

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		25/09/2007	
<b>(Members Briefing)</b>		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		19/09/2007	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Cassie Plumridge				2007/3881/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
6 & 6a Greenaway Gardens London NW3 7DJ				See 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>							
<p>The revision of planning permission granted on 12/02/07 as reference 2006/5462/P (for change of use of the two residential dwellings to form a single dwellinghouse incorporating alterations and extensions) comprising alterations to the windows on the front elevation, an increase in depth of a ground floor side extension, the change of the roof profile and design for the rear outbuilding, an increase in the excavated basement area and various other minor external works.</p>							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant 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	10	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
				No. electronic	00		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		None.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>		<p>An objection was received from the <b>Fitzjohn's / Netherhall CAAC</b>, who in summary raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The original scheme was excessive, this intensifies it.</i> <u>Response:</u> The proposed changes are considered to be minor variations on the approved scheme, and would not adversely impact on the integrity of the conservation area or on the amenity of the surrounding properties. Please see assessment section of the report for further comments.</li> <li><i>Objection to loss of trees.</i> <u>Response:</u> See assessment section of the report.</li> <li><i>Impact of vents on neighbours boundary.</i> <u>Response:</u> See assessment section of the report.</li> </ul>					

## Site Description

The application property is within the Reddington / Frognal Conservation Area and is not a listed building.

No. 6 and 6A Greenaway Gardens is currently divided into two maisonettes, however the subject site was split in the 1950s, and was originally built as a large detached single dwelling house, along with the rest of the development within the road, in the early 20th century. Apart from being split in two, the house exhibits the same character, materials and detailing as its neighbours, that is: neo-Georgian style; classically derived detailing; two storey plus roof storey; detached unit; red brick; prominent chimneys; strong eaves line; vertical fenestration with glazing bars.

The subject properties are provided with a generous rear garden with some substantial planting along the boundaries. The rear façade of No. 6A is provided with a projecting wing at ground and lower ground level, with an unscreened roof terrace.

The adjoining properties, No. 5 and No. 7, exhibit the same character, materials and detailing as the subject site that is: neo-Georgian style; classically derived detailing; two storey plus roof storey; detached unit; red brick; prominent chimneys; strong eaves line; vertical fenestration with glazing bars. No. 5 is not provided with substantial rear extensions, and the swimming pool of this property is located adjacent to the common boundary with the subject site.

No. 7 is provided with a rear extension at ground and lower ground floor level that extends the full width of the host building, it like No. 6A is provided with two unscreened roof terraces at first floor level. No. 7 is also provided with a very substantial building in the rear garden accommodating the pool house (see history below), which sits adjacent to the northern boundary of the site, away from the common boundary with the subject site.

## Relevant History

Planning permission 2006/5462/P granted on 09/02/2007 allowed for works to 6 & 6a Greenaway Gardens for the *"Change of use of the two residential dwellings to form a single dwellinghouse, and alterations and extensions including excavation works to provide an enlarged basement with two front and rear light wells, erection of a rear ground floor full width extension, single storey pool house extension to the rear, alterations to the rear fenestration; alterations and additions to the front façade, the rebuilding and alterations to the roof, and erection of a front boundary fence"*.

## Relevant policies

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. However it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

### Camden's Revised Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2004

- S1 & S2 – Strategic Policy on Sustainable Development
- SD1 – Quality of Life
- SD6 – Amenity for Occupiers & Neighbours
- SD7B – Light noise and vibration pollution
- SD8 – Disturbance
- H3 – Protection of Existing Housing
- B1 – General Design Principles
- B3 – Alterations & Extensions
- B7 – Conservation Areas
- N5 - Biodiversity
- N8 - Ancient Woodland and Trees
- T3 – Pedestrians and Cycling
- T4 – Public Transport
- T8 – Car Free Housing and Car Capped Housing
- T9 – Impact of Parking

## Assessment

### **PROPOSAL:**

Planning permission 2006/5462/P granted on 09/02/2007 allowed for works to 6 & 6a Greenaway Gardens for the *“Change of use of the two residential dwellings to form a single dwellinghouse, and alterations and extensions including excavation works to provide an enlarged basement with two front and rear light wells, erection of a rear ground floor full width extension, single storey pool house extension to the rear, alterations to the rear fenestration; alterations and additions to the front façade, the rebuilding and alterations to the roof, and erection of a front boundary fence”*.

