

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		30/10/2014	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		09/10/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Sam Watts				2014/5370/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
11 Greville Road London NW6 5HY				See decision notice.			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Side extension at second floor level to flat and replacement of windows on first and second floor.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission.					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	07	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		No responses received.					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		N/A					
Site Description							
The site consists of a second and third floor flat located in a three storey mid-terraced dwelling with integral basement on the north side of Greville Road. The site is not located in a conservation area, nor is it listed. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature.							
Relevant History							
2014/1426/P - Erection of single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level – Granted 28/05/2014							

Relevant policies

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)

Page 94 Paragraph 13

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

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

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG 1 (Design) 2013

Paragraph 4.13, 5.6

CPG 6 (Amenity) 2011

Assessment

1.0 Proposal:

1.1 The proposal is for a side extension at second floor level. The side extension is proposed to be single storey and set back slightly from the front elevation.

1.2 A window is proposed to be replaced to the front elevation to match the windows on the second floor. To the rear elevation the windows are to be replaced and the render is proposed to be removed with the brickwork being repointed.

2.0 Amendments:

2.1 Revisions have been received through the process of this application which now shows the proposed extension being set back from the front elevation by 2 metres and stretch all the way to the rear wall. The materials used would be London stocks Flemish bond to match the front elevation with brick on edge coping. The proposal would seek to extend the rear wall up to create the proposed extension. The extension is proposed to sit slightly lower than that of the neighbouring extension to Number 9. The extension is proposed to house a family bathroom and an en-suite shower room. A single window is proposed to each elevation and a rooflight is proposed on the flat roof towards the front of the extension.

3.0 Design:

3.1 Policy DP24 of the LDF states that designs for new buildings, and alterations and extensions, should respect the character and appearance of the local area and neighbouring buildings. Paragraph 5.6 of CPG 1 (Design) states that roof extensions and alterations are likely to be *unacceptable* where there is likely to be an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene.

3.2 Following from this, paragraph 13 of DP24 states that development should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street or ignore patterns or groupings of buildings. As the property next door at number 9 is the only other property in a long row of houses which has a side extension at this level, the proposed second floor side extension at the application site is considered to impair the appearance of the roof slopes and detract from the historic roof form. It is also important to note the proposed extension would be substantially larger than the one at number 9. Therefore, by virtue of its' siting, the proposed second floor side extension would likely create an unacceptably obtrusive and incongruous form of development, and would harm the appearance of the existing roofline.

3.3 Furthermore, the height of the extension is contrary to paragraph 4.13 of CPG1 which states that in most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level will be strongly discouraged. The extension is also not considered to be subordinate to the existing building and results in a significant mass and bulky appearance.

3.4 Moreover, in terms of respecting local character, policy DP24 paragraph 13 states that past alterations and extensions should not be regarded as a precedent. On this basis, the proposed second floor side extension is considered to harm the character and appearance of the cluster of roofs upon which it is located and the wider surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the policy DP24 of the LDF and design guidance of CPG 1 (Design).

3.5 In relation to the alterations to the windows and removing the render, the proposals are considered acceptable as they respect the host property and the wider streetscene. No objection is raised to these elements of the proposal.

3.0 Amenity

3.1 The second floor rear extension is not considered to cause any additional overlooking to what currently exists on site nor have any overbearing impact on any neighbouring properties. The extension would not look directly into any surrounding windows and as such the application is considered to comply with policy DP26 and CPG6.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission.