

**PLANNING, DESIGN & ACCESS & HERITAGE**

**IMPACT STATEMENT**

for

**1 GLENILLA ROAD, LONDON, NW3 4AJ**

**Prepared for Mr Bengis**

**Hedley Clark**

Karen@hedleyclark.co.uk  
www.hedleyclark.co.uk  
Tel: 01420 489851 or 07766 650569

## **CONTENTS PAGE**

- 1.0 Introduction
- Background
  - Description of Site/Character of Area
- 2.0 Planning History
- Pre-application engagement with the Council
- 3.0 The Proposal
- 4.0 Design and Access Component
- 5.0 Planning Policy Framework
- 6.0 Planning Policy Compliance
- Design and Conservation Considerations
  - Basement Impact
  - Neighbouring Amenity
  - Transport
  - Trees and Landscaping
  - Sustainability
- 7.0 Other Material Considerations
- Fall back position
- 8.0 Conclusion

**Hedley Clark**

Karen@hedleyclark.co.uk  
www.hedleyclark.co.uk  
Tel: 01420 489851 or 07766 650569

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This Statement has been prepared and submitted in support of a planning application for a single storey rear extension, replacement front boundary wall, external alterations including rooflights together with retrospective consent for an enlarged basement and rear garden wall at 1 Glenilla Road, NW3 4AJ("the Site"). This application follows the approval of similar extensions/alterations under 13/5538/P.

1.2 This statement should be read in conjunction with the following documents

- Drawings prepared by XUL Architecture;
- Arboricultural Report prepared by Tim Moya Associates
- An appended copy of the Basement Impact Assessment relating to the approved (and larger) basement under 13/5538/P.

### **Background**

1.3 Planning permission was granted under 13/5538/P for a single storey rear extension, installation of new windows throughout and 6 skylights at roof level together with the enlargement of an existing basement including the addition of front and rear lightwells. This permission was subject to a number of conditions and a legal agreement to secure the submission of a Construction Management Plan.

1.4 A Basement Impact Assessment was submitted as part of this application and was determined to be appropriate and acceptable for the enlargement of the basement. The approved basement extended under the footprint of the existing property and the proposed rear extension, with a front and rear lightwell proposed. External access to the basement was approved from both the front and rear lightwells.

**Hedley Clark**

Karen@hedleyclark.co.uk  
www.hedleyclark.co.uk  
Tel: 01420 489851 or 07766 650569

- 1.5 Works pursuant to the approved details commenced during 2014 and in particular those relating to the excavation and extension of the basement. During these initial stages of construction a number of amendments evolved, most notably the decision to reduce the overall size of the basement.
- 1.6 The basement, as constructed, now extends only under the footprint of the main property and does not extend under the original or proposed single storey rear projection (as approved). The approved details for the rear lightwell and external stairwell have not been implemented. The reduction in the size of the basement is considered non-contentious and a minor amendment to the approved details with less development involved than previously deemed permissible.
- 1.7 As a consequence of reducing the size of the basement the applicants have taken the opportunity to re-consider the design of the rear extension. In particular, given the reduced size of the basement there is no requirement for the rear lightwell or the external access to it from the rear garden. Consequently, in order to create a visually more balanced, symmetrical and elegant solution, the rear extension now extends across the former stairwell.
- 1.8 The bespoke and innovative design of the rear extension includes small sections of brick wall adjacent to the side boundaries of the site which benefit from a reduced height before stepping up to the central full height fully glazed section, the latter of which sits centrally on the rear elevation. The objectives of the re-design are to provide a more sensitive extension that appear both balanced and subordinate in form whilst affording protection to neighbouring occupiers.
- 1.9 The extension does not appear full width and cleverly uses the different materials and heights to create a visually lightweight and balanced extension that allows the original host property to remain visually dominant.