The proposal seeks to amend the design of the previous approval. The proposed changes include the following:

- The position of windows on front elevation was relocated to be centred around the new entrance.
- The front light well is provided with a curved, rather than square edge, and a rendered rather than brick finish.
- The depth of the side ground floor extension is increased.
- Provision of a planting box and BBQ area to rear at ground floor level.
- Changes to the roof of the pool house to include roof lights, rather than solar heating.
- New basement plant room ducts.
- Increasing the size of the basement.
- Location of the first floor rear terrace.
- Changes to the design of the roof to the pool house.
- Provision of sunshades on the rear elevation.

**Amended plans:** The application as originally submitted included more substantial changes that were not considered acceptable. The applicant submitted amended plans removing or altering the extent of the changes. These changes are summarised below:

- The revised design as originally submitted included increasing the size of the basement. The basement as proposed would encroach on the root protection zone of a Western Red Cedar in the rear garden side boundary of No 5 Greenaway Gardens, which was not considered to be acceptable as it would have been detrimental to the health and stability of the tree. Amended plans were submitted showing a change in the extent of the basement, while it continued to show an increase in depth, it maintained the root protection zone of a Western Red Cedar in the rear garden side boundary of No 5 Greenaway Gardens. The basement as proposed it not considered to compromise the health of this tree.
- The revised design as originally submitted included a glazed link to pool house from the rear of the building at ground floor level. This was considered excessive, resulting in unreasonable bulk and compromising the development. This change was omitted from the application.
- The revised design as originally submitted included alterations to side extension, which included raising the height of the extension. This was not considered acceptable given the increase in height would make the side addition more visible from the street, and would reduce the gap between the buildings. This change in height was omitted from the application.
- The location of the first floor terrace was moved to the other side of the rear elevation. Amended plans were submitted showing balustrading to the relocated terrace to define the area to be used, in order to protect the adjoining property from overlooking.
- The revised design as originally submitted included sun shading screens on the rear elevation. These were considered to add significant bulk to the building and extend it out further to the rear. They were reduced in depth.

## **ASSESSMENT:**

The principle of the change of use of the two residential dwellings to form a single dwellinghouse, and substantial alterations and extensions has already been accepted and approved. The proposed changes are considered to be minor variations on the approved scheme, and would not adversely impact on the integrity of the conservation area or on the amenity of the surrounding properties.

