

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	26/12/2013
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	28/11/2013
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number</b>	
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin			2013/6721/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
24 Elliott Square London NW3 3SU			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</b>				
Erection of ground floor rear extension, alterations to fenestrations including replacement of doors and windows to dwelling (Class C3).				
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Grant Conditional Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Householder Application			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>
<b>Informatives:</b>	

### Consultations

<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>04</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
			No. electronic	<b>01</b>		

<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>One neighbouring property objected to the proposal. In summary, their concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed rear extension would be highly visible from Kings Henry's Road and the houses opposite in the Elsworthy conservation area and would have a significant negative visual impact.</li> <li>• The rear extensions at other houses in Elliott Square are located in the back gardens which either face onto other back gardens or Adelaide Road.</li> <li>• No rear extension have yet been constructed to any of the house directly face onto King Henry's Road. If permission is granted this would set a precedent.</li> </ul>
---	---

<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>	No response has been received.
------------------------------------	--------------------------------

### Site Description

The application site is a mid-terrace house dating from 1960s located on the south side of Elliott Square and rear of the site is bounded by King Henry's Road. The site is part of a development of blocks of uniform terraced housing arranged around Elliott Square, to the south side of Adelaide Road.

Although the site is not in a conservation area it is located opposite Elsworthy conservation area (south side of King Henry's Road).

### Relevant History

None

### Relevant policies

#### 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)

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

#### Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CGP1 - Design

CPG6 – Amenity

## Assessment

### Proposal

It is proposed to erect a single storey rear extension and replace doors and windows on the front and rear elevations.

The proposed rear extension would project across the full width of the property and would be just below the first floor level balcony of the house. It would have a depth of 3m and a height of 2.9m with a flat roof. The proposed extension would have horizontal rooflights inserted into the flat roof and largely glazed folding doors on the rear elevation.

The alterations to the front elevation would include new entrance and garage doors and replacement of windows on the first and second floor windows. It is also proposed to replace the first floor and second floor windows on the rear elevation.

### Design and Appearance

Policy DP24 states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to be of the highest standard of design and respect character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties and character and proportions of the existing building.

#### Rear Extension:

In terms of rear extensions section 4 of CPG1 advises that rear extensions should be secondary to the building being extended in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing. The Council's guidance does not put a specific limitation on the width of the rear extensions as long as rear extensions are subordinate to the host building and respect the established pattern of development in the area.

The rear elevation of the application property is not considered to be architecturally distinguished and the ground floor level of the property is mainly screened by the rear high boundary wall along King Henry's Road. The proposed extension would also be screen by this fencing and only the top quarter of the extension would be visible from the street views on King Henry's Road.

The proposed rear extension would be set back by 5.8m from the rear boundary fencing on Kings and would take up less than half of the rear garden space. The proposal would still provide approximately 33.6 m<sup>2</sup> of external amenity space.

Although the group of this terrace properties facing onto King Henry's Road have not been extended towards the rear, the proposed rear extension would respect the modern design of the existing building and would minimally be visible from the public realm. The proposed extension by reason of its modest height and bulk and sympathetic design would not significantly affect the appearance and character of the surrounding conservation area.

The proposed rear extension could potentially give a precedent for similar size extensions to the other residential properties on this terrace (25-28) but this is not considered to be unacceptable in principle.

Many of the properties with similar in style and size to the application property in the immediate vicinity have full width extensions. It is considered that the design, bulk and size of the proposed extension would be in keeping with character with the general pattern of development in the area.

The proposed rear extension is considered to be acceptable in design terms as it would be subservient to the existing building in terms of design, scale and bulk.

#### Alterations to elevations:

A number of properties in this terrace have slight variation on the pattern of windows and doors. The proposed doors and windows would be very similar to the existing ones and would have a minimal impact on the appearance of the existing building.

Overall the proposed extension and alterations are not considered to harm the architectural integrity of the existing building and would be in keeping with the development pattern of the area. Therefore, they are considered to be acceptable in design terms.

#### **Amenity**

The flank walls of the proposed rear extension would abut on the boundaries of the adjoining properties but it would be 0.9m higher than 2m high boundary treatment which could be erected without planning permission. The proposed extension is considered not to significantly worsen the impact that 2m high boundary treatment would have had on the adjoining neighbours.

Given the modest size of the proposed extension the proposal would not have a significant impact on the amenities of the adjoining neighbours in terms of loss of light, outlook, privacy or increase sense of enclosure. As the existing first floor balcony will remain as existing, it is not considered necessary to impose a condition preventing the use of the flat roof of the extension as a roof terrace.

The proposed alterations to the elevations would not raise any amenity issues.

#### **Others**

Given the additional floor space is less than 100sqm the Mayor' CIL is not applicable in this case.

**Recommendation:** Grant conditional permission.