

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		10/03/2009	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		06/03/2009	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Jennifer Walsh				2009/0111/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
5 Oakeshott Avenue London N6 6NT				Please refer to draft decision notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a first floor side extension to single-family dwelling (Class C3) as an amendment to planning permission granted 15/08/2008 (ref: 2008/3051/P) for erection of a single storey side and rear extension, and erection of side and rear dormer window to the single-family dwelling.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	06	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		3 Oakeshott Avenue object on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to the extremely extensive nature of the additions. - Contravenes CAAC guideline H6.1. - Outkeeping with the houses that characterise the estate. - It will block the view between the houses from the pavement. - It will block the sun coming through the gap into their garden. 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		Holly Lodge CAAC objected on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First floor extension is contrary to guidelines H.6.1. - It would be bulky, unbalanced addition, unsympathetic to the house and detrimental to its character and appearance. 					

Site Description

The application site is located on the northern side of Oakeshott Avenue within the Holly Lodge Conservation Area. The site consists of a two storey semi-detached house. The house is not listed.

Relevant History

A rear conservatory currently exists at the application site. No planning records can be located.

2007/6189/P – Erection of a single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and side and rear dormers to single family dwelling (class C3). Refused 02/04/2008

2008/1003/P - Erection of a single storey rear extension and side and rear dormers to single family dwelling (Use Class C3). Withdrawn 28/04/2008

2008/3051/P- Erection of a single storey side and rear extension, and erection of side and rear dormer window to the single-family dwelling. Granted 15/08/2008

Relevant policies

Unitary Development Plan 2006

S1 & S2 – Sustainable development

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 – General design principles

B3 – Alterations and extensions

B7 – Conservation areas

Camden Planning Guidance

Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

Proposed

Design

The application seeks approval for a first floor side extension above the existing garage. This is very similar to a first floor side extension which was refused in 2007 (2007/6189/P). The proposed extension comprises a flat roof which sits above the height of the eaves of the house by 0.3 metres. The proposed extension is in line with the neighbouring property (number 3) and would be built right up to the boundary line of the neighbouring property.

As stated in the previous officer's report for the refused application in 2007, the rear gardens of no 3 and no 5 Oakeshott Avenue are characterised by large trees in the rear garden. The proposed side extension will infill this gap, and therefore will result in the loss of views through from the street to the rear garden. The application would harm the character of detached dwellings in the street scene with views between the dwellings through to vegetation and sky. The proposed infilling of this gap and adjoining two detached units at first floor level would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene therefore and would contravene the CPG which states that infilling of gaps between the properties will not be considered acceptable where significant views or gaps are compromised.

It is accepted that the neighbouring property does have a first floor extension, similar to this application. However, paragraph 3.31 of UDP policy B3 states that, "past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations or extensions". The proposed side extension would create a terraced effect on two semi detached houses. The side extension by reason of its location and size is considered to be bulky and over dominating on the existing building which together detracts from the character and appearance of the conservation area. This is considered contrary to policy B1, B3 and B7 and therefore unacceptable.

Planning guidance states that extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level will be strongly discouraged. Whilst this normally refers to rear extensions, it is considered that, in this case, it is appropriate for this guidance to be applied to the side extension proposed. Planning guidance also states that side extensions should not be unduly prominent in the streetscape and should be subordinate to the main building. It is considered that the 2-storey proposed extension, together with the neighbouring one, would result in a intensification of development that would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the building, in terms of location, building lines, height, bulk, mass and design.

Amenity

The boundary between No. 3 and No. 5 Oakeshott Avenue is somewhat different to other sites within the Estate. The area behind the garage of No. 5 forms part of the garden for No. 3. Therefore the two storey extension would sit on the boundary line. Whilst it is considered that the proposed extension may have an impact in terms of outlook and a sense of enclosure on No.3 it is not considered to cause significant harm and therefore is not stated specially as a reason for refusal.

The proposal does not include any windows on the rear elevation of the proposed first floor extension. One window is shown on the side elevation which would face over the rear of the property. It is therefore not considered that unreasonable additional amounts of overlooking would result from this proposal.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above it is considered that the proposed scheme is contrary to policy B1, B3, B7 and SD6, as well as supporting planning guidance and as such refusal is recommended.

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