

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	17/09/2007
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	05/09/2007
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Cassie Plumridge			2007/2804/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
23 Maresfield Gardens London NW3 5SD			2006/P3; 2006/P1		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of single-storey rear extension to ground floor flat and relocation of existing summerhouse to rear of site.					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	15	No. of responses No. electronic	06 00	No. of objections	06
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>An objection was received from 11-13 Maresfield Gardens, who in summary raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of garden space. • Not in keeping with conservation area. • Incremental increase. • Undesirable precedent. <p>An objection was received from 25 Maresfield Gardens, who in summary raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Set an undesirable precedent.</i> • <i>Loss of green space.</i> • <i>Infringement on privacy.</i> <p>An objection was received from Flat A, 25 Maresfield Gardens, who in summary raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Loss of daylight.</i> • <i>Impact on trees.</i> • <i>Disruption during construction.</i> <p>An objection was received from Flat C, 25 Maresfield Gardens, who in summary raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Over development of the site.</i> • <i>Loss of light</i> • <i>Destroy symmetry of rear elevation.</i> • <i>Erosion of garden space.</i> • <i>Not in keeping with the conservation area.</i> • <i>Same as previous application.</i> 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>The Heath and Hampstead Society raised objection to the extension as the design and composition did not complement the host building.</p> <p>The Fitzjohn's/ Netherhall CAAC did not raise any objection to the rear extension, however did object to the relocation of the shed; stating it was an ugly building and in its new location would be more visible to the surrounding properties.</p>					
Site Description						
<p>The subject site falls within the Fitzjohn's / Netherhall Conservation Area, and is identified as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. The subject building is a four storey building that is divided into four flats. A large full width rear extension has been provided to the lower ground floor, which has a protruding bay feature for a portion of the rear elevation adjacent to the boundary with No. 25. The rear extension is in contrast the adjoining properties which have not been extended. It is noted that the adjoining property to the south, No. 21, has a large building in the rear garden area.</p>						

Relevant History

- On 21/08/1985 planning permission 8501092 was **granted** for the *erection of a single-storey ground floor rear extension and conservatory*.
- On 23/01/1986 planning permission 8501776 was **granted** for *works of alteration and conversion to form a two-bedroom flat at ground floor level with a screened roof terrace at the rear*.
- On 23/01/1986 planning permission 8501777 was **granted** for *erection of a single-storey basement level rear extension*.
- On 30/07/1987 an application for planning permission (reference 8602476) was **refused** for *change of use and works of conversion including the erection of a single storey rear extension and a roof extension at the rear to provide four self-contained dwelling units*.
- On 19/11/1987 Planning permission 8703038 was **granted** for the *change of use and works of conversion including the erection of a single storey rear extension with roof terrace over to provide four self-contained dwelling units*.
- On 12/01/2004 planning permission 2003/1220/P was **granted** for *the retention of a timber shed within the rear garden area*.
- On 24/11/2006 an application for planning permission (reference 2006/3608/P) for the *erection of single-storey rear extension to ground floor flat and relocation of existing summerhouse to rear of site* was **refused**. It is noted that the works in this scheme are identical to the subject scheme. The application was refused on the following ground:

The proposed single-storey rear extension, by reason of bulk, mass, size, location of the building, material and detailed design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and the Fitzjohn/Netherhall Conservation Area contrary to policies B1 (General Design Principles), B3 (Alterations and Extensions), and B7 (Conservation Areas) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006, Supplementary Planning Guidance 2002 and the Fitzjohn/Netherhall Conservation Area Statement.

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 Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

- S1 & S2 – Strategic Policy on Sustainable Development
- SD1 – Quality of Life
- SD6 – Amenity for Occupiers & Neighbours
- B1 – General Design Principles
- B3 – Alterations & Extensions
- B7 – Conservation Areas

Camden Planning Guidance

Fitzjohn's / Netherhall Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

PROPOSAL:

The subject application seeks planning permission for the erection of single storey rear extension to ground floor flat and relocation of the existing garden shed to the rear of the site

ASSESSMENT:

As noted above, the proposed works are identical to those recently considered in application 2006/3608/P, which was refused on 24/11/2006. While it is acknowledged that the Camden Planning Guidance 2006 has been adopted since the determination of the previous application, there is not considered to be a substantial change in policy to warrant approval of the application. As discussed below, the proposed rear extension is still considered to not be suitable for support.

