

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		06/02/2015	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		25/12/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Fergus Freaney				2014/7276/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Flat 52 Parliament Hill Mansions Lissenden Gardens London NW5 1NB				See decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Single storey rear extension to replace existing							
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	33	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	1
				No. electronic	01		
Summary of consultation responses:		Press notice: 04/12/2014 – 25/12/2014 Site notice: 03/12/2014 – 24/12/2014 One objection received from an adjoining neighbour: Concerns that the proposed extension would be larger and more ostentatious than the modest existing extension; also commented that they had not seen the plans. <i>Officer comment: The plans have been available to view online since registration of the application, in excess of the required 21 day consultation period.</i>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		Dartmouth Park CAAC – No response received					

Site Description

The site is located on the west side of Lissenden Gardens. It comprises a large circa Edwardian mansion block with multiple apartments.

The site is not listed, but is within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area

Relevant History

No relevant history

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 2011 (CPG1: Design; CPG6: Amenity)

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement

NPPF

Assessment

Proposal:

Permission is sought for the replacement of an existing single storey rear conservatory with a larger conservatory.

Assessment:

The existing conservatory measures approx. 3.7m in width x 2.5m in depth x 2.1m at eaves height (rising to 2.8m where it abuts the building). It is constructed from timber.

The proposed conservatory would measure approx. 4.7m in width x 3.5m in depth x 2.7m at eaves height (rising to 3.1m where it abuts the building). It would be constructed from powder coated aluminium.

The existing extension does not appear to benefit from planning consent, however judging by its appearance it has been in place for some time and likely benefits from deemed consent by virtue of having been erected more than 4 years ago. Furthermore, there are no other examples of consented conservatories at the rear of Parliament Hill Mansions.

Camden Planning Guidance advises that conservatories should, amongst other things, respect and preserve existing architectural features. The existing conservatory has been installed within a small undercroft and extends out no further or higher than the boundary wall. The proposal would extend the conservatory out over a projecting bay and would have an uncomfortable relationship with an existing ground floor window within the bay. Furthermore it would fully envelope the undercroft.

It is considered that the projecting bay and undercroft are important architectural features of the building which are worthy of preservation. Although the existing conservatory does interfere with the the undercroft it does not completely obscure it as the proposal would.

It is not considered that there would be any impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours as a result of the scheme as it would not result in any additional overlooking, or block light so much as to be an appropriate reason for refusal.

The proposal is considered to be overly large and obtrusive on the host building, it fails to respect and

preserve important architectural features and fails to comply with policy DP25 which requires development to respect and preserve the conservation area.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission