

| | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Delegated Report (Members Briefing) | | Analysis sheet | | Expiry Date: | | 02/11/2006 | |
| | | N/A / attached | | Consultation Expiry Date: | | 11/10/2006 | |
| Officer | | | | Application Number(s) | | | |
| Matthew Durling | | | | 2006/3752/P | | | |
| Application Address | | | | Drawing Numbers | | | |
| Flat 2 7 Netherhall Gardens London NW3 5RN | | | | See decision notice. | | | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signature | C&UD | Authorised Officer Signature | | Date | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | |
| Erection of a single-storey ground floor extension to the rear of the existing self-contained flat. | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | Grant planning permission | | | | | |
| Application Type: | | Full Planning Permission | | | | | |
| Conditions: | | Refer to Draft Decision Notice | | | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | | No. notified | 21 | No. of responses | 02 | No. of objections | 02 |
| Summary of consultation responses: | | <p>Two letters of objection received;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ordnance Survey extract is incorrect and does not take account of the extension to the rear of 7B; <i>Response: the extension to the rear of 7B has been accounted for.</i> Height of the proposed extension is considered unacceptable given the proximity to living room windows of 7B and will significantly reduce the natural light reaching the ground floor to the rear of the house; <i>Response: by virtue of the set back, it is considered that the extension will not result in a detrimental loss of light to this property.</i> Scale, density and architectural style of the proposed extension are inappropriate given the close proximity to the adjoining property; <i>Response: the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of scale and detailed design.</i> The replacement of the party wall with the south wall of the proposed extension is unacceptable and is uncomfortably close to the conservatory and the sitting room and will seriously reduce the light to these rooms; <i>Response: it is considered that the proposal will not result in serious harm to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers.</i> Proposed extension would seriously affect the amenity of the patio area, limiting its use and having an unfavourable effect on the value of the property; <i>Response: It is considered that the proposal will not seriously reduce the amenity of the adjoining garden. The impact of development on property value is not a material planning consideration.</i> | | | | | |
| CAAC comments: | | <u>Fitzjohns/Netherhall CAAC</u> : no objection. | | | | | |

Site Description

A 3-storey property, sub-divided into flats and located on the western side of Netherhall Gardens, which is located within the Fitzjohns/Netherhall conservation area. The application relates to the ground floor flat.

Relevant History

9005737: PP granted 14/05/1991 for the erection of a conservatory to Flat 2 at rear garden level and alterations to the terrace and garden steps.

Relevant policies

Replacement UDP 2006

SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours
B1 General design principles
B3 Alterations and extensions
B7 Conservation areas

Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area Statement Supplementary Planning Guidance

Assessment

Proposal:

The application seeks permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension to provide additional accommodation for the existing ground floor level flat.

Assessment:

The proposed single storey rear extension will be 'L' shaped in order to retain natural light to both windows of a bedroom located within the rear part of the original house. Whilst the extension will be 6.6m wide, it will not be full-width and will maintain a 1.2m gap with the boundary shared with 7B Netherhall Gardens. The extension will project 5m from the rear elevation of Flat 2 and 4.1m from the rear elevation of the adjoining flat (Flat 1), to be level with the rear elevation of the existing conservatory. The extension will be 3.6m high, and incorporate a small parapet of 300mm. The development will appear as a subordinate addition in the context of the substantial parent building, and is considered to be acceptable in terms of bulk, massing and scale.

It is proposed to replicate some of the existing period features of the property into the new extension, including two timber-framed double doors and fanlights. The proposed fenestration detailing will be consistent with the existing rear elevation in terms of size and proportion. The timber-framed windows will complement the existing building. The walls of the extension will be smooth rendered white to match the existing white rendered band at ground floor level. This will help to integrate the extension into the design of the existing building. The extension will not be visible from the public realm, and will not have any impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area. In terms of design, the single storey rear extension is considered to be acceptable.

The topography of the site necessitates the erection of a terrace area to the rear of the extension. The terrace will be bounded by a 2m high boundary wall on the southern elevation to prevent overlooking and provide an element of privacy between the two properties. It is considered that the rear terrace will thus not facilitate overlooking of the adjoining property such that it would be harmful to their amenities. The terrace will project a further 2.5m from the extension and will result in the loss of some planting. The proposals do however allow for the retention of a substantial garden area with ample amenity value, and are considered to be acceptable in this regard.

On the southern (side) elevation, the extension will comprise part of the party wall with the adjoining ground floor level flat (Flat 1). Whilst the extension will result in some loss of light to the sitting room windows on the rear elevation, it is not considered that this loss would be to a degree that would cause detrimental harm to neighbour amenity such as to warrant the application being refused. Furthermore, the proposed extension will be located directly north of Flat 1 and it will therefore have a minimal, if any, impact on the amount of direct sunlight received to these windows. The doors serve a living room that is also lit by a similar partially glazed door opening on to the conservatory structure. The conservatory to Flat 1 comprises a lightweight structure that facilitates views through it and it is therefore considered that general outlook from the habitable rooms to the rear of the adjoining flat will not be unreasonably impaired.

The northern (side) elevation of the proposed extension will be set away from the boundary with 7B Netherhall Gardens by approximately 1.2m. By virtue of this set back, it is considered that the extension will not result in a detrimental loss of light or amenity to this property.

On balance, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of design and amenity and approval is recommended.

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613