

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	01/09/2014
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	02/09/2014
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Obote Hope			2014/4348/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
124 Fleet Road London NW3 2QX			Refer to Decision Notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of single storey rear extension at ground floor level and associated fenestration alterations to flank elevation (Retrospective)				
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	10	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 10/05/2013 and a public notice was published in the Ham & High from 16/05/2013.</p> <p>An objection to the proposal was raised from 128 Fleet Road relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of privacy • The in appropriate design • The loss of garden space • The loss of habitat • Light disturbance <p>Support from 3rd Flat124 Fleet Road are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have a view from above upon the rear extension. It is now a much more attractive site to look down upon <p>Objection received from 120 Fleet Road are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 17 is not filled in on the application form • In March 2012 we sought planning advice about a proposed extension of a similar ground floor Fleet Road flat would be resisted. <p>Officers Comments</p> <p>The proposed application is for retrospective consent and is therefore constructed and the loss of habitat would not be a material consideration due to the extension being already built.</p> <p>Each application is assessed on a case per case basis, and against planning policies at local and national level. The officer opinion during discussions for a scheme that you were proposing may have felt that an extension at the property may have been unacceptable, for a number of reasons. As I have no specific details of what was discussed it is hard to make a specific opinion on your proposal. And as such, I cannot provide a specific response to that enquiry. However, the council would always act in a professional manner and most importantly try to be consistent in our approach in dealing with planning applications.</p> <p>The relevant section of the application form has been filled out and the proposed works would not constitute a change of use in the number of flats associated to the applicant site at ground floor level. Which would remain as existing.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	The Mansfield CAAC was formally consulted. No response has been received to date.					

Site Description

The application site comprises a three-storey terraced property located on the north side of Fleet Road. The application property has been divided into a number of self contained flats. This application relates to the ground floor flat. The character of the immediate area is predominantly residential in nature.

Whilst not listed, the building is located within the Mansfield Conservation Area.

Relevant History

124 Fleet Road:

PE9900742 – PP Refused (09/11/1999) Erection of a single storey extension at rear third floor level as extension to the existing second floor flat.

2013/1496/P- PP Refused (07/06/2013) Erection of a roof extension with roof terrace in connection with residential flat (Class C3).

Associated applications

96A Fleet Road

2013/7463/P- PP Granted (**11/04/2014**) Use of rear part of ground floor and first, second and third floors as 3 self-contained flats (2 x 1-bed, 1x 2-bed), including rear extensions at ground and first floor level. Installation of 2 rooflights to front elevation, and 3 rooflights to rear elevation.

Relevant policies

National and Regional Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
London Plan (2011)

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)
CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)
DP24 (Securing high quality design)
DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)
DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance 2013

CPG1 Design
CPG6 Residential amenities

Mansfield conservation area appraisal and management strategy (2008)

Assessment

1. Proposal:

1.1 The application proposes:

- Retrospective consent for a single storey rear extension at ground floor
- Alterations of the proposed windows and doors to the side elevation

1.2 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Design
- Amenity

2. Assessment

2.1 North of the Royal Free Hospital, on the north side of Fleet Road, Nos.90-130 (even) comprises a uniform three storey terrace (front elevation), constructed of grey brick with full height projecting square bay windows containing pairs of sliding sashes. At the east end of the terrace, Nos.90-106 comprises some rebuilt frontages of a differing design, incorporating commercial elements at ground floor level. At the north end, the terraced adjoins a modern built residential development with very high wall that backs onto the rear of the terrace properties on Fleet Road. Access to the site that adjoins 90-130 Fleet Road to the rear are provided via Tranley

and Byron Mews.

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'.

2.3 The property lies within Mansfield Conservation Area, and any alterations/extension to the building should therefore preserve and enhance the character and appearance of this conservation area. Within this context, there is no uniformity in terms of the pattern and layout of the gardens to the north side of Fleet Road with approximately 16 of the 26 properties completely infill the rear gardens with full width rear extension of 1, 2 storeys or more, which has been strongly influence by the existing high rear boundary wall of approximately 7.4m between Byron Mews and 80 – 130 Fleet Road.

2.4 The proposed extension would not be visible from the public domain and as such would not have a visual impact on the conservation area. Albeit the extension would not meet planning guidance in terms of the loss of garden space. The extension measures approximately 2.5m in height, 3.9m in depth and 2.2m in width. Within the existing terrace there are numerous extensions and large roof terraces such as 96A fleet Road (2013/7462/P). Therefore, the proposed extension would be acceptable in design, and as such, would not be unduly over-dominant in terms of its size and bulk and when accessed in context of the development within the existing terrace to the rear elevation. Therefore, it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on account of its design in and the loss of garden space.

2.5 The application proposed to replace the existing window and door by relocating of the proposed door on the flank elevation directly below the existing first and second floor window, which replicates the design and aesthetics of the host property. The extension is constructed using bricks, glazed roof, timber windows and doors, the roof would be fully glazed. Therefore, be similar in design with the neighbouring properties. Therefore, broadly meet planning policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of the LDF.

3. Neighbour amenity

3.1 The proposed extension would be the same height of the existing bound wall. However, the boundary wall of 2.5m contains a mixture of timber fencing with planters surmounted on concrete fence. The photographic evidence taken from the garden of the neighbouring site show the top end of glazing, namely the window opening and as there is an existing timber fence it is not anticipated that the extension would have a detrimental impact in terms of loss of light, or sense of enclosure.

3.2 Complaint in regards to light emission from the extension. However, the light would not be emitted into the neighbouring window but to the rear of the neighbouring garden.

3.3 It is not anticipated that the extension being close to the boundary with number 128 and at ground floor level would have a detrimental impact in terms of loss of privacy on account of its design, location and setting.

Recommendation: Grant Planning permission