- 1.10 In addition to the above, a number of other changes to the approved scheme have evolved. The original stairwell and position of the entrance door into the basement from the front lightwell were not viable. Accordingly, the configuration of the stairs and the position of the entrance door at basement level have been changed. It has become apparent that the front boundary wall is unsound and will require demolition and complete re-building, together with a number of other repairs to the elevations. The approved rear boundary wall has also been increased in height by 500mm.
- 1.11 In view of the number and form of amendments proposed, having regard to the potential need to amend/remove pre-commencement conditions pursuant to 13/5538 which were not discharged, the need to vary the legal agreement associated with the extant approval and having liaised with the Council, it is concluded that a new application would be the simplest approach to regulate works and secure an improved design. Therefore, whilst a 'fresh' application, the principle of the extensions and alterations herein proposed have been historically approved by the Council. The focus of this submission is therefore to assess the proposed amendments to the approved details, with the extant permission comprising a material fall-back position.
- 1.12 Works the subject of this application are listed in Section 3 of this Statement.
- 1.13 For clarification, a separate application for the formation of a dormer window is being submitted in parallel with this application. Accordingly, this submission seeks consent for skylights on the rear elevation.

**Description of Site/Character of Area**

- 1.14 The application site comprises an end of terrace property which forms part of a short terrace of similar houses on the northern side of Glenilla Road. The Edwardian property is set back from the road with a low brick wall defining the front boundary. The property extends over four floors, including the original small basement area and an area within the roof space. A single storey projection to the rear provided the former kitchen area. This was a flat and glass roofed structure sited along the common boundary with no.3 to the east.
- 1.15 The front façade includes a slate mansard roof detail with a double set of dormer windows and rooflight. The front elevation is painted brickwork. The rear façade benefits from a dormer extension on the rear mansard with yellow stock bricks below.
- 1.16 The property benefits from a private rear garden. There are no trees of merit within the boundary of the site.
- 1.17 The site lies within the Belsize Park Conservation Area (sub-Area 4 known as Glenoch). The property is not listed.
- 1.18 The area is characterised by terraced Edwardian properties of distinct detailing. The terrace of which the application site forms apart, is relatively uniform in its appearance from the street elevation. There is, however, greater variation in character and appearance along the rear elevation with a number of properties having benefitted from rear extensions and alterations.
- 1.19 To the rear of the site lies 43-60 Tudor Close, a 4 storey block of apartments. To the east lies no.3 Glenilla Road whilst to the west lie the rear gardens of those properties fronting on to Belsize Avenue. A number of trees lie beyond the rear boundary of the site.

## **2.0 PLANNING HISTORY**

- 2.1 As noted in paragraph 1.3 above, the property benefits from an extant permission (13/5538/P) for a single storey rear extension, installation of new windows throughout, 6 skylights at roof level and the enlargement of the original basement including front and rear lightwells. A copy of the Officer report recommending approval of this scheme is appended as is the decision notice.

### **3.0 THE PROPOSAL**

3.1 Consent is sought for the following works;

- Retention of the basement for use as a gym including the front lightwell (the basement being smaller than as consented under 13/5538/P);
- Retention of the boundary wall in the rear garden area (500mm higher than approval 13/5538/P);
- Replacement rooflight on front elevation and rooflights on rear roof slope to facilitate the conversion of the roof space;
- Erection of single storey rear extension (amended and improved design from that permitted under 13/5538/P);
- Replacement double glazed timber sash windows throughout the property; and
- Re-building the front boundary wall and installation of replacement low timber gate on a like for like basis.

3.2 For the sake of completeness, the submitted drawings also include details of repair works to the front and rear elevations.



## **4.0 DESIGN & ACCESS COMPONENT**

### **Amount**

- 4.1 The basement, as constructed, extends to a net increase of 63sqm whilst the proposed single storey rear extension has a footprint of 27sqm.

