

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	20/12/2013
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	13/02/2013
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Fergus Freeney			2013/7128/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
93 Hillway London N6 6AB			See decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Amendments to planning permission dated 30/09/2013 (ref. 2013/4511/P) for the erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension and other alterations, namely to erect an enlarged single-storey pool extension in rear garden.					
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission			
Application Type:		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	02	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:	Site notice: 22/01/2014 – 12/02/2014 Press notice: 21/11/2013 – 13/02/2014 No comments received					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>Holly Lodge CAAC – Objection received 16/01/2014 on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The extension is not in harmony with the original form of the house. <i>Officer comment: Please see section 4 (design) of the report below</i> - It is 70cm high above the existing perimeter fence as the vegetation could be removed. <i>Officer comment: Please see section 14 (Amenity) of the report below.</i> - The application appears to include the excavation of a new swimming pool and a BIA should be submitted. <i>Officer comment: There is an existing swimming pool located at a patio area; this pool would be replaced with an extension and a new pool area excavated within. A BIA has been submitted and independently assessed to confirm that the extension complies with all relevant policies/guidance. Please see section 10 (Excavation works) of report below for further information</i> - It is overly large and will impact upon the amenity of the adjoining neighbour. <i>Officer comment: Please see section 14 (Amenity) of the report below</i> <p>Second objection received 31st October 2014, reiterating points above and raising the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CPG 4 also requires a Construction Management Plan be developed for <u>all</u> basement works in a Conservation Area, it doesn't qualify in regards of the scale of the development. Therefore a condition must be applied to any permission that may be granted requiring a CMP in accordance with Camden's published Planning Guidance. Also, as the roads and verges of the Holly Lodge Estate are not adopted but are owned by Trustees of the Estate a consultee to the CMP must be the Holly Lodge Estate Committee, members of which are the Trustees. <i>Officer comment: Generally a construction management plan would need to be submitted for basement works to ensure that large scale excavation and construction works are managed in a sustainable way with minimal impact on the highways network and neighbours. However, the guidance allows for discretion and should be applied only where relevant. An assessment of why a construction management plan is not considered necessary in this instance is outlined in section 10 (Excavation) of the report below.</i> 					

Site Description

The site is located on the west side of Hillway. It comprises a two-storey semi detached dwelling house. The property is not listed, but is within the Holly Lodge Conservation Area.

Relevant History

14/07/1995- Permission granted for the installation of a dormer window at the rear and two velux windows at the side and alterations to the fenestration at the rear (Ref: 9500735)

14/07/1095- Conservation Area Consent granted for the demolition of an existing rear dormer (Ref: 9560091)

07/02/1997- Permission refused for the retention of summerhouse. (Ref: P9600733)

02/02/2006- Permission refused for the erection of a conservatory to rear of house (Class C3). (Ref: 2005/5181/P)

18/04/2006- Permission granted for the erection of a conservatory-style extension to the dwelling house (Class C3). (Ref: 2006/0830/P)

11/10/2007- Permission refused for the erection of a first floor front extension to the side wing of single-family dwelling (Class C3). (Ref: 2007/3724/P)

30/09/2013 – Permission granted for the erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension, following removal of existing extension, enlargement of the rear ground floor terraced area, installation of a dormer window on the side roof slope, extension of the existing front porch including enlargement of the terraced area at first floor level on the front elevation in connection with existing use as a single family dwelling (Class C3) (ref: 2013/4511/P)

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core strategy:

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development policies:

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

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

DP27 (Basements and lightwells)

Revised Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG 1 Design- Chapters: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5

CPG 6 Amenity – Chapters: 6 & 7

Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2012

London Plan 2011

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Assessment

1. Proposal:

2. Permission is sought for the erection of an extension to replace an existing raised swimming pool and patio area. The extension would contain a new swimming pool of similar dimensions to the existing, however it would be set lower into the ground.

3. Assessment:

4. Design

5. The previous permission (see planning history above) granted permission for an L shaped rear extension and new balustrade to the swimming pool area. The proposed amendments would see an additional extension erected around the swimming pool.
6. The extension would be lower than the approved extension by approx. 1m. It would project approx. 10m from the rear of the approved extension. The extension itself would measure approx. 10.2m in length x 4m in width x 3m in height and would be erected over an existing swimming pool patio area.
7. It would be constructed from white rendered walls, timber clad walls and timber louvres. It would contain aluminium framed sliding doors and solar thermal collectors. It would be of a contemporary design.
8. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in design, it relates well to the contemporary extension which has been approved and would extend the L shaped design over an existing patio area. It would not be overly visible from the public realm or from adjoining properties. As it would be built over an existing swimming pool patio area no garden amenity space would be lost.
9. The proposal is considered to comply with Camden Planning Guidance, it would be secondary to the main building and respect the design and appearance, relating well to the approved extension.

10. Excavation works

11. As the work would involve some minor excavation and the site lies within an area of underground development constraints (Claygate beds) a basement impact assessment has been submitted and independently assessed to confirm that it complies with all relevant policies and guidance.
12. The BIA and independent assessment conclude that the scheme will comply with policy DP27 in respect of maintaining the structural stability of the building and any neighbouring properties; avoiding the impact on drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment and; avoiding the cumulative impacts on the structural stability of the water environment.
13. The proposal would see the excavation of approx. 39sqm of soil to accommodate the pool, it is not considered that a scheme of this scale would justify the submission of a Construction Management Plan. It will not require large excavation machines or a significant amount of construction vehicles to remove the excavated soil and the amount and types of vehicles required will not be such that the highways network will be impacted upon. Although there is no direct access to the rear, the excavated soil could be brought through the property to the front, this will not impact upon neighbours.

14. Amenity

15. The proposed extension would be approx. 70cm above the existing fence. The neighbouring boundary contains dense vegetation; furthermore the main building line of the adjoining

property is set back behind the rear building line of the application site.

16. Therefore it would be hard to demonstrate that a lower extension, set well away from the rear of the neighbouring property would harm sunlight/daylight levels or outlook.
17. The proposed new extension would step down from the approved extension and would be 70cm above the existing boundary fence for the majority of its length. The width of the garden at the neighbouring property is approx. 10m and the boundary is planted with mature shrubs and vegetation. It is not considered that the introduction of the new extension rising above the height of the existing fence by 70cm would result in such significant loss of light to the adjoining garden that it would harm the amenity of future residents, particularly as the existing mature shrubs and vegetation is significantly higher than the boundary fence.
18. Furthermore, the adjoining property itself is well set back from the new proposed extension, it was not considered that the as approved extension would impact upon light levels to habitable rooms within the neighbouring property, as the newly proposed extension is further away from neighbouring windows and a much lower profile, it is not considered that light levels to habitable rooms will be affected.
19. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of amenity.

20. Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission.