof.</p> <p><u>Neighbouring Properties:</u>  <b>17 Hollycroft Avenue</b> – Planning permission was granted on 07/03/1997 for the replacement of the existing single storey rear ground floor level extension with an enlarged extension, the replacement of the existing rooflight in the side roof slope with a dormer window, the replacement of the existing front boundary fence, and associated internal and external works of refurbishment (ref: P9601366R2).</p>						
<b>Relevant policies</b>						
<p><b>Replacement Camden Unitary Development Plan 2006</b>  SD6 – Amenity for Occupiers and Neighbours  B1 – General Design Principles  B3 - Alterations and Extensions  B7 – Conservation Areas</p> <p><b>Camden Planning Guidance 2006</b></p> <p><b>Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area Statement</b></p>						

## Assessment

### Proposal

The proposal is for a single storey infill rear extension incorporating an extended roof terrace above and alterations to the side and rear openings. All the new windows and doors are proposed to be timber.

### Design and Appearance

#### Rear extension and other alterations to rear elevation

The proposed rear extension would be well screened and would not be visible from the front of the building. It would infill the gap between the existing ground floor rear extensions and would be in line with the existing rear extension which abuts a similar rear extension at the adjoining property (no.15). The height of the proposed extension would be 3.31m above the ground level. The roof of the proposed extension would be used as a terrace, and would enlarge the existing rear terrace at first floor level by 7.36sqm.

The Council's planning guidance states that rear extensions should be subordinate to the building being extended in terms of location, form, scale, proportions and dimensions and should respect the design of the original building. Additionally, the guidance discourages full width extensions where they are visible from the street.

The adjoining property (no.15) has a similar infill extension with roof terrace above. The Council has no planning records of that extension; which was probably built as 'permitted development'.

Although full width rear extensions are normally discouraged, the proposed rear extension would be subordinate to the existing house and would not be visible from the street. The proposed rear extension would follow the development pattern of the rear extension at the adjoining property and not significantly change the rear elevation of the building. A number of properties in the area also have various styles of rear extensions (most of which were built as 'permitted development').

Although the fenestration details of the proposed rear extension would be different from the existing rear extensions at no.15, the extension would be of matching brickwork and would have timber doors. It is also noted that the windows and doors on the rear elevation of the house could be altered and replaced with doors and windows with matching materials to the existing. Therefore, it would be difficult to justify the refusal of this application on the ground of inappropriate fenestration detailing.

Other proposed alterations to the rear elevation would include replacement of first floor windows (next to the first floor timber French doors) with matching French doors, replacement of rooflights and windows of the ground floor rear extension at the two storey rear addition with three new rooflights and timber doors, and replacement of first floor windows at the two storey addition with larger timber windows. The proposed alterations to the rear elevation would be in harmony with the existing fenestration details and acceptable in terms of their style, design and materials. It is also noted they could in themselves be carried out as 'permitted development'.

#### Alterations to the side elevation

It is proposed to relocate one of the windows and insert a new window on the north side elevation on first floor level. The new window would serve the bathroom and would have a matching materials and design to the existing windows. The new window would be barely visible from the street.

The proposed extension and alterations are considered not to harm the architectural integrity of the existing

building or the appearance and character of the wider Conservation Area. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in design terms and in accordance with policies B1, B3 and B7 of the UDP.

### **Amenity**

Policy SD6 of the UDP states the Council will not grant planning permission for development that it considers harms to the amenity of occupiers and neighbours. The proposal is not likely to worsen the impact of the existing building on the residential amenities of the adjoining neighbours in terms of loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook or privacy.

The extended first floor terrace at the rear would be screened by the 2-storey rear addition at the existing building; therefore there would be no overlooking from the proposed terrace to the adjacent property at no.11. However, the new windows on the side elevation at first floor level would face the side windows of the adjacent property. A condition for the new side windows to be obscure glazed and fixed shut to a height of 1.7m above floor level is recommended in that respect (see decision notice). This can be justified as it would be a requirement of the exercise of permitted development rights.

The extended first floor terrace would mirror the area of the existing first floor terrace at the adjoining property (no.13). There is a screening wall between the first floor terraces at the application site and adjoining properties. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not result in increase overlooking to the adjoining property.

Subject to a safeguarding condition for obscure glazing, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with policy SD6.

**Recommendation:** It is considered that subject to safeguarding conditions the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of adjoining neighbours and the appearance and character of the conservation area therefore planning permission should be granted.