### **Scale and Appearance**

- 4.2 Following a reduction in the size of the basement and the omission of the rear stairwell, the rear extension has been re-designed. In re-visiting the design of the rear extension particular attention has been given to its scale, appearance, relationship to the host property and neighbouring occupiers, with the need to retain the visual dominance of the host property paramount. The desire to create a more visually balanced, contemporary and functional space has influenced the final design.
- 4.3 In order to create a visually more balanced, symmetrical and elegant solution, the rear extension now extends across the former stairwell area, as originally approved under 13/5538/P. The developed footprint has not therefore changed.
- 4.4 The bespoke and innovative design includes small sections of brick wall at each side (as viewed from the rear) and these have been carefully designed to be lower in height than the fully glazed central section which sits centrally on the rear elevation. Consequently, the extension has an eaves height of 2.8m adjacent to either side boundary, stepping up to 3.5m in height 600mm in from the side boundaries.
- 4.5 A simple aluminium frame is proposed with the central section fully glazed. High level glazing is proposed on either flank wall (0.6m from the boundaries) at the junction between the central glazed section and the stepped height of the flank details. A flush rooflight positioned at the junction between the original rear wall of the property and the extension. A 'living' sedum roof is proposed.

- 4.6 The inspired choice of materials and stepped roof line ensures the extension does not appear full width, with the brick elements receding into the appearance of the original rear wall behind. The central glazed section thus takes visual prominence at ground floor level.
- 4.7 The bespoke design creates a visually lightweight extension that allows the original host property to remain visually dominant. It is simplified from the slightly awkward design previously approved, with greater balance, symmetry and sensitivity shown to ensure the dominance and design of the host property is not compromised.
- 4.8 The basement is contained wholly under the footprint of the original dwelling. There is no external manifestation of it to the rear whilst the size of the front lightwell reflects that previously approved. The front stairwell leading down to the basement is, however, modified from that previously approved, an amendment which is essential to provide access to basement level. The elevation treatment of the basement level varies from that previously approved with the entrance door moved to the western side and a window installed where the formerly approved door was proposed. The front wall is structurally unsound and is to be demolished and rebuilt to replicate that existing.
- 4.9 The existing windows are to be replaced with white painted timber sash windows (as previously approved).
- 4.10 The submitted plans provide full details of the proposal as well as highlighting the commitment to repairing and upgrading the existing architectural features of the property and its finishes.

#### **The Use**

- 4.11 The residential use of the property as a single dwelling is unaffected by the proposals. No change in use of land is proposed as part of the proposal.

**Access**

- 4.12 No change is proposed to the main pedestrian access to the site from Glenilla Road. Access to the basement will be provided via the front lightwell in addition to an internal stairwell, as previously approved.

**Layout**

- 4.13 The proposals seek to enhance the original layout of the property to provide an improved standard of accommodation. The internal changes to layout do not require the benefit of planning permission.
- 4.14 The primary entrance remains at ground level on the front elevation. The enlarged basement is accessible from within the property, providing valuable additional living space, as well as from an entrance in the front lightwell.

## **5.0 PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK**

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

- 5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development which lies at the heart of decision making. Paragraph 14 makes it clear that development that accords with an up to date Local Plan should be approved without delay and where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impact of doing so would significantly outweigh the benefits or specific NPPF policies indicate development should be restricted.
- 5.2 Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning. Paragraph 58 requires development to respond to local character, reflecting the identity of local surroundings and materials whilst not preventing or discouraging innovation.
- 5.3 The NPPF specifically states that design policies should avoid unnecessary detail and not be unduly prescriptive. Paragraph 60 goes on to state that *"Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles."*
- 5.4 The Framework encourages design to secure the optimal and efficient use of a site whilst responding to local character and history.
- 5.5 Paragraph 126 recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and seeks to conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. It is appropriate to consider the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness.

5.6 The Frameworks makes it clear that an application in compliance with development plan policy should be approved without delay.

**Development Plan**

5.7 The relevant policies of the Core Strategy include:

- CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
- DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction
- DP24 Securing high quality design
- DP25 Securing Camdens Heritage
- DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours
- DP27 Basements and lightwells

5.8 Camden Planning Guidance, updated in 2013, is also relevant and in particular;

- CPG1 Design
- CPG4 Basements and Lightwells
- CPG6 Amenity

5.9 The Belsize Park Conservation Area Statement (2002) is also a material consideration for the purposes of this proposal.

