

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		25/06/2009	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		09/06/2009	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Eimear Heavey				2009/1422/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
25 Gascony Avenue London NW6 4NB				Refer to draft 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>							
The erection of a full width extension with two windows on the rear roof slope and two new rooflights on front roof slope, and a second floor rear extension over part of an existing roof terrace, to provide additional accommodation for the existing second and third floor maisonette.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	18	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	02
				No. electronic	00		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>2 objections were received relative to this application (one of which was duplicated), from the occupants of the flats at 27 Gascony Avenue. The concerns raised were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential noise nuisance;</li> <li>The proposed extension is out of context and out of scale with the original building and neighbouring properties;</li> <li>The existing extension is already of significant size and reaches beyond neighbouring properties;</li> <li>The most recent additions to the property have not considered using matching materials;</li> <li>Potential loss of privacy as occupants will see more of my front garden;</li> <li>The proposal will result in a loss of daylight and sunlight to my property</li> </ul> <p><u>Response:</u> Please see assessment section of report for further comment,</p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify		N/A					

## Site Description

The proposed development comprises a three storey over basement terraced property situated on the north side of Gascony Avenue, close to its junction with Kilburn High Road. The property is not listed nor is it located within a Conservation Area. The building has been converted into flats and this application relates to the upper floor maisonette.

## Relevant History

9005767 – Planning Permission was refused in May 1992 for the change of use from 3 self contained flats to a Guest House for homeless people.

8401974 – Planning Permission was refused in February 1985 for the change of use including works of conversion to form two self-contained flats and an upper maisonette with the erection of a rear extension and dormers in the roofspace

8500476 – Planning Permission was granted in May 1985 for the change of use including works of conversion to form two self-contained flats and an upper maisonette with the erection of a rear extension and dormers in the roofspace.

34199 – Planning Permission was granted in September 1982 for the construction of a small rear extension at second floor level to provide an additional bathroom.

## Relevant policies

### Replacement UDP 2006

S1/S2 – Sustainable Development

SD1 – Quality of Life

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 – General Design Principles

B3 – Alterations and Extensions

### Camden Planning Guidance 2006

## Assessment

### Proposal

Planning Permission is sought for the erection of a full width extension with two windows on the rear roof slope and two new rooflights on front roof slope, and a second floor rear extension over part of an existing roof terrace, to provide additional accommodation for the existing second and third floor maisonette.

### Main Planning Considerations

- Acceptability of the proposal, its impact on the original building and on the surrounding area; and
- Impact of the proposed development on neighbour amenity

### Design

Camden Planning Guidance states that rear extensions should be subordinate in size to the host building; should respect existing architectural features; should respect the established grain of the surrounding area and not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties.

The Planning Guidance for roof alterations and additions also needs to be considered and it states that roof additions are likely to be acceptable where the alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and would retain the overall integrity of the roof form.

### Rear Extension

It is also proposed to extend the existing second floor rear extension by 2 metres. The proposed extension would project outwards into the existing terrace area and would provide extra space in the form of a bedroom. It is considered that the proposed minor addition would be acceptable in design terms given that the principle of the extension has already been established by virtue of the existing extension.

### Roof extension

In this instance it is proposed to erect a full width extension on the rear roofslope incorporating one large window and one small window. The proposed extension would project outwards approximately three metres from the roofslope and would be 5 metres wide, covering the whole of the rear roof slope. Whilst it is accepted that the principle of a dormer window is already established on this site, the proposed roof extension is considered to be overly dominant on the roofslope. It is noted that a replacement of this window would be a more appropriate addition to the roof in this instance. It is also noted that an extension of the type proposed

exists at no 15 Gascony Avenue, however there are no planning records for this ever being approved by the Council. In light of this, the proposed extension, due to its bulk and scale, is not considered to protect the overall integrity of the roof form and consequently is not considered to be sympathetic to the original building.

It is also proposed to install two rooflights on the front roofslope and these are considered acceptable.

#### **Amenity**

The proposed roof extension is not considered to impact adversely upon neighbour amenity in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy or loss of sunlight or daylight. The proposed rear addition is also considered to be acceptable in terms of neighbour amenity however objections were received from neighbours who had concerns regarding loss of privacy and loss of sunlight and daylight.

Given that the terrace at second floor already exists the proposed development is not considered to intensify the level of overlooking already possible from this terrace. Furthermore the rear of the properties face in a northerly direction and therefore would not be affected by sunlight. With regards to daylight, the proposed 2 metre extension at second floor level is not considered to result in excessive bulk or massing and will therefore have little or no impact on daylight to neighbouring properties.

#### **Conclusion**

Although the proposed extension at rear second floor level is considered to be acceptable, the proposed full width rear roof extension is considered to be overly dominant on the roofslope and fails to protect the integrity of the roofslope.

**Recommendation:** Refuse Planning Permission.

### **Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613***