

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	16/02/2009
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	12/02/2009
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Laura Swinton			2009/0090/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
35 Swain's Lane London N6 6QL			Refer 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>					
Erection of a part single storey, part two storey rear extension including two Juliet balconies to the existing single dwellinghouse (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	3	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	2
			No. electronic	0		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 22/01/2009 to 12/02/2009.</p> <p>The following responses were received;</p> <p><u>28 Swains Lane</u> - objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The site notice is not there despite the fact that the consultation period has not yet expired.</li> <li>– The drawings are totally inconsistent and misleading.</li> <li>– The proposed ground floor extension is intrusive.</li> <li>– Being built up to the boundary line is inconsistent with Holly Lodge Conservation Area guidelines.</li> <li>– The second floor extension would only overlook neighbouring properties but is out of keeping with adjoining properties.</li> </ul> <p><u>33 Swains Lane</u> – objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Single storey extension spreads to the border of 33 Swains Lane, inhibiting light.</li> <li>– The extension to the first storey is out of keeping with neighbouring properties.</li> <li>– The proposed first storey extension would affect light to neighbouring properties at both ground and first floor level.</li> <li>– The plans for the rear opening doors onto balconies is out of keeping with the neighbouring properties in the Conservation Area.</li> <li>– Given the extension currently in progress at top floor, it would be vastly different in scale and design to the other properties.</li> </ul>					
CAAC:	<p><u>Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Advisory Committee</u> – objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Agree with objections raised by resident at 33 Swains Lane.</li> <li>– The proposed rear ground and first floor extensions are contrary to our Guideline H6.1 – it would add excessive bulk to the house, and the Juliet balconies would infringe on the privacy of nearby properties.</li> <li>– The Design and Access Statement states that ‘the front of the property is not being altered’ – the side extension would however be visible from the front.</li> <li>– The drawings are inconsistent and confusing.</li> </ul>					
<b>Site Description</b>						
<p>The application site is a two storey semi detached property located on the northern side of Swain's Lane. The area is predominately residential and similar styles of property adjoin the site on all sides.</p> <p>The property is located within Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area however it is not a Listed Building.</p>						

## Relevant History

**2008/4037/P:** Erection of a single storey ground floor level side and rear extension to the single dwellinghouse (Class C3). **Granted** 20/11/2008.

**2008/4418/P:** Erection side and rear dormer window to facilitate a loft conversion to single family dwellinghouse (Class C3). **Granted** 20/11/2008.

## Relevant policies

London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP)

S1 & S2 – Sustainable development

SD1 – Quality of life

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 – General design principles

B3 – Alterations and extensions

B7 – Conservation areas

Camden Planning Guidance 2006 (CPG)

Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Statement (CAS)

## Assessment

### Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the following alterations and extensions;

- Erection of a part single storey, part two storey rear extensions including two Juliet balconies.

### Assessment

Planning permission was granted on 20/11/2008 (reference 2008/4037/P) for a single storey ground floor rear extension at 35 Swains Lane. Originally, this application also included the provision of a first floor rear extension with two Juliet balconies. During the assessment of this application however, the drawings were amended to remove these elements on the basis that they were considered unacceptable in terms of design.

This current application proposes an identical extension to the rear at ground and first floor level and also includes the provision of two Juliet balconies. The first floor extension and Juliet balconies, as explained above, were negotiated out of the original planning application.

Notwithstanding, the sites planning history, this application will be assessed on its own merits against the relevant policies of the UDP and associated CPG and Holly Lodge Estate CAS (as outlined in the relevant policies section above).

### **Design**

Swains Lane is predominately characterised by rows of two storey semi-detached properties, many of these having extended at roof level with dormer windows to create a third floor. Single storey, rear extensions are characteristic of the properties on the northern side of Swains Lane and although they differ in detailed design, they share similarities in their height and massing.

In addition to the requirements of policy B1, B3 and B7 of the UDP, the CPG (paragraph 19.16) requires that all rear extensions are one full storey below the level of the roof eaves and should not rise above the general height of the neighbouring projections and nearby extensions.

The proposed ground floor and first floor extension would be extend the full width of the existing building and would be between 3.1 meters in depth at ground floor level and 1.1 metres in depth at first floor level. The height of the extension would extend to the base of the main roofs eaves.

At first floor level, the rear extension is considered to be unacceptable. It extends to the height of the

roof eaves and is inconsistent with the height of the projections and extensions of the adjoining and surrounding properties, the majority of which are at ground floor level. In addition to this, the first floor extension would not respect the form, proportions or dimensions to the original building and would not appear subordinate in size to the existing building. The proposed first floor rear extension is considered to dominate the appearance of the host building and result in a prominent form of development in the wider conservation area.

The proposed Juliet balconies would result in addition imbalance between the set of semi-detached properties. At present, the windows on the rear elevation are consistent in height and location. The proposed Juliet balconies would result in the lowering of the window position which would destroy the consistency between the pair of semi-detached dwellings and other surrounding properties.

The proposed development, as a whole, would be detrimental to the appearance of the building and would neither preserve nor enhance the special character of the Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore considered unacceptable in design terms.

### **Amenity**

UDP policy SD6 refers to the amenity of neighbouring properties and states that *'Council will not grant planning permission for development that it considers causes harm to the amenity of the occupiers and neighbours'*.

It is not considered that the proposed extension at ground and first floor level and associated Juliet balconies would result in any undue loss of amenity to the neighbouring properties. Whilst it is acknowledged that the introduction of two Juliet balconies may provide some scope for overlooking into the rear gardens of the adjoining properties, it is not considered that this would be over and above what is already experienced from the existing windows on the rear elevation. A minimal loss of daylight and outlook may occur to the neighbouring property at 37 Swains Lane, however; it is not considered that this would be to an unacceptable degree.

The application is therefore considered acceptable in terms of amenity.

### **Recommendation**

The application is inconsistent with policies S1, S2, SD1, B1, B3 and B7 of the UDP and it is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused.

### **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***