

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		23/08/2006	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		04/08/2006	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Grant Leggett				2006/2988/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
16 Powlett Place London NW1 8DR				Site Location Plan 3139/01; 3139/033139/05; 3139/06; 3139/10B; 3139/12B; 3139/13B; 3139/11B; 03 Photo Sheets			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		Date:		
Proposal(s)							
Part single, part two storey rear extension to residential dwellinghouse (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	03	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:		No responses.					
CAAC/Local groups' comments:		No CAAC for Harmood Street Conservation Area.					

Site Description

The application relates to a two-storey mid-terrace dwellinghouse (Class C3) situated on the south side of Powlett Place.

The site is within the Harmood Street Conservation Area.

Relevant History

May 2006: Planning permission **refused** for the erection of a two storey rear extension and replacement of windows to dwelling house.

The application was refused because the extension, by reason of its height, bulk, location and orientation, would result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of occupiers at the neighbouring no.14 Powlett Place through loss of daylight and sunlight to and outlook from ground floor habitable room windows and an increased sense of enclosure

Relevant Policies

London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 – General design principles

B3 – Alterations and extensions

B7 – Conservation areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance 2002

2.7 – Extensions and alterations

Assessment

Permission is sought for a part single/part two-storey rear extension. The ground floor of the extension would be full-width and project 3.5m from the rear building line of the house whereas the first floor component would only be part-width.

The application is a revision to the previously refused application which was refused on grounds of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook and increased sense of enclosure at no.14.

Design

Ordnance Survey maps for the site show an historic back addition which appears to have been demolished some time after 1971. The proposed extension would match the depth of the existing extensions at neighbouring properties. The depth is therefore considered acceptable.

The full-width nature of the extension at ground floor level is of some concern. Supplementary Planning Guidance (2002) seeks to strongly discourage full-width extensions as they can dominate the original building in terms of bulk and obscure original features. In this case the extension is considered to do both. However the proposed extension must be considered in its context. Several neighbouring buildings in the terrace including no.18 and 20 to the east and no.12 to the west have full-width, two-storey rear extensions. The proposed extension would also not be visible from the public realm. In order to refuse the application the extension must be considered under relevant UDP policies, as well as supplementary planning guidance. The principal policies in considering the proposal are B7, which seek to ensure developments preserve or enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas, and B3 which seeks to resist inappropriate extensions to existing buildings.

The key test in assessing the acceptability of an extension under these policies is whether it would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Certainly if the application were to be refused, material harm to the conservation area harm would need to be demonstrated.

The SPG is subordinate to the Unitary Development Plan. While there is a conflict with SPG there is no compulsion to refuse permission in any circumstance and in all cases most regard must be had to the relevant UDP policy which requires harm to be demonstrated before an application can be refused. The extensions are therefore considered acceptable.

The proposed windows would be casement and would not be in keeping with those on the existing building or on adjoining buildings. Therefore a condition is attached requiring these windows to be timber sliding sash and an informative added to encourage re-use of the existing windows.

Amenity

The proposed extension has been reduced since the previous refusal and is now considered to appropriately address the reasons for the refusal. The neighbour's rear-facing habitable room (living room) window at the rear is 1.6m from the boundary. The first floor component of the proposed extension is set 1.8m from the boundary and rises to 4.9m in height, but is only 3m deep. A desktop analysis of the potential effect reveals that a 45-degree plane would only intersect the window in one plane, suggesting the effect on daylight, sunlight and sense of enclosure to the window would not be harmful.

No other adverse effects on residential amenity are expected, subject to conditions.

Recommendation

Planning permission should be **granted** subject to conditions.

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

