

<b>Delegated Report</b> <b>(Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>02/01/2015</b>
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>11/01/2015</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Raymond Yeung			2014/5962/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
Flat 1 30 Redington Road London NW3 7RB			See 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 side extension at ground floor level.					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Granted			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	12	No. of responses	05	No. of objections	04
			No. Comment	01		
Summary of consultation responses:	4 Objections					
	Flat 3-					
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Security issue with the flat right below theirs.</li> <li>2. Proposal would be right up to their living door above to their flat above, digging foundations, Burglars in the process of the construction works , noise from digging and works will require consent from others nearby</li> </ol>					
	<p><i>Officer's response:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>It is acknowledged that the proposal would have a flat roof, but at 3 metres in height which is considered to be the height of a general single storey extension. Such layout of the proposal is enclosed by the existing buildings and set back away from the public highway, it is considered that there would not be a material increase of a security issue that would result.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Such issues raised would not be directly relevant to be a material planning consideration to determining this type of application.</i></li> </ol>					
Summary of consultation responses:	Flat 4 –					
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Danger to the structure of the house based on the proposed works to the side of the building.</li> </ol>					
	<p><i>Officer's response:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Such issues raised would not be directly relevant to be a material planning consideration to determining this type of application.</i></li> </ol>					
	Flat 5-					
Summary of consultation responses:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overcrowding of a space designed for fewer buildings and occupancy.</li> <li>2. Spoiling the nature and character of the area due to excessive building.</li> <li>3. The height of the building extension would impact would be to deny the security of other flats in the levels above by allowing easy access to burglars from the ground level direct access to windows and doors of the flats above.</li> <li>4. The size of the extension would reduce the amount of garden area in sacrifice to more buildings area impacts the use of surrounding flats by creating a sense of overcrowding. This would be a significant change in the environmental sense of space and calm the flats immediately above and around currently enjoy.</li> <li>5. Blocking access for firefighters to the back garden in the event of fire at the</li> </ol>					

upper back levels of the premises.

6. Photographs of the pile drivers which are required to construct the buildings have been produced. This will create excessive and unbearable noise.
7. The normal building works and noise and disturbance from plant and machinery will blight the land for the period of the building. This will mean that the flat above will not be available to let.
8. The dust raised from the building works will be substantial and have a severe impact on the use of the flat above. This will lead to illness in the baby and young child occupying the flat above.
9. The act of building itself is a non-residential use of the building.
10. The use of the new building would be to allow more residents to occupy the site. This would put a strain on the drainage for the building. This was badly impacted some years ago when the drains became blocked. Inspection showed that this was due to mal use. Also it would increase the demand on space for refuse disposal, which is limited at the front of the house.
11. Builders, decorators and potentially others for different uses will have access to the roof of the proposed extension.
12. The building would be unlawful. This is because the head lease requires that the extension requires the discretionary consent of the other flat owners.

*Officer's response:*

*1 and 2. The proposal would be ancillary accommodation for the ground floor flat, and is of single storey not extending beyond the rear wall. It would involve removal of existing side extension and side outbuilding. Such proposal is considered not to be overcrowding. The trees have been demonstrated by the applicant that there would not be any impact.*

*3. As mentioned above the extension would be enclosed away from public access, such height of the extension would be a height of a general side extension. Such proposal would not create a serious security issue*

*4. As mentioned in response 1 and 2. The extension would have a footprint in between the side of the building and the back wall of the property, it would not extend beyond the rear wall into the rear garden. The extension would be screened by the side wall which would replace the existing one of a similar height.*

*5 to 12. It is considered that these issues do not directly relate to the material consideration of assessing the planning application. Such issues are dealt with by other means. The proposal is for an ancillary accommodation to the existing flat, as such proposal is residential.*

**No.6 Well walk-**

1. The attachment of an extension will reduce security to the flat above it regardless of whether lights or cameras are attached. A flat roof near to the flat above balcony door is an unnecessary additional security risk.
2. There will be significant noise and dust from this unnecessary work which might damage the foundations of the building which is built into a hill. We have previously

	<p>had problems with the lower level shared hallway and damp.</p> <p>3. Joint owner of flats 2 and 5 in this house. The building work will cause unnecessary noise and dust for our tenants. The flats are owned with a shared freehold between the 5 flats, any works have to be agreed by a majority of freeholders, this extension has been turned down twice by the freeholders and will continue to be turned down, but the flat owner persists in applying for planning permission in knowledge he does not have freeholder permission to build because of potential structural damage to the building and a reduction in security for the flat above.</p> <p><i>Officer's response:</i></p> <p><i>1. As mentioned above the proposal would not be accessible to the public and is enclosed, a height of 3 metres height is a normal length for a single storey extension.</i></p> <p><i>2 to 3. It is considered that these issues do not directly relate to the material consideration of assessing the planning application. Such issues are dealt with by other means. Noise, dust and smells a part of the construction work and is temporary.</i></p>
<p><b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify</p>	<p>Redington / Frognal CAAC consulted; No representations received to date.</p>

