

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN
REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

Officer: <i>Rob Brew</i>	Application Number(s): <i>PE9800663</i>
Application Address: <i>5 Brookfield Park</i>	Drawing Numbers: <i>S/LSP/300,</i> <i>S/EGFP/300 301 S/CE/302,</i> <i>S/EGFP/303; S/EE/304</i>
Signature (Area Team): <i>JPR</i>	Signature (Authorising Officer): <i>[Signature]</i>

SITE DESCRIPTION:

2 storey + attic semidetached house located in street of similar properties. Application relates to rear where there is currently a single storey rear ext at G floor level. Rear garden is of reasonable size + is at level ~1m below G floor level of house. Rest of street framed by houses + gardens of similar character. ~~Some~~ ^{Some} houses nearby have rear extensions of regrettable design + bulk. Site in Barnmouth PK CA (designated 4/2/92)

PROPOSAL:

Erection of a single storey conservatory extension at rear ground floor level to accommodate additional living space.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

15/10/65 PP granted for car port + new access to highway.
PP's have been granted for rear ext's to other properties in street since 1987 (when BP adopted) + 1992 (when CA designated) but these were for smaller ext's that were clearly subordinate to the main house

RELEVANT POLICIES:

Borough Plan: UD1, 2, 3, 4, 18

UDP: EN1, 16, 16 (new), 52, *, 27, 33

SPG/other: SPG/Env Code

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS

16 NOV 1999

RECOMMENDATION AGREED
ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL

CONSULTATIONS:

Adjoining Occupiers: Number Notified: 3

No. of Responses: 2

No. of Objections: 2

CAAC/Local Group Comments:

CAAC object - bulk excessive

Summary of Consultation Responses:

Objection received from 2 neighbours - object on grounds of loss of light + light pollution from conservatory

ASSESSMENT:

Amenity

Proposed extension will not lead to a significant loss of daylight/sunlight for neighbours, or result in a loss of privacy. The proposed ext could increase the amount of light emitted from the site, but this lies beyond planning control.

Design

The ^{proposed} size of the extension (in particular its bulk, width + general scale) ^{is} not considered to be sensitive to the main building or compatible with the established townscape. The extension would therefore not be clearly subordinate to the main building + would disrupt the historic townscape of this part of the CA. The proposal ~~also~~ thereby fails to preserve or enhance the character/appearance of the CA.

Materials are considered appropriate. Rest of street has some other inappropriate exts that do not benefit from recent RP, but have left overall character of street unaffected. Amenity value of remaining garden space acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION: Rp

1. The proposed extension would, by reason of its width, bulk and general scale, dominate the main building and disrupt the established townscape of the area, and therefore the extension fails to preserve or enhance the character ~~and~~ ^{or} appearance of this part of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The proposal therefore fails to comply with the Council's UDP policies EN1, 16, 16(new), 52, and 33.