

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>30/10/2013</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		10/10/2013	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Neil Quinn				2013/4689/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
68 Woodsome Road London NW5 1RZ				Refer to decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>		<b>Area Team Signature</b>		<b>C&amp;UD</b>		<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Formation of roof terrace in association with rear first floor extension to closet wing. Replacement of existing patio door with 3 panel sliding door at rear ground floor level to existing dwellinghouse (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>16</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
				No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Site notice: 11/09/2013 to 02/10/2013 Press notice (Ham&High): 19/09/2013 to 10/10/2013  Objection raised from <u>one neighbouring occupier</u> on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Additional noise and vibration that will be caused by these two building works, particularly given works to neighbouring properties;</li> <li>- Asked for condition to be added preventing loud music to be played during the day <i>Officer comments:</i> It is considered that a condition could be attached to any approval ensuring building works are restricted to normal working hours.</li> <li>- Potential for subsidence if there is to be excavation at No 54 Croftdown Road; <i>Officer comments:</i> The proposed alterations are not considered to cause any risk of subsidence given there is no excavation / digging proposed.</li> <li>- Also will the solar panels be on the rear extension, which I overlook, or will they be on the rear of the main roof? <i>Officer comments:</i> The proposal does not involve the installation of solar panels, either on the main roof or that of the extension.</li> </ul>					
<b>CAAC comments:</b>		No response received from <b>Dartmouth Park CAAC</b> .					

## Site Description

The application site is a three-storey, end-of-terrace property on the northern side of Woodsome Road, which is in use as a single family dwelling. It is not listed, but is identified as a building which makes a positive contribution to the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

The rear of the property benefits from a two-storey closet wing, which is characteristic of the terrace; there is a consistent depth to these closet wings to the immediate south-west. To the immediate north-east is a three-storey modern block of flats. The property has also been infilled at ground floor level with a conservatory-style structure, with a small single storey addition projecting beyond the two-storey closet wing.

## Relevant History

None relevant

## Relevant policies

### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

CS1 (Distribution of growth)

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

### **Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

CPG1 (Design)

CPG6 (Amenity)

**Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (adopted Jan 2009)**

**London Plan 2011**

**NPPF 2012**

## Assessment

### 1.0 Proposal

1.1 The application proposes the following alterations:

- The extension of the rear first floor closet wing to a depth of approximately 4.9m from the main rear building line, matching the width of the existing closet wing;
- The installation of 1.1m high railings around the flat roof of the closet wing, and the installation of French doors at second floor level, in connection with the use of the flat roof as a terrace;
- The installation of a new rendered bay window at first floor level to the rear closet wing;
- The replacement of the ground floor rear infill conservatory with a new brick-built rear pitched roof extension, matching the depth of the closet wing extension (i.e. 4.9m), and new triple sliding doors to the rear elevation.

### 2.0 Considerations

#### 2.1 Design / Impact on Dartmouth Park Conservation Area

2.2 Policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of Camden's Local Development Framework seek to promote high quality places and conserving Camden's heritage. Policy CS14 states that the Council will ensure Camden's places and buildings are attractive, safe and easy to use by inter alia *'preserving and enhancing Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas...'*. The property lies within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, and any alterations/extension to these buildings should *preserve and enhance* the character and appearance of this conservation area.

2.3 Further detailed advice on the design of rear extensions is provided in CPG1 'Design'. Importantly, paragraph 4.10 states that rear extensions should be designed to:

- Be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
- respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space;
- not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure.

2.4 Also of relevance is the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal, which points to unsympathetic rear extensions and alterations (including roof terraces) as a significant negative feature of the conservation area, which *"can alter the balance and harmony of a property or group of buildings"* (page 49). Page 56 goes on to state that *"the original historic pattern of rear elevations within a street or group of buildings is an integral part of the character of the area and as such rear extensions will not be acceptable where they would diverge significantly from the historic pattern."*

2.5 Although there is a modern block of flats to the immediate north-east of the application site, the property should be read in context with the rest of the terrace to the immediate south-west along Woodsome Road. While it is acknowledged that a variety of styles of extensions and alterations have been carried out at ground floor level, importantly at first floor level, there is a relatively consistent character to the rear of these properties in terms of the depth of closet wing extensions. In addition, there are no examples of roof terraces / associated balustrading at second floor. A search of planning history also confirms there are no extant planning permissions for this type of extension to immediately neighbouring properties.

