<b>Delegated Rep</b>	Ort Analysis sh	Analysis sheet		10/11/2014			
	N/A / attache	ed	Consultation Expiry Date:				
Officer Mandoon Chagger		Application N 2014/5258/P					
Mandeep Chagger							
Application Address	Drawing Numbers						
30 Thurlow Road London NW3 5PH		001, 000, 101					
PO 3/4 Area Team	Signature C&UD	Authorised O	fficer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Single storey side extension with associated elevational alterations							
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	16	No. of responses No. electronic	04 00	No. of objections No. of support	00 00			
Summary of consultation responses:	notices was ere were received. comments: 1. Any worl wonderful building a whole. 2. This will b and suppe 3. On the fa which do would not and the n and house 4. If they w view-bloc neighbour would cer Officer comment 1. Noise cor 2. Given the trees.	<ul> <li>The proposal was advertised in the Ham &amp; High on the 09/10/2014 and site notices was erected on the 08/10/2014. Four neighbour representations were received. 3 letters of support and one letter with the following comments:</li> <li>1. Any work done to refurbish and modernise the flats in these wonderful houses is only a positive thing that helps conserve the building and adds to the general improvement of the properties as a whole.</li> <li>2. This will be a sympathetic schedule of works that I heartily approve of and support.</li> <li>3. On the face of it, they do look like a straight-forward remodelling, which do not go beyond existing boundary walls. On that basis, we would not oppose, despite the inevitable noise caused by the works and the never-ending desire to extend and remodel in so many flats and houses near this location.</li> <li>4. If they were to involve the destruction of trees, greenery, and the view-blocking extension of boundary walls, to the detriment of neighbours in flats very close by, as was the case with Flat 2, we would certainly oppose the application.</li> <li>Officer comments: <ul> <li>1. Noise concerns are addressed by Environmental Health.</li> <li>2. Given the position of the extension, the proposal would not affect any</li> </ul> </li> </ul>							
CAAC/Local groups comments:	ritzjonns/Nethe	ernali (	CAAC: No comments	receiv	ea.				

# Site Description

The application site is a pair of four-storey, semi-detached house located on the north side of Thurlow Road, south of the junction with Eldon Grove. The building is converted into four self-contained flats.

The site lies within the Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation Area and is noted as making a positive contribution. The building is not listed.

## **Relevant History**

There is no relevant planning history.

## **Relevant policies**

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies CS1 Distribution of growth CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development CS6 (Providing quality homes) 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 1 Design – chapters 1, 2, and 5 (2013) Camden Planning Guidance 2 Housing (2011) – chapters 1, 2, 4 and 5 Camden Planning Guidance 6 Amenity (2011) Fitzjohns and Netherhall Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2001

London Plan 2011 National Planning Policy Framework 2012

## Assessment

#### 1. Proposal

1.1 The proposal is for a single storey side extension and associated elevational alterations. The proposal comprises a kitchen and store. The extension would abut the side boundary. The existing side conservatory would be demolished.

## 2. The main issues are:

- Design and character and appearance of the conservation area.
- · Adjacent residential amenity.

## 3. Design and character and appearance of the conservation area.

3.1 Policy DP24 expects alterations and developments to be of the highest standard of design. Policy DP25 permits development in conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area. In addition, CPG 1 ensures extensions are designed to be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing and respect and preserve existing architectural features. Materials should be chosen that are sympathetic to the existing building wherever possible.

3.2 The Fitzjohns and Netherhall Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2001) states the infilling of gaps will be refused where an important gap is compromised or the symmetry of the composition of a building would be impaired. Where side extensions would not result in the loss of an important gap they should be single storey and set back from the front building line.

3.3 The proposed extension, by reason of its position, size, single storey structure would appear subordinate to the main building. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable.

3.4 The proposal would have a raised parapet wall surrounding the flat roof of the side extension. The proposed extension would be constructed of painted render walls with painted timber French doors and windows. A flat flushglaze rooflight is proposed over the flat roof.

# 4. Neighbour impact

4.1 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.

4.2 As there is an existing conservatory in the same position at the property it is considered the proposal would not impact neighbouring amenity. On this basis, the proposals would comply with Policy DP26 of the Development Plan, and advice set out in CPG6.

Recommendation: Grant planning permission.