#### DISCLAIMER

# Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> March 2008. For further information see

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

Delegated Report (Members' Briefing)		Analysis shee	Analysis sheet		01/01/2008				
		N/A	N/A		14/12/2007				
Officer			Expiry Date: Application Number(s)						
Jenny Fisher			2007/5744/P						
Application Address			Drawing Numbers						
9 Greville Road London NW6 5HY			Refer to draft decision notice.						
PO 3/4 A	rea Team Signat	ure C&UD	Authorised Of	ficer Signature					
Proposal(s)									
Erection of rear basement level extension and formation of steps to garden level.									
Recommendation(s): Grant con		ditional permission							
Application Typ	be: Full Plar	Full Planning Permission							

Conditions:									
Informatives:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice								
Consultations									
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	09	No. of responses No. electronic	01 00	No. of objections	01			
Summary of consultation responses:	<ul><li>The freeholder of 11 Greville Road has raised objection to the proposal on the following grounds:</li><li>Impact on drainage; and</li></ul>								
	Loss of privacy.								
Local groups comments:	No reply to date.								
Other comments:	<b>Thames Water</b> There are public sewers crossing this site, and no building works will be permitted within 3 metres of the sewers without Thames Water's approval. An informative should be attached to the decision notice to this affect.								
Site Description									
Premises comprise bas building is located on th The site is not located w	e north side of G	reville	Road that links Kilbu						
Relevant History 16/09/1997 (PW970244 second floor level to the	, .			erecti	on of a side extens	sion at			
19/02/2002 (PWX0103 dwellinghouse.	847): Certificat	e of	Lawfulness granted	for e	existing use as a	single			
Relevant policies									
Replacement UDP 2006 - S1/S2; SD6; B1; and B3.									
Camden Planning Guidance 2006									

### Assessment

### **Proposed**

The proposal is for a basement level extension to the rear of the property. The extension is to be 5m wide where it abuts the existing rear elevation, tapering down to 4.5m wide at the rear building line. The extension is to be 5.5m deep, leaving a 1.5m. wide path between the flank wall of the extension and the boundary wall with the neighbouring premises (No. 11). The extension is set into the raised garden level and the steps up to the existing raised garden would be enlarged. The extension is 2.7m high, but as it is set significantly below the raised garden level, only 1.4m of its height is appreciated to the rear. The rear garden is 13m in length. An additional  $30m^2$  of habitable floor space would be provided. Sliding folding doors would be installed in the flank wall of the extension opening onto the path. Three large (each 1m x 3m) rooflights would be installed in the roof.

## Main issues

- Visual impact
- Amenity

### Visual impact

The scheme has been assessed for compliance with policies B1 and B3. The height, scale, massing, proportions and bulk of development should respect the local area and adjoining buildings and be subordinate to the main building.

The extension would be mainly at basement level; only approx. 1.4m of the height of the extension would be visible above the raised garden and above the height of boundary walls with neighbouring properties. The erection of the extension within a sunken area of garden reduces the overall visual impact. It is considered that the proposed extension is in line with Replacement UDP policies and supporting design guidance.

#### Amenity

The application has also been considered for compliance with policy SD6 which deals with the impact of development on local amenity. The proposed extension is single-storey. It is set away from the boundary with No. 11 which prevents any adverse impact on this property in terms of loss of light or outlook. The windows on the side elevation are set predominantly below the height of the existing boundary wall, and certainly eye level of occupants would be below the height of the boundary wall. There would be no increase in overlooking to this property. The extension does abut the wall with No. 7, but its projection above it is no so significant that there would be a loss of light or outlook to the neighbour. No openings are proposed on this elevation so privacy would not be affected.

**<u>Recommendation</u>**: Grant conditional permission.