

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	12/12/2006
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	21/11/2006
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Hugh Miller			2006/4273/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
Flat A 119 Chetwynd Road London NW5 1DA			Site Location Plan; Drawing No. EXTINS 1-2?; 102 Rev A; 105; 100; P101; P103; Environment And Ecological Benefit Report; Sustainability/Access Statement; Bauder Extensive Green Roof Document		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		<b>Date:</b>
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
Single-storey rear extension to flat (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant			
<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	<b>15</b>	No. of responses	<b>02</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The proposal of a green roof is an excellent addition to the building and would benefit both the environment and the landscape for those that overlook it.</p> <p>Concerned about the change to the entrances.</p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>	<p>Dartmouth Park CAAC. No response.</p> <p><u>Chetwynd &amp; Twisden Roads Residents' Association</u></p> <p>Certificate 'B' of the current application form is different listing of the ownership of the property from the 2006/1877/P application. The property is owned by the Council's Housing Department and it should be notified by the applicant.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> <i>Since the submission of the application the applicant has formally consulted the Council's Housing Department to notify them of the planning application.</i></p> <p>We have no objection to the proposed extension, which is well designed. On the application form, box 7 it states two alternative materials for the construction whilst the drawing shows render. The render finish would seem more in keeping with the building.</p> <p><b>Officer comment:</b> <i>Painted rendered finish is more appropriate as it would match the host building and a condition is attached to this effect.</i></p>					

## Site Description

A 3-storey building situated on the north side of Chetwynd Road, west of Dartmouth Park Hill and south of St Mary Brookfield Church and Vicarage buildings. There is a modern block of flats, which abuts the east side of the application building, which projects beyond the rear building line at ground and upper floor levels. An access driveway and part of the common boundary wall separates the host building from the habitable rooms at ground level from no. 121.

The building is converted into flats and it has a white painted render finish. The site is located within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

## Relevant History

July 2006 Pp was refused for the erection of a single storey rear extension to garden level flat.

## 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.

### **RUDP –2006**

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 – General design principles

B3 – Alterations and extensions

B7 – Conservation Areas

### **SPG – 2002**

Alterations & extensions, section 2.7

**Consultation Draft SPG 2006:** Extensions, alterations and conservatories.

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement- Rear extensions/Conservatories -DP, DP20 – 22.

## Assessment

### Background

In July 2006, planning permission was refused for the erection of a single storey rear extension at garden level.

The main issues concerned design, & the impact on the appearance of the building, the conservation area and neighbour amenity.

### External alterations & extensions

The proposal measures approximately 4.40m width x 4.9 depth x height x 3.0m (21.56sqm gross floor area). It would be of identical footprint to the former single –storey extension at the rear of the building, which was demolished prior to this application. It has a shallow depth and width and would be of similar height to the previous extension. The extension would abut a 3.8m high common brick boundary wall on the east side adjacent to the access driveway with no.121 Chetwynd Road. The extension comprises brick painted rendered walls, timber framed windows and doors, part glazed roof and new part green roof. Proposed sedum green roof would replace the existing lean-to lead roof on the infill extension also the new extension to the host building.

The proposed extension with flat green roof would help to:

- a) minimise its overall height and visual bulk and,
- b) to ensure it would be subordinate and not detract from the appearance of the host building or detract from the appearance of the conservation area. The proposed extension would be subordinate to the host building in terms of its siting, size and form within the rear garden. In terms of design, size and materials (timber framed) the proposed extension is acceptable.

The alteration to widen the existing rear door would be more in keeping with the scale and proportions of the host building and it is acceptable in terms of design and use of materials.

### Neighbour amenity

The proposed window and sliding patio doors are oriented due north and west. The views from these openings would not cause loss of privacy or overlooking of occupiers of the adjacent properties. In addition, the proposed extension overall height and location would ensure that there would be no loss of daylight or sunlight to habitable rooms of adjacent occupiers.

The rooflight is well forward of the first floor window and is set below the raised upstand of the rear bay window. Given the location and siting the proposed roof light is unlikely to cause harm through light pollution to occupiers at first floor level rear. The proposal is therefore satisfactory.

Approval is recommended.