DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 23rd March 2009. For further information see

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

Delegated R (Members Briefin	•	Analysis sheet	5	Expiry Date:	24/03/2009		
(momboro Brioni	-9/	N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	11/03/2009		
0	ficer		Appl	ication Num	nber(s)		
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin			2009/0155/P				
Application Address			Drawing Numbers				
12 Lambolle Road London NW3 4HP			See draft decision notice				
	a Team nature	C&UD	Authoris	sed Officer	Signature		
Proposal(s)							
Alterations to existing single family dwellinghouse incorporating full width rear extension at ground floor level, bay window to rear and installation of skylight over main staircase and rear main room at second floor level (on side and rear roof slopes).							
Recommendation(s): Grant Planning Permission							
Application Type:	Full Plannir	ng Permission	ı				

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice									
O a was altations										
Consultations										
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	02	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00				
0	A site potice was	ا مانمهاد	No. Electronic		02/2000					
Summary of consultation	A Site notice was	saispia	ayed from 18/02/2009	to 11/	U3/2UU9.					
responses:	No reply from the adjoining occupiers are received.									
	B.1.: 0440	•								
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	are: The proposubordinat Response: Plee The design the period Response: Plee The proposes Plee The proposes Plee The proposes Plee	sed rease renotes as end of the lease resease resease done	ar extension would be full house. If the assessment proposed doors would house. If the assessment pull house if the assessment pull house if the assessment proposed the assessment proposed the assessment proposed for the asses	art of the not be art of the art of the art of the art of the tall to the art of the art	 The proposed rear extension would be full width and bulky and would not subordinate to the house. Response: Please refer to the assessment part of the report. The design of the proposed doors would not be in keeping with the style and the period of the house. Response: Please refer to the assessment part of the report. The proposal would result in further loss of garden space. Response: Please refer to the assessment part of the report. The proposed dormer would be detrimental to the form and character of the house. Response: The front dormer window element has been omitted from the 					

Site Description

The application site is located on the north side of Lambolle Road in the Belsize Conservation Area. The site has a 2-storey red-brick semi-detached property plus attic and semi-basement level accommodations. The property has an existing single storey rear extension abutting the boundary with no. 14. The Belsize Conservation Area Statement identifies the application property as a positive contributor to the appearance and character of the Conservation Area.

Lambolle Road is mainly characterized by uniform groups of semi-detached red brick Victorian houses. Many of the houses have single storey rear extensions.

Relevant History

Application Property:

PW9702716 – Planning permission was granted on 29/10/1997 for replacement of existing patio doors and terrace at rear roof level by the erection of a dormer window.

Neighbouring Property:

10 Lambolle Road – Planning permission (ref: 2007/5901/P) was granted on 18/03/2008 for alterations and additions to the single dwellinghouse including excavation to form a new basement level with sunken patio to rear and lightwells to front elevation.

38 Lambolle Road – Planning permission (ref: 2006/4788/P) was granted on 21/12/2006 for replacement of the existing single storey extension and bay window with two square bay windows to the rear of the single dwellinghouse.

8 Lambolle Road has an existing rear bay window on the ground and first floor levels. The Council has no planning records of it.

Relevant policies

Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

- S1/S2 –Sustainable Development
- SD6 Amenity for Occupiers & Neighbours
- B1 General Design Principles
- B3 Alterations and Extensions
- B7 Conservation Areas

Camden Planning Guidance 2006
Belsize Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

The original scheme was for alterations to existing single family dwellinghouse incorporating a full width rear extension at ground floor level, bay window to rear at 1st floor level and the installation of a dormer window to front roof slope and skylight over main staircase and rear main room at second floor level (on side and rear roof slopes). Following the officer's recommendation, the proposed front dormer window was omitted from this application and the proposed skylight on the side roof slope was scaled down.

The proposed full width single storey rear extension would have the same depth as the existing extension and would infill the gap between the existing rear extension and the shared boundary with no. 14. It would have a height of 3.9m with a pyramid shaped rooflight increasing the maximum height of the extension to 4.5m in the centre.

The proposed first floor bay window at the rear would be set back by 0.7m from the north-east corner of the building and would reach the eaves height. It would project 1m beyond the rear wall of the building.

The proposed skylight on the rear roof slope would be just below the ridge line and would be flush with the rear roof slope.

The proposed skylight on the side roof slope would be in the middle of the east side roof slope and would project approximately 10cm above the roof slope.

Design

Single storey rear extension and rear bay window:

The Belsize Conservation Area Statement states rear extensions should be no more than one storey in height and should not adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached.

The Council's Planning Guidance states rear extensions should be subordinate to the building extended in terms of location, form, scale, proportions and dimensions and should not normally project across the full width of the building.

Many of the properties in the area have single storey rear extensions which project across approximately the half width of the property. Although the proposed rear extension would project across the full width of the application property, it would still be in harmony with the existing building in terms of its materials, size and bulk. The design of the proposal would incorporate large glazing which would give a lightweight appearance. It should also be noted the single family dwellinghouses in the area have permitted development rights to build a full width single storey rear extension up to 4m in height and 3m in depth within the provision of the amended Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995. Additionally, the adjoining property (no. 10) has an existing veranda which project across the full width of that property. Therefore, it would be difficult to justify the refusal of the proposed extension on the basis of its design and full width.

The proposed bay window on the first floor level would be a small addition to the building and would

have sash windows with soldier course details. The proposed windows would match with the design and size of the existing sash windows on the first floor level on the rear elevation. It is also considered that it would be subservient to, and would not harm the appearance of, the building.

Initial concerns regarding the site coverage of the proposed rear extension were raised. The proposed extension would only take up an approximately 19.2sqm area of the rear garden space which is already paved. The proposal would still provide an approximately 130sqm useable garden space. Therefore, the proposal would not significantly reduce the amenity value of the existing open space. There are also no trees of a value in the rear garden which would be affected by the proposal.

The proposed rear extensions are considered not to harm the architectural integrity of the existing building and the character of the wider Conservation Area.

Skylights:

The proposed alterations would not affect the front elevation of the existing building. Only the proposed skylight to the side roof slope would be glimpsed from the street.

The proposed rooflights would have a modest scale and would not significantly alter the appearance of the roof. The positioning and design of the proposed skylights are also considered to be appropriate to the existing roof form.

The proposed external alterations and extensions to the building would be modest and would not harm the appearance and character of the existing building and the wider Conservation Area. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the Council's relevant policies and guidance and acceptable in terms of its design.

Amenity

The proposal would not adversely impact of the amenities of the adjoining and adjacent properties (nos. 17A and 21) in terms of loss of outlook, daylight and privacy and are considered to be in accordance with policy SD6.

The adjacent property (no. 14) has an existing single storey rear extension with a similar depth to the proposed extension. The impact of the proposed rear extension on the adjacent property would be ameliorated by the existing extension at that property.

The adjoining property (no.10) has an existing veranda projecting approximately 2m beyond the rear wall of that property. The proposed single storey rear extension would be more than double the width of that veranda (approximately 5m). The height of the proposed extension immediately adjacent to the shared boundary with that property would be approximately 3.9m. Although the proposed extension could minimally affect the day light to the rear openings on the ground floor level of the adjoining property, it is considered that the proposal would not significantly worsen the overshadowing effect of

the existing veranda on the adjoining property. The proposed first floor bay window would be 5.3m from the shared boundary with the adjoining property and would not be likely to cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of that property. Recommend: Grant subject to conditions.
property and would not be likely to cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of that property.
Recommend: Grant subject to conditions.