- ***The position of windows on front elevation was relocated to be centred around the new entrance.***  
The original approval include alterations to the front façade to include a new entrance (the building currently has 2 for each dwelling). The proposed revision is considered to be a minor alteration that enhances the symmetry of the front façade.
- ***The front light well is provided with a curved, rather than square edge, and the provision of rendered rather than brick finish.***  
The provision of render on the internal and lower elevation, and curved lightwell, is considered to be a minor and acceptable alteration in the design. Views of the basement level is considered to be minimal given the raised lip of the light well, the metal grill above, the setback from the front boundary of the site, and the proposed boundary treatment, will obscure views of the rendered portion of the front elevation.
- ***The depth of the side ground floor extension is increased.***  
The depth of the side extension is to be increased, pulled forward closer to the front façade. As the change does not include an increase in height, as noted above, the increase is considered to be a minor alteration that does not compromise the rhythm of spacing between the buildings.
- ***Provision of a planting box and BBQ area to rear at ground floor level.***  
This is considered to be a minor and acceptable alteration.
- ***Changes to the roof of the pool house to include roof lights, rather than solar heating.***  
While the loss of the solar heating is regrettable, the change is considered to be acceptable. The adjoining property No. 7 has a substantial pool house in the rear garden, which has large areas of glazing. The changes to the design of the roof, are in keeping with the surrounds, and are considered acceptable in this instance.
- ***Location of exhaust ducts marked on plans.***  
Whilst as part of the substantive application the applicant did submit details of the existing noise level and what levels the plant would need to achieve to comply with Councils Guidelines, information regarding the noise to be produced by the plant was not provided. Further details were required in order to ensure the plant would not adversely impact on the amenity of the surrounding properties; this was to be secured by condition. The substantive permission included the following conditions relating to the plant and noise pollution.
  - *Noise levels at a point 1 metre external to sensitive facades shall be at least 5dB(A) less than the existing background measurement (LA90), expressed in dB(A) when all plant/equipment are in operation unless the plant/equipment hereby permitted will have a noise that has a distinguishable, discrete continuous note (whine, hiss, screech, hum) and/or if there are distinct impulses (bangs, clicks, clatters, thumps), then the noise levels from that piece of plant/equipment at any sensitive façade shall be at least 10dB(A) below the LA90, expressed in dB(A).*  
*Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policies SD6, SD7B, SD8 and Appendix 1 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.*
  - *Before the use of the plant commences, the plant shall be provided with acoustic isolation and sound attenuation in accordance with the scheme to be approved by the Council. Any necessary acoustic isolation shall be maintained in effective order to the reasonable satisfaction of the Council.*  
*Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policies SD6, SD7B, SD8 and Appendix 1 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006*

This information is still required in order to ensure that the plant does not adversely impact on the surrounding properties, regarding noise pollution. An informative will be placed on the permission advising that this information is still required by the substantive approval.

- ***Increasing the size of the basement.***

As noted above, the revised design as originally submitted included increasing the size of the basement. The basement as proposed would encroach on the root protection zone of a Western Red Cedar in the rear garden side boundary of No 5 Greenaway Gardens, which was not considered to be acceptable as it would have been detrimental to the health and stability of the tree. Amended plans were submitted showing a change in the extent of the basement, while it continued to show an increase in depth, it maintained the root protection zone of a Western Red Cedar in the rear garden side boundary of No 5 Greenaway Gardens. The basement as proposed it not considered to compromise the health of this tree.

The original consent proposed the removal of a Privet inside the front side boundary of number 5. This tree is now shown as being retained. The proposed extension of the basement construction towards the rear boundary will be closer to T5-T8, however it is sufficiently far from these trees not to be damaging to their root protection zones.

Sufficient tree protection details are provided within the Arboricultural report. The substantive permission requires details of hard and soft landscaping to be submitted which will ensure that the scheme includes sufficient replacement planting to protect the value to the amenity and character of the Conservation Area. An informative will be placed on the permission advising that this information is still required by the substantive approval.

- ***Location of the first floor rear terrace.***

The location of the first floor terrace was moved to the other side of the rear elevation. As noted above, amended plans were submitted showing balustrading to the relocated terrace to define the area to be used, in order to protect the adjoining property from overlooking. The change is considered to be acceptable.

- ***Changes to the design of the roof to the pool house.***

The alterations to the pool roof, from a solid square shape, to a more fluid curved shape, are considered to be a minor alteration that is acceptable.

- ***Provision of sunshades on the rear elevation.***

As noted above, the revised design as originally submitted included sun shading screens on the rear elevation, with a depth of 1.6 metres. These were considered to add significant bulk to the building. They were reduced in depth to 1 metres, which was on balance was considered to be acceptable and minor alteration.

The applicant will be advised by informative that all conditions and informatives attached to the substantive approved scheme (reference 2006/5462/P, granted on 09/02/2007) still apply and require compliance.

An informative will also be placed on the permission advising that the conditions (Condition 4 – hard and soft landscaping; Condition 6 – green roof details; Condition 9 – acoustic report and isolation for plant) of the substantive planning permission (reference 2006/5462/P, granted on 09/02/2007) are outstanding and require details to be submitted.

The proposal works are considered to be in keeping with the previously approved scheme and as such are considered suitable for support.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Grant