### Site Description

The property is two storey plus basement, a roof building on the north east side of Frognal Lane. It is not listed but lies within the Red/Frog Conservation Area. The property is divided up to form flats, the proposal related to the ground floor flat. The gradient slope upwards from south-west to north-east.

### Relevant History

8804360 - Erection of a single storey side extension to existing – Granted 22/02/1989

PWX0002470 - Erection of a single storey side extension at ground floor level –Granted 04/12/2000

2005/4439/P - Renewal of planning permission granted on 04/12/2000 for erection of a single storey side extension at ground floor level to provide additional accommodation for the existing flat –GRANTED - 09/12/2005

### Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies  
CS1 (Distribution of Growth)  
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  
Redington / Frognal Conservation Area Statement  
London Plan 2011  
NPPF 2012

## Assessment

1. Proposal: Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey side extension at ground floor level side extension to provide additional accommodation for the existing flat.

2. Assessment:

### 2.1 Design:

The Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider:

- a) character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;
- b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed;
- c) the quality of materials to be used;
- d) the provision of visually interesting frontages at street level;
- e) the appropriate location for building services equipment;
- f) existing natural features, such as topography and trees;
- g) the provision of appropriate hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatments;
- h) the provision of appropriate amenity space; and
- i) accessibility.

POLICY DP24 in Camden's Development Policy states in the side extensions section under paragraph;

*4.16 Certain building forms may lend themselves to side extensions. Such extensions should be designed in accordance with the general considerations set out above in paragraph 4.10. Side extensions should also: be no taller than the porch; and set back from the main building.*

*4.17 In many streets in the north of the Borough houses have mature rear gardens that can often be seen through gaps between buildings, softening the urban scene and providing visual interest. The infilling of gaps will not be considered acceptable where: significant views or gaps are compromised or blocked; the established front building line is compromised; the architectural symmetry or integrity of a composition is impaired; the original architectural features on a side wall are obscured; or access to the rear of a property is lost.*

*4.18 Where a property is located in a conservation area, reference should be made to the relevant conservation area statements, appraisals and management plans, which often identify important gaps and vistas where infilling would be inappropriate.*

**2.1.2** The proposed single storey side extension has been previously approved with the same design, layout and size on two occasions previously as outlined in the planning history section above.

**2.1.3** The proposal would create additional ancillary accommodation to the flat. It would measure 2.8 metres width on the front elevation, 5 metres width on the rear elevation, the depth would span the depth of the building itself. The height of the extension is 3 metres in height with a flat roof. The height and sizes of the window would be in-keeping with the window features to the front and bay windows to the rear. Such proposal is considered subordinate to the main building.

**2.1.4** There is an existing side wall to the side of the property which currently screens the view of the existing side extension/outbuilding which is to be demolished, such wall would be demolished aswell and to be rebuilt to the height of the extension which is slightly shorter than existing. Such proposed extension would not be seen within public viewpoints as it would be enclosed by the adjoining neighbour and the rebuilt wall.

**2.1.5** The materials are considered sympathetic and acceptable as the extension would be of brick walls, slate roof and timber framed doors and windows to match the existing property. The proposal would not be prominent in the streetscene.

**2.1.6** Taken as a whole, the proposed extension would be sympathetic to the host property and do not alter any prominent elevations of the host property with its subservient nature and appearance.

**2.1.7** There has not been a material change of circumstances on site compared to the previous permission, and it is considered that the proposal for the points raised above that it would generally comply with the principles to the most recent policies set out above, and would importantly, it would preserve the character and

appearance of the conservation area.

## **2.2 Amenity:**

The adjoining neighbour No.28 is considered to be the only neighbour that would be affected, as mentioned the gradient of the land slopes upwards and this neighbour is situated higher up. The proposed side windows would not directly overlook to create a loss of privacy to the adjoining neighbour. Therefore such proposal would not have any harmful impact on neighbouring properties in terms of loss of daylight / sunlight.

**Recommendation:** Grant planning permission

### **DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on 26<sup>th</sup> January 2015. For further information please go to [www.camden.gov.uk](http://www.camden.gov.uk) and search for 'members briefing'