

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>19/03/2015</b>
Members' briefing				<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>19/02/2015</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Obote Hope			2015/0315/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
4 Langland Gardens London NW3 6PY			See decision notes		
<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 2 storey rear extension at ground and first floor level, installation of a new window to the front elevation, new balustrade with side screening for a proposed terrace at first floor and erection of a dormer extension to the side elevation. (Revised)					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant planning permission with conditions			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	37	No. of responses	08	No. of objections	06
			No. electronic	05		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Objections are received from 2 Langland Gardens are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>I am very concerned that the proposed works lacks engineering information, and as such, would have structural, geotechnical and hydrological integrity on the neighbouring property; please refer to the officer's comments below.</i></li> <li><i>Excavation of the proposed basement would require a basement Impact assessment; Please refer to the officer's comments below.</i></li> <li><i>The proposed terrace at first floor level would lead to the loss of privacy to the ground floor living space, patio and garden; Please refer to paragraph 3.1 &amp; 3.2.</i></li> <li><i>The terrace would introduce noise pollution and the proposed timber wall may change in the future by other materials such as glass, railings or balustrade. Which would have an impact with loss of privacy; Please refer to paragraph 2.4 &amp; 3.3.</i></li> <li><i>How would the current fencing and garden bed be dealt with; Please refer to paragraph 2.2</i></li> <li><i>The number of street parking for the proposed site should be made known;</i></li> <li><i>The proposed period for comments should be extended; Please see the officer's comment below.</i></li> </ul> <p>Comments from Flat B, 6 Langland Gardens are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Confirmation if the extension is a single or two storey; Please refer to paragraph 2</i></li> <li><i>Would the proposed 2 storey rear extension block light of the bedroom to the rear; Please refer to paragraph 3.3</i></li> <li><i>Would the basement require excavation works; please refer to the officer's comment below.</i></li> </ul> <p>2 x Objects from Flat 7, 11 Lindfield Gardens are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Concerned that the proposal submitted three different sets of plans within the consultation period; please refer to the officers comments below.</i></li> <li><i>Concern in regards to the proposed digging involved with the shallow foundation of the Victorian houses; please refer to the officers comments below.</i></li> <li><i>The proposed development is considered excessive and would be out of character to the conservation area that would reduce the garden and space between the houses; Please refer to the design section in paragraph 2 below.</i></li> </ul> <p>Objections from 2 Langland Gardens are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The lack of engineering details for the proposed basement</i></li> <li><i>The proposed second storey extension and terrace on the east side would</i></li> </ul>					

lead to loss of privacy of the ground floor g space, patio and gardens;  
*Please refer to the officers comment below.*

- The west single storey extension abuts 2 Langland Gardens that would impact on the existing garden beds, how would this be dealt with in terms of security and disturbance; *please refer to paragraphs 2.2 & 3.3.*
- The proposed roof top terrace would result in loss of privacy and would be unnecessary amenity space unprecedented in the area; *Please refer to paragraph 1.4.*
- The proposed terraces are a concern in regards to potential debris from the wind that occur in the area; please refer to paragraphs 1.4 & 2.4.
- Would like to appoint an independent engineer if permission is given;
- Oppose of the plans dated 11/02/2015. *Please see officer's comment below*

Objections from 2 Langland Gardens are as follows:

- *Concern that the proposal would involve extensive digging that could damage the foundation of our house; please refer to officer's comment below.*
- *The proposed balustrade would reduce the light of the ground floor of number 6 and increase noise level within close proximity with the bedroom; please see the officer's comment below.*

Objections received by post from 5 Langland are as follows:

- A major difficulty in commenting on the proposed application relates to the changes in the plans/drawings that were submitted; *please see paragraph 1.4 below along with the officer's comment.*
- The plans dated 16/02/2015 would not preserve or certainly enhance the character of the conservation area; *please see 'design' in paragraph 2.*
- The proposal would lead to the loss of light and privacy with the neighbouring properties; Please see the amenity section in paragraph 3 below.
- Any digging out would affect the shallow foundation that may impact on the equilibrium of the water table; Please see the officer's comment below.
- The proposed works would impact on noise and traffic flow; *please refer to officer's comment below.*

. Objections received from 6 Langland Gardens are as follows:

- Concerned that the proposal involves extensive excavation works; *please refer to the officer's comment below.*
- The proposed extension could damage the foundation of number 6; *please refer to the officer's comment below.*
- The proposed roof terrace would increase noise due to the close proximity of the bedroom of the neighbouring property; *Please refer to paragraph 2.5 below*
- The terrace would result in the loss of privacy; *Please refer to paragraph 2.5 below*