Relocation of the existing garden shed:

- Planning permission (reference 2003/1220/P) granted on 12/01/2004 allowed for the retention of a timber shed within the rear garden area. The application proposes to relocate this existing garden shed to the rear southwest corner of the site.
- The relocation of the shed is considered to be acceptable, as it has a limited height it would not adversely impact on the amenity of the surrounding properties, adjacent to rear boundaries is a typical location for a utilitarian structure. While planting is provided along the rear boundary, the relocation of the shed would not require the removal of any significant vegetation.

Erection of single storey rear extension:

- As noted previously, the lower ground floor flat has already been provided with a large substantial full width rear extension, which has a protruding bay feature for a portion of the rear elevation adjacent to the boundary with No. 25. This extension protrudes a maximum distance of approximately 6.7 metres (to the front bay) beyond the original rear façade of the host building, with the smaller recessed portion of the extension having a depth of 4 metres. The recessed section of the existing rear extension provides some visual relief and articulation to the existing rear extension, softening the impact of the substantial addition on the rear elevation of the host building.
- The proposed single storey rear extension would infill the recessed section of the existing single storey rear extension, and would increase the overall depth of the extension from the original rear façade of the host building as it would protrude past the existing bay feature. The extension would increase the depth of the existing single storey extension to 7.8 metres. The proposed extension would match the materials of the existing building, having a white rendered finished with timber framed windows. The addition has a roof light to service the new room. The addition would be accommodated within the existing paved section of the rear garden.
- As discussed below, the proposal is considered to adversely impact on the integrity of the host building and the wider conservation area.
- The adjoining properties, No. 25 and No. 21, have not been provided with rear extensions, although it is acknowledged that No. 21 has been provided with a substantial sized building in the rear garden. It is considered that further extension of the building on the subject site into the rear garden, whilst only increasing the overall depth of the building by approximately 1.1 metres, is not acceptable. The incremental encroachment of built form into the rear garden is considered to harm the balance between built and un-built space and disrupt the pattern of development of the surrounding properties and the wider Conservation Area.
- The Conservation Area Statement identifies as current issues *“extensions, conservatories and backland extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. A number of additions have harmed the character of the area and further inappropriate erosion will be resisted...”*. The further extension beyond the rear building line of adjoining properties is considered to harm the pattern of development and the additional depth is considered to be of an inappropriate scale for a rear extension, increasing the overall depth to 7.8 metres.
- The choice of materials for the proposed extension is not considered appropriate. The existing extension is provided with recessed section which allows for some visual relief for this elevation. The solid materials of

the proposed extension present as a bulky addition, and while the bay feature of the proposed extension provides some variation to this elevation, as discussed above, further encroachment into the garden is not acceptable. The choice of materials does not assist in reducing the bulk associated with the scale of the extension.

- It should be noted that given the extent of existing extension, it is considered that infilling the recessed portion of the rear façade (regardless of materials) is unlikely to be considered acceptable. There is a need to preserve the balance between built and unbuilt space within rear gardens, and provide articulation to the rear facade.
- The addition will have limited presentation to the adjoining property at No. 21 Maresfield Gardens given the addition is set in from the common boundary, the addition sits beyond the rear elevation of this property (given the existing single storey extension adjacent to this boundary has a depth of 4 metres) and the addition has been designed to have a flat roof form. Therefore, the addition is not considered to adversely compromise the amenity of this property. It is considered that given the size of the rooflight and its relationship to the windows of flats on the upper floors that there is unlikely to be significant light pollution to the detriment of the occupiers of these flats.

As discussed above the rear extension is not considered suitable for support. The proposed rear extension, by reason of size, location and detailed design, would be detrimental to appearance of the host building and would harm with wider Fitzjohn's / Netherhall Conservation Area contrary to policies B1 (General Design Principles), B3 (Alterations and Extensions), and B7 (Conservation Areas) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006, is contrary to the Conservation Area Statement guidelines and Camden Planning Guidance.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse