

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>23/01/2014</b>
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>23/12/2013</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number</b>		
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin			2013/7337/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
9 Huson Close London NW3 3JW			See draft 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>					
Single storey rear extension as revision to planning permission 2009/2095/P granted on 21/07/2009.					
<b>Recommendation:</b>		<b>Grant Planning Permission</b>			
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Full Planning Permission</b>			

<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>03</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>02</b>
			No. Electronic	<b>00</b>		

<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	No response received.
---	-----------------------

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

### Site Description

The application site relates to a three storey mid-terrace property on the south side of Huson Close. Huson Close has uniform terrace properties dating from 1960s. The rear boundary of the site joins the highway boundary on Adelaide Road.

The site is not in a conservation area.

### Relevant History

#### Application property:

2009/2095/P – Planning permission was granted on 21/07/2009 for the erection of a single storey rear extension and alterations to the front elevation in connection with the conversion of garage to habitable accommodation of dwelling house (Class C3).

#### Neighbouring properties:

1 Huson Close – Certificate of lawfulness was granted on 21/01/2013 for the erection of single-storey rear extension, alterations to facade at front ground floor level including new window and installation of 'porthole' obscure glazed windows on side elevation at ground and first floor level all in connection with existing dwellinghouse (ref: 2012/6596/P).

5 Huson Close – Planning permission was granted on 06/12/2012 for the erection of a single storey rear extension and alterations to balustrade at rear of dwellinghouse (ref: 2012/5773/P).

### 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:

The proposal is for a full width single storey rear extension with a depth of 3m below the first floor level balcony.

Difference between the proposed extension and approved extension are:

- One roof light above the roof instead of two rooflights;
- Rendered finishing instead of red brick;
- Incorporation of French doors and new windows on the rear elevation;
- Reducing height of extension from 2.89m to 2.65m;

### Design

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.

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 was not considered to be architecturally distinguished and the ground floor level of the property is mainly screened by the rear boundary fencing along Adelaide Road. The proposed extension would also be screen by this fencing and would minimally be visible from the public realm.

The proposed extension would not have a significant impact on the appearance and character of the building or the surrounding area as it would be subordinate to the existing building and would take up less than half of the rear garden space. It is noted that the Council have approved full width extensions with more than 3 m depth to a number of properties that are similar in style and size to the application property in the immediate vicinity (see relevant history). 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 rendered finishing and style of the proposed doors and windows are also considered to respect the appearance of the existing building.

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in design terms as the proposed extension would be subservient to the existing building and respect the architectural style of the existing building and the retained garden would provide adequate outdoor amenity space.

### Amenity

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.

### Other

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

**Recommendation:** Grant conditional planning permission.