#### **Officer comments**

- The proposed works for the proposed lightwell to the front elevation has been revised as the proposed works would be considered as engineering works and future submission for the lightwell would require a Basement Impact Assessment;
- Comments in regards to the proposed scheme were still being logged and addressed for an additional two and a half weeks prior to the application being determined.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed scheme would still retain the existing use of the property and as the proposal is not seeking to introduce new self-contained flats, such details would not be a material consideration when determining this planning application nor should the proposed works have a detrimental impact with the current on street parking provision.</li> <li>• The plans were revised due to the rooftop terrace and the proposed lightwell that have now been omitted from the proposed scheme.</li> <li>• It's not anticipated that the proposed terrace would have an impact on the bedroom window at first floor nor the window to the side elevation at ground floor level.</li> <li>• <i>The proposed scheme would still retain the existing use of the property and as the proposal is not seeking to introduce new self-contained flats, such details would not be a material consideration when determining this planning application nor should the proposed works have a detrimental impact with the current on street parking provision.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify</p>	<p><u>Heath and Hampstead Society object</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed on top of the building seeks to camouflage the terrace by not installing balustrade or railings that would appear later when the safety of the terrace is compromised, object concerns overlooking, noise and intrusion into the skyline.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Officer comment</u></b> <i>The proposed high level roof terrace was withdrawn from the proposal.</i></p>

### Site Description

The subject site is a semi-detached property, located on the east side of Langland Gardens and comprises a three storey property, with six self-contained flats.

The building is located in the Redington and Frognaal Conservation Area and is not listed.

### Relevant History

**8600838** – Planning permission for: change of use and works of conversion including second floor side extension and roof terrace at the rear to provide two self-contained maisonettes and one self-contained flat as shown on drawing No.76/82/6 13 14 & 15 and 72/86/13 & 16. **Granted** on 16/07/1986

### Neighbouring Sites

#### **Number 6 Langland Gardens**

10/03/1994 (9301445) Granted

The erection of a rear extension at ground floor level.

#### **2 Langland Gardens NW3**

21/09/2007 (2007/3403/P) Approved

The erection of rear extension at ground and basement floor levels incorporating excavation to enlarge the existing basement level at the rear as an extension to the existing single-family dwelling house (Class C3).

## Relevant policies

NPPF 2012

The London Plan 2011

### Local Development Framework – Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

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 2013

CPG 1 Design

CPG6 Amenity

### Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2003

## Assessment

### 1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission was sought for the erection of a 2 storey rear extension to the rear at ground and first floor level, excavation of the existing garden to the front elevation for a new lightwell including the construction of a bay window and the replacement of existing bay window, the installation of balustrade and timber screening the provision of a terrace at first floor level, the erection of a dormer window to the side elevation and the new terrace at roof level.

1.2 The main issues for consideration are the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the conservation area generally and its impact on the amenity of neighbours.

### 1.3 Revision

1.4 The application was revised due to the impact of the proposed roof terrace and the lack of a basement impact assessment (BIA) and construction management plan for the proposed lightwell being created. Planning permission is now sought for the demolition of the existing single storey extension and:

- Erection of a 2 storey rear extension;
- Erection of a dormer window to the side elevation;
- Installation of balustrade and screening for a terrace to the rear at first floor level and;
- Installation of a window to the front and side elevation.

1.4.1 Policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of Camden's Local Development Framework seek to promote high quality places and conserving Camden's heritage. Policy CS14 states that the Council will ensure Camden's places and buildings are attractive, safe and easy to use by inter alia *'preserving and enhancing Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas...'* The property lies within the Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area, and any alterations/extension to these buildings should *preserve and enhance* the character and appearance of this conservation area.

1.4.2 These policies are reinforced by the advice set out in CPG1 (Design). With regard to rear extensions (para. 4.10), CPG1 states that these should be designed to be *'secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing'*, as well as *'respecting and preserving the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style'*.

### 2.0 Design

2.1 The rear of the property it's proposed to erect a 2 storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension at ground floor level to create duplex apartments (maisonettes) to the ground and basement level, following the installation of new internal staircase for 2 x 2bed flats (there would be no increase in the number of flats). The proposed extensions at ground floor level would be measure 3.9m in height x 10.2m in width x 7.5m in depth. The rear extension would be set back approximately 1.9m from the boundary of No. 2. Whilst, maintain a gap of 2.9m with No.6 Langland Road.

