

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		13/01/2015	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		18/12/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Raymond Yeung				2014/6453/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
21 Rosecroft Avenue London NW3 7QA				See decision notice.			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of 2 storey rear extension to form 2nd floor and 2 x windows on the side elevation in obscure glass.							
Recommendation(s):		Refused					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	10	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		None received to date.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		Redington and Frognaal CAAC were consulted: No comments received to date.					

Site Description

The application property relates to a 1960's semi-detached property on Rosecroft Avenue. The property is a brick-built, single family dwelling on three storeys with an additional lower-ground floor level. The property is within the Redington and Frogna Conservation Area (adopted in 1985) and is noted as having a neutral contribution to the area. The gradient of the ground slopes down from south to north.

Relevant History

PWX0002033-Certificate of proposed use for replacement window and doors and new stair at side and rear. GRANTED 24/02/2000.

2012/6688/P-Single storey rear extension to lower ground floor levels of existing dwelling house (Class C3). GRANTED 26/02/2013. This included planning permission for the 3 new windows shown on the flank elevation on this application. The applicant has stated in their design and access statement that the current application is in relation to the 2-storey extension only.

2013/1623/P-Certificate of Lawfulness (Proposed) Erection of 2-storey rear/side extension in connection with existing dwellinghouse (Class C3). REFUSED 02/04/2013

Refusal reason:

The proposed development would not constitute permitted development as the enlarged part extends beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Schedule 2 Class A of Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, as amended by the No. 2 Amendment Order 2008.

Relevant policies

The 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 2011:

CPG1 Design: Chapters 1- 5

CPG6 Amenity:

NPPF 2012

Redington and Frogna Conservation Area Statement (2003)

Audit Guidelines: Rear Extensions/Conservatories, Polices RF22-26.

Assessment

1. Proposal :

1.1 The proposal refers to: Erection of 2 storey rear extension to form 1st and 2nd floor and 2 x windows on the side elevation in obscure glass. This would contain a study on the 1st floor and additional bedroom/study on the 2nd floor.

1.2 The extension would be above the existing rear 2 storey projection which covers the lower ground and ground floor which mirrors the adjoining neighbour No.19 Rosecroft Avenue which the two properties forms part of a semi-pair. Both houses are similar in terms of design, appearance and materials.

2. Assessment:

2.1 Principal issues are a] Design and impact on the character and appearance on the Conservation Area, b] impact on amenity.

3. Design and the Impact on the Conservation Area:

3.1. Policy DP24 advocates for the highest standard of design and in considering proposals the Council takes into account the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings. Where alterations and extensions are proposed the Council also considers the character and proportions of the existing building. Policies CS14 and DP25 seek to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation area.

3.2 CPG1 within the Camden under paragraph 4.13 states;

'In most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged.'

3.2 In addition the Redington and Froggnal Conservation Area statement notes that extensions to existing dwellings can have a cumulative impact on elements that contribute to the character and appearance of buildings, streets and areas as a whole. Policy RF23 within the statement states;

'Rear extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or Conservation Area. In such cases such extension should be no more than one storey in height'

3.3 The proposal would measure approximately 5 metres height, 3 metres deep and set in from both side of the property at 6 metres width above the existing 2 storey rear projection with windows to the side elevation. The materials of the wall would be in brick to match existing, the windows would be of aluminium. The proposal would be set below the parapet at approximately 450mm.

3.4 It is considered that such development would be contrary to the policies CPG1 and the Conservation Area statement set out above being more than one storey in height above an existing extension and higher than one full storey below the roof eaves/parapet level and therefore would not be acceptable in principle.

3.5 The applicants have justified the proposal on the basis that the subject property is not a period property, the proposal would enhance the host property and that such guidance should not apply in all cases. However it is considered that the property has design merit and the integrity of the building and the semi-detached pair together should be maintained to ensure that their contribution to character of the conservation area is not harmed. Although the rear of the building is only visible from private

views within the garden itself and from neighbouring properties, as mentioned above, there is uniformity between the semi-detached pair in terms of design, materials, size and heights. The introduction of such size and bulk (two storeys high and 6 metres wide) to the 1st and 2nd floor would unbalance the symmetry of the pair and detract from the form of the original rear projections.

3.6 The proposal would appear as a prominent feature in the rear garden or as seen from neighbouring properties. The scheme is not in accordance with Camden's development policies and guidance and would not preserve and/or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

3.7 With the above taken into consideration, the proposal, by virtue of its height and detailed design would represent an overly dominant, visually intrusive structure which would be at odds with the modest character of the host building, the semi-detached pair and the surrounding conservation area. As such the proposal is contrary DP24 and 25 of the LDF and CPG1 Design.

4. Amenity:

4.1 The most affected property would be the adjoining neighbour No.19 Rosecroft Avenue, they have a two storey flat roof rear projection which forms the lower ground floor and the ground floor which mirrors the application site. As the proposal would be above this flat roof extension on the application site, the windows on the 1st and 2nd floor of the neighbour nearest the proposal may be affected as a result of the development. With the extension only 3 metres in depth, set in from the sides and that these neighbouring windows appear to serve a non-habitable room (staircase), it is considered that such proposal would not be material to affect the neighbour's amenity.

4.2 The next closest neighbour towards the northern side is No.23 Rosecroft Avenue, and their windows would be at least 14 metres away from the proposed development, and at less than 3 metres depth, such extension would not create a material amenity issue in terms of outlook and light. The proposed windows on the elevation would be obscure and therefore would not overlook this neighbour.

4.3 The neighbouring properties on Hollycroft Avenue to the rear are over 30m away and therefore will not be impacted in amenity terms by the proposed extension.

4.4 The proposed rear extension is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The proposed extension to lower ground floor level, although deep is single storey and on the same ground level as no 19. Rosecroft Avenue. In addition the location of the windows on the lower ground floor of no. 19 is due South West and therefore any loss of daylight would be insignificant.

4.5 The rear extension, on account of its depth would not cause any loss of outlook or privacy to adjoining windows or occupiers and therefore this would not be a reason for refusal. It is therefore considered that the development would not cause any undue impact to the residential amenities of the occupiers of any neighbouring properties and is in accordance with DP26 and CPG6 paragraph 7.

5. Conclusion:

5.1 The proposed extension, by reason of its height, form, bulk, location and detailed design, would result in harm to the character and appearance of the building, the semi-detached pair which it forms a part, and this part of the Redington and Frognaal Area, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; Design guidance CPG1 and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design), DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development

Framework Development Policies.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.