Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	12/08/2014		
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:			
Officer			Application N	umber(s)			
Obote Hope			2014/3988/P				
Application Address			Drawing Numbers				
14 Briardale Gardens London NW3 7PP			Please refer to decision notice				
PO 3/4 Area T	eam Signature	e C&UD	Authorised Of	ficer Signature			
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a full width rear extension following demolition of existing bay window and replacement of existing windows and doors to the garage at side front elevation level, installation of new folding/sliding door, replacement of boundary fence to rear and installation of new boundary fence to the front elevation all associated with the use as residential dwellinghouse.							
Recommendation(s)	Refuse Pla	Refuse Planning Consent					
Application Type: Householder Planning A			oplication				

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice									
Informatives:										
Consultations				1						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	25	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01				
			No. Electronic	01						
	As press notice was published on 07 July 2014 expiring 24 July 2014 and a site notice was displayed on 27 June 2014 until 18 July 2014.									
Summary of consultation	Heath and Hampstead Society:									
responses:	 ill-considered proposal, to extend this fine Quennell-designed house This application proposes to jam a badly-proportioned and poorly detailed glass box onto the rear of this beautiful Arts-and-Crafts house the proposal is damaging to the appearance and character of our Conservation Area 									
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	N/A									
 a 2 storey detached residential dwelling, Arts and Craft building with designed by Charles Quennell with integral garage. The property has bay window to the front and rear at ground floor, gables and sweeping tile roof. The upper floor is rendered and the ground floor is constructed using red bricks level that gives a uniformity and variation. The site is located in the sub are one of the Redington/Frognal Conservation Area and number 2-14 are considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area. Relevant History 29400: Construction of a double garage at the side and means of access thereto. GRANTED 19/02/1980 										
Relevant policies LDF Core Strategy CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) Development Policies										
DP24 (Securing high quali DP25 (Conserving Camde DP26 (Managing the impa	n's heritage)	on occu	piers and neighbours)							
Camden Planning Guida CPG1 (Design) 1, 2, 3 and CPG6 (Amenity)										
Redington/Frognal Conservation Area Statement 2000 (Page 28)										
National Planning Policy Framework 2012										

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing bay window and erection of a full width rear extension. The proposed extension would measure 8.4m wide, 4m deep with a 3.5m high flat roof. The rear elevation of the extension would be host to a series of sliding/folding doors measuring 7m wide and 2.8m in height.

1.2 The main issues for consideration are:

1) The design and impact of the development on the existing building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

2) The impact of the development on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

2.0 Design

2.1 DP24, DP25, CS14 and CPG1. The council's design planning guidance provides guidance on rear extensions in chapter 4. Rear extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation and 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 original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;
- respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies or chimney stacks;
- respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to un-built 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;
- allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden; and
- retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity, including that of neighbouring properties, proportionate to that of the surrounding area.

2.2 As the host building exists, it has an existing rear extension which extends for part of the width of the property, the remaining rear elevation of the dwelling is characterised by an original double height bay window which is in keeping with the integrity of the parent building. The proposed development would involve the demolition of the rear extension and removal of the bay window, followed with the erection of a full width rear extension with a series of three large paned sliding doors.

2.3 The proposed extension is considered to be an overly dominant addition to the rear elevation by virtue of its design and bulk. The proposed extension would be 2.1m from the boundary with 12 Briardale Gardens and 3.0m from number 376 Finchley Road. The extension would be constructed using brick and painted white render with 2.8m (height) x 7.0m (width) folding/sliding aluminium door.

2.4 The Conservation Area management plan requires careful consideration of alterations and extensions to buildings in the conservation area. The CA statement stipulates 'that extensions to the rear elevations of buildings in the conservation area should respect the historic pattern of development, and preserve the character and historic features of existing buildings'. The design of the proposed extension is bland and is not characteristic of the host building unlike the beautifully crafted bay window between the ground and first floors, the design of the proposed extension is a large full width square box with excessively large sliding doors and it's proposed that the design would have a detrimental impact to the host building, especially as the design fails would contribute to the loss of original architectural features. Furthermore, the proposed design is a far contrast from the solid void ratio of the rear elevation of the host building. And as such, the proposed extension is contrary to the guidance offered in the Redington/Frognal Conservation Area.

2.5 The property is considered to make a positive contributor to the Redington/Frognal Conservation Area. Therefore, the extension would be contrary to planning policy CS14 and DP25 of the LDF. Furthermore, the proposed demolition of the bay window would fail to respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building and respect and preserve existing architectural features to the detriment of the host building. Notwithstanding, the overly large sliding doors would result in a large gap to the rear elevation.

2.6 The proposed design of the sliding door by virtue of its height (2.8m) and width (7.0m) would leave a combined total of 1.4m of masonry to the side and 0.7m from the parapet wall, and as such, the fenestration details do not reflect the characterful windows to the existing rear or the use of timber within the main dwelling due to the scale of the glazing and proposed use of aluminium to the rear elevation of the extension.

2.7 There are no objections for the replacement of the garage door and windows or for the installation of folding/ sliding door subject to the door being timber framed nor would there be an objection for the erection of a new 2.1m garden fence to the front at side and rear elevation subject to the new fence is designed to match the boundary treatment all associated with the front elevation.

3.0 Amenity

3.1 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."

4.0 Impact on the amenity of surrounding residential occupiers

4.1 It is not considered that the proposed rear extension would not result in any significant loss of amenity for neighbours in terms of privacy, overlooking or sense of enclosure.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed full width extension is considered an overly dominant and large extension, with poor design which is unsympathetic to the host building and the character of the area.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 Refuse Planning Consent