

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		15/09/2014	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		27/08/2014	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Carlos Martin				2014/4761/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
Flat A 7 Holmes Road London NW5 3AA				Refer to draft decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>		<b>Area Team Signature</b>		<b>C&amp;UD</b>		<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Erection of a single storey rear extension at ground floor level, including installation of rooflight to existing lean-to extension.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>06</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
				No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		No response.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify		None; not in CA.					

## Site Description

The application site relates to a 3-storey mid-terrace Victorian property located on the south side of Holmes Road. The site is not listed and does not form part of any conservation area. Similar properties adjoin at either side. The site backs onto a car park.

## Relevant History

8600936: pp granted on 23/07/1986 for change of use including works of conversion from a house in multiple-occupation to a self-contained flat on the ground-floor and a self-contained maisonette on the first and second-floors.

## Relevant policies

### NPPF 2012

### The London Plan 2011

### Local Development Framework – Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

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 2013: Chapter 4 (Extensions, alterations and conservatories)

CPG6 Amenity 2011:

## Assessment

### Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension at ground floor level, including installation of rooflight to existing lean-to extension.

The proposed extension would be located at the rear end of the existing patio, which is already partly filled by the existing back-addition, thus forming an internal courtyard between the proposed extension and the main body of the house. The proposed materials are white render and slates for the roof to match existing. The extension would feature a sloping roof with rooflights, which would mirror the existing back-addition, forming a V-shaped roof.

The main issues for consideration are the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area generally and its impact on the amenity of future occupiers and neighbours.

### Design

Camden Planning Guidance 1 (design) advises that “*extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation unless the specific circumstances of the site, such as the context of the property or its particular design, would enable an exception to this approach*” and with regards to rear extensions specifically establishes that they should be designed to:

1. be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
2. respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;
3. respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space;
4. allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden; and

Given the location of the proposed extension, which would result in a full-width extension at the rear of the patio garden, it is not considered that the proposal complies with the above points.

The location of the extension is not considered to be secondary to the building, as this is a traditional Victorian property comprising a main house and a back-addition no more than half the width of the main part of the house. Therefore, infilling most of the rear patio would alter the proportions of the building and would fail to respect and preserve the historic pattern of the surrounding area. No. 7 forms part of a group of 9 well preserved similar properties. The group is largely intact in terms of rear extensions and most of the properties retain a patio between their back-addition and the boundary of the other side. It is acknowledged that the existing patio is not of a high amenity value, but the proposed extension would result in a 10 sq m courtyard which would further diminish the amenity value of the outdoor amenity space and would set a precedent that may undermine the ability of the council to resist similar proposals on the neighbouring properties, which may eventually lead to a the loss of the historic pattern of the group.

The proposal is therefore considered harm the character of the existing house and the group of which it forms part, contrary to policies CS14 and DP24 of the LDF which seek to secure high quality design and promote high quality places.

### **Amenity**

In terms of neighbouring amenity, the extension would be completely enclosed within the high walls of the patio and it is not considered to result in any unacceptable loss of amenity for neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, privacy, outlook or increase sense of enclosure.

However, with regards to the amenity of the existing unit, it is considered that the overall amenity of the property would be reduced as a result of the extension, as only one room in the property, which would be converted into a bedroom, would have a satisfactory outlook towards the front garden. The openings of the new living room and the existing bedroom would have a poor outlook to the internal courtyard and would receive more limited natural light. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy DP26 of the LDF which seeks to preserve the amenity of existing and future occupiers.

**Recommendation:** Refuse.