2.2 The proposed extension to the rear elevation at ground floor level would be full width. However, the extension would be set back 2.9m with No. 6 and would be approximately 2.5m deeper. With regards to No. 2 the extension would set back by within 2.0m with the boundary towards the final 1.9m of the rear elevation. However, the proposed extension would be a similar depth with the half-width extension that is considered a pair with the neighbouring property to the south of the host building. The extension would also retain 20m of garden space and a proportion of the garden would be used to construct the extension by removing the existing shrubs. The proposed extension would not have a detrimental impact in regards to the mature trees to the rear elevation. Therefore, the extension would subservient in terms of its depth and not considered as overdevelopment or excessive in terms of its size and scale. The proposed extension would incorporate a Sash window to the flank elevation.

## **2.First floor extension and terrace**

2.4 Camden Planning Guidance states that balconies should not be introduced where they: result in an unreasonable amount of overlooking in to any habitable rooms or the gardens of neighbouring properties; result in an unreasonable loss of sunlight or daylight to habitable rooms of neighbouring properties; have an adverse effect on the townscape or character of the building as a result of being visually intrusive or of an unsatisfactory design.

2.5 The proposed first floor extension would measure 4.9m in width x 4.5m in depth x 3.3m in height that would incorporate 2 x French doors that would allow access to a proposed terrace, the total height of the ground and first floor extension would be 7.1m, the terrace would measure 4.6m in width x 2.5m in depth with 1.9m balustrade and timber screen to the north elevation it's not considered that the proposed timber screening would not be greatly affected by potential wind in regards to debris. There are no details as to the proposed materials being used in regards to the extensions, doors or windows, and as such, a condition would be attached for the use of matching material materials.

## **2.6 Dormer roof extension**

2.7 The proposed scheme is also for the erection of a dormer extension to the side elevation that located towards the northwest elevating the dormer window would be partially visible from the public domain due to the orientation of the dormer within the flank elevation, the dormer extension would be 1.3m high and 1.7m wide to provide natural light for the existing 1 bedroom flat and is considered to be appropriate design in regards to its position and scale with the window below. The dormer extension would be 0.2m from the eaves which would be contrary to planning guidance. However, the dormer extension would be 1.4m from the ridge and side of the roof pitch. Furthermore, there are a variety of dormer extensions within the local area in terms of its design, scale and setting some of which cuts through the roofline, and as such, it would be hard to refuse the erection of the dormer extension on this occasion.

2.8 There is no objection in regards to the proposed window being installed to the front elevation at basement/ground floor level.

## **3.0 Amenity**

3.1 Concerns were raised in regards to the potential noise and the loss of light associated with the first floor roof terrace. However, the terrace is not overly large. There is a minimum of 3m gap between the first floor windows. Furthermore, there would be a timber screening 1.9m high that would maintain the privacy of the windows to the flank elevation with No. 6 Langland Gardens.

3.2 Objects in regards to the potential loss of light to the bedroom windows to the rear and side of the property were considered, the site visit indicate that there is an existing element of overshadowing to the rear due to the large mature trees, the orientation of the rear garden (west) and the position of the proposed first floor rear

extension in regards to the neighbouring property (No.6) Langland Gardens and the proposed 2 storey rear extension would be approximately 1.5m higher than the neighbouring property rear addition. The extension would have some light impact in regards to the neighbouring window rear extension to the flank elevation. However, this is not considered as significant harm that would warrant the refusal of this application. There would also be no significant impact with the first floor bedroom window which would remain unaffected.

3.3 The objection received in regards to the potential noise of proposed extension is noted. Construction noise and dust is not a valid reason for the refusal of this planning application. An informative will be added to the decision notice to ensure that the applicant is aware of the hours of construction in accordance with the Control of noise pollution Act 1974. It's not anticipated that the proposed development would require a construction management plan in regards to traffic flow.

## **5.0 Conclusion**

5.1 Overall, the development is considered to be acceptable in design and amenity terms. The proposed rear extensions would be contained within the limited views of the properties to the rear elevation and the plans were assessed in context with the design and setting of the neighbouring properties. The semi-detached properties along the west elevation majority of which have rear additions, and as such, would be difficult to refuse consent as the proposed design complements the host building and is similar in design to the neighbouring properties, and as such, would broadly meet planning policies DP24, DP25, CS5 and CS14 of the LDF.

## **6.0 Recommendation**

6.1 Approval with conditions

### **DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2015. For further information please go to [www.camden.gov.uk](http://www.camden.gov.uk) and search for 'members briefing'.