Delegated Report	OOrt Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	09/05/2014 24/04/2014				
(Members Briefing)	N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:						
Officer		Application Nu						
Tessa Craig		2014/1864/P						
Application Address		Drawing Numb	pers					
166 Haverstock Hill London	A(09)011 Revision B, A(09) 012 Revision B, A(09)014 Revision B, A(09)015 Revision B, A(09)017 Revision B, A(09) 018 Revision B and							
NW3 2AT		A(09) 019 Revi						
PO 3/4 Area Team Sig	nature C&UD	Authorised Of	ficer Signature					
Proposal(s)								
Erection of single storey side infill extension at lower ground floor level and new front gates and boundary treatment.								
Recommendation(s): Grant Planning Permission								
Application Type: Full I	Full Planning Permission							

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice								
Informatives:									
Consultations						Ī			
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	13	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02			
Summary of consultation responses:	Thirteen neighbours were notified of the proposal by post. A site notice was erected on 03/04/2014 and the application was advertised in Ham & High on 03/04/2014. Two letters of objection were received from: 164c Haverstock Hill- object to potential for precedence, want to see common boundary wall in rear garden protected, request garden be maintained. 168 Haverstock Hill- object to size of extension, would support extension up to same depth and height as 168 Haverstock Hill. Officer Comment The extension has been revised since original submission to become an infill side extension, therefore, the depth would not extent beyond the general depth of these properties, and the common garden wall with 164c would not be affected. The landscaping of the rear garden will be carried out in accordance with the proposed plans, however it does not require planning permission and therefore it is not considered necessary to impose a condition for landscaping to be carried out.								
CAAC comments:	Parkhill CAAC- object to proposal as considered overdevelopment of site. Officer Comment Since the original submission, the proposal has been revised to remove the large rear extension and construct a side infill extension which is considered acceptable in terms of design and amenity.								

Site Description

The subject property is located on the northern side of Haverstock Hill and comprises a three storey semi-detached property which has been subdivided into flats. The subject property is the lower ground floor flat which is accessed at the side of the property.

The site is located in the Parkhill Conservation Area and the building is identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The building is not listed.

Relevant History

None.

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)

DP24 (Securing High Quality Design)

DP26 (Managing the Impact of Development on Occupiers and Neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design

CPG6 Amenity

Parkhill and Upper Park conservation area and appraisal management strategy 2011

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for a side infill extension and changes to the front boundary of the property. The side infill extension will be 5.075m deep, 3.075m wide and 3.5m high and includes a glazed rooflight. The extension will include three sliding aluminium framed doors, whilst the existing rear elevation will be revised to include five folding doors. The extension will be white render and the existing rear elevation will also be white render.
- 1.2 Changes to the front of the property include installation of three white rendered pillars, a black steel pedestrian gate and an automated security gate in black steel. A new entrance door will replace the existing access and includes a stucco canopy. Stone pavers will replace the existing concreted driveway and a gate will be installed within the front of the property between the separate access to the upper floor flats and the driveway belonging to the lower floor flat. At the rear of the site new planter boxes will be installed along with a paved area stepping up to the rear garden.
- 1.3 The proposal has been revised since its original submission. Initially a 3m deep, full width rear extension was proposed. The development was revised to be a side infill extension excluding any further depth beyond the main existing rear elevation.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main consideration in relation to this proposal is the design and impact on the conservation area and impact on amenity.

Design

- 2.2 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within policy DP24 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the quality of materials to be used. Policy DP25 'Conserving Camden's Heritage' states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.
- 2.3 The Park Hill and Upper Park conservation area statement advises where infill extension are acceptable they should not exceed two storeys, but should be subordinate to the design of the main building and read as an extension.
- 2.4 CPG1 design guidance recommends alterations take into account the character and design of the property and surroundings, windows, doors and materials should complement the existing building, and rear extensions should be secondary to the main building.
- 2.5 The proposed infill extension is considered acceptable in design being subservient to the main building and sympathetic to the host property. The proposed materials will match the existing rear elevation.
- 2.6 The proposed changes to the front boundary are considered acceptable, sympathetic to the street scene and the conservation area. Similar boundary treatments can be seen along Haverstock Hill.

<u>Amenity</u>

2.7 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of

development is fully considered. Furthermore Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG6 seeks for developments to be "designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree" and that the Council will "aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight caused by a development on the amenity of existing occupiers."

2.8 The side infill extension is considered acceptable in terms of impact on amenity, there are no windows in the side elevation, only in the rear and therefore no loss of privacy or overlooking will result. The extension will be of a similar height to number 168 Haverstock Hill and no loss of daylight or sunlight to this site would result. The neighbouring property at 168 does not include any windows in the side elevation adjacent to the proposed extension.

3.0 Recommendation

3.1 The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design and amenity and consistent with the policies and guidance identified above. Therefore, it is recommended the proposal be granted planning permission.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 2nd June 2014. For further information, please go to www.camden.gov.uk and search for 'Members Briefing'.