2.6 On this basis, it is considered the extension of the closet wing would deviate from the relatively consistent character of the terrace. It is also considered the detailed design including the bay window would represent an unsympathetic, incongruous alteration at first floor level which would be harmful to the host building and this part of the conservation area.

2.7 At second floor level, the installation of railings along the perimeter of the roof of the enlarged closet wing would also represent an alien, incongruous feature at a high level of the building, which would be prominent when viewed from surrounding properties. The creation of the door at second floor level in itself is acceptable in design terms, however this is only required in connection with the terrace.

2.8 The replacement of the infill conservatory with a brick-built rear infill extension, and the creation of the triple sliding doors to the rear elevation are also considered acceptable. However this element of the works is linked to the first floor extension (the pitched roof leads directly off from the extension), and the additional bulk created here would also be inconsistent with the rear of this terrace.

2.9 Overall, the proposed first floor extension, bay window and roof terrace would disrupt the degree of harmony and consistency which currently exists to the rear of this terrace, and is therefore harmful to the appearance of the host building, and the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. It would therefore fail to comply with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of the LDF, and the advice provided in CPG1.

### 2.10 Amenity

2.11 The Council has a duty to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause material harm to amenity in accordance with Policy DP26.

2.12 The main issue raised is the creation of the roof terrace at second floor level, and its impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of privacy/overlooking. The terrace would have an area of approximately 15 sqm, and would therefore allow a significant number of people which is a significant enough space to allow a number of people to sit and stand out for long periods of time.

2.13 The terrace would allow direct views into the upper floor windows of the flats to the immediate north-east of the site (70-86 Woodsome Road), as well as views into surrounding gardens of neighbouring gardens to the north-east and south-west. While it is acknowledged there is already some mutual overlooking between properties from upper floor windows along this terrace, the perception of overlooking would be significantly increased as a result of the proposal. It would therefore fail to comply with policy DP26 and advice provided in CPG6.

2.14 The design of the proposed balustrade (metal railings) could be changed to obscure glazed screening to mitigate overlooking to neighbouring properties. However, given that these would need to be installed to a height of at least 1.7m to be effective, this would raise further concerns in design and conservation terms to those outlined above.

2.15 The proposed first floor rear extension would result in additional bulk along the north-eastern boundary, and would cause some overshadowing to the occupiers of the flats immediately adjoining at Nos. 70-86 Woodsome Road. However given the relatively limited additional depth, this is not considered to cause a material loss of daylight/sunlight or increased sense of enclosure to these occupiers.

2.16 To the south-west, the proposed first floor extension is considered to be a sufficient distance from neighbouring windows to the rear of No. 62 to ensure there would be no material loss of daylight/sunlight or increased sense of enclosure; the additional bulk from the pitched roof would cause some loss of daylight to the roof of the conservatory, but not sufficiently to warrant refusal on these grounds.

2.17 The other rear alterations (i.e. the bay window and the new triple sliding doors) are acceptable in amenity terms given views already possible from windows at first floor level to neighbouring properties, and the level of existing boundary treatment.

### 2.18 Other issues

2.19 The concerns raised by neighbouring occupiers regarding noise and disruption from the construction process are noted. Were the application to be recommended for approval, a condition would be attached ensuring building works can only take place during normal working hours (0800 – 1800 Monday to Friday, and 0800 – 1300 Saturdays) to mitigate noise disturbance to neighbouring occupiers as much as possible.

## **3.0 Recommendation**

### **3.1 Refuse permission on design and amenity (overlooking) grounds**