## **6.0 PLANNING POLICY COMPLIANCE**

### **DESIGN AND CONSERVATION**

6.1 The NPPF makes it clear that good design is a key component of sustainable development and that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 are of relevance as is the Belsize Park Conservation Area Statement.

6.2 Planning permission 13/5538/P granted consent for, inter alia, a single storey rear extension, front lightwell, rear boundary wall and extension to an existing basement. The current proposal seeks permission for similar works. Taking each component part in turn;

#### **Rear Extension**

6.3 Under approval 13/5538/P permission was granted for a modern frameless rear extension with a depth of 4m and a width of 6.4m and included a sedum 'living roof', following removal of an existing single storey projection. The design and appearance of the original single storey projection was not deemed sufficient to require its retention when assessing 13/5538/P and this conclusion remains valid.

6.4 Following amendments to the size of the basement, the opportunity has been taken to re-consider the design and configuration of the rear extension, the objective of which was to secure a more balanced and subordinate extension whilst protecting neighbouring amenities, as set out in the introduction of this statement.

6.5 There is no policy presumption against full width rear extensions and the 'test' of acceptability rests with whether it appears subordinate to the main property, respects the pattern of development in the area and retains appropriate amenity space.

- 6.6 As set out in the Design & Access Component (section 4), the bespoke and innovative design now proposed includes a stepped roof line and use of distinct materials at either end of the extension. At either end of the extension low level brick walls have been designed, with the central glazed section raised in height. Consequently, the extension has an eaves height of 2.8m adjacent to either side boundary, stepping up to 3.5m in height 600mm in from the side boundaries. A simple aluminium frame is proposed with the central section fully glazed, with a 'living' sedum roof above.
- 6.7 The brick components of the extension visually recede into the original rear wall behind, thereby allowing the central glazed section to take visual prominence at ground floor level. Consequently, the sensitive design solution neither dominates the rear elevation nor appears full width. Accordingly, the stepped roof line and use of different materials ensures the overall bulk, mass and appearance of the single storey extension is visually subordinate to the scale, appearance and form of the original property, in accordance with design advice and policy requirements.
- 6.8 Furthermore, the carefully crafted design offers a more balanced and symmetrical appearance over that for which extant permission exists. This further reinforces the dominance and design of the host property.
- 6.9 Whilst marginally wider than that previously approved (extending over the previously approved external stairwell) there is no policy resistance to this in principle and the proposal affords visual improvements over the extension that benefits from extant permission.
- 6.10 The rear extension would respect the existing pattern of rear extensions along the terrace and retain an appropriate garden space (same size as previously determined acceptable).

6.11 Having regard to the siting of the rear extension and the innovative design which secures a lower eaves height adjacent to site boundaries, the proposal would not be highly visible or obtrusive in public views, with only limited private views of it achieved from the upper levels of neighbouring properties.

6.12 For the reasons set out above, the rear extension would be fully compliant with development plan policy and design advice.

6.13 In assessing the extension approved under 13/5538/P Officers stated in paragraph 2.1:

*“The design of the rear extension comprises largely of a frameless glazed box with frameless sliding doors. This contemporary design is considered acceptable at ground floor level.”*

The modern design and materials of the rear extension now proposed reflect those previously approved, securing the provision of a lightweight structure that is neither incongruous nor dominant in relation to the host property or in local views.

6.14 For the reasons set out above, the rear extension fully accords with development plan policy and design advice.

#### **Basement**

6.15 Under permission 13/5538/P permission was granted for the enlargement of the existing basement to include the formation of front and rear lightwells. In approving these details it was concluded that the basement and associated front and rear lightwells were of appropriate design and would not harm the character or appearance of the property, streetscene or wider Conservation Area.

6.16 The previously approved basement works have been partially implemented. However, in contrast to the extant consent, the basement as constructed and for which retrospective consent is now sought as part of this application, is smaller than that



previously approved. It is no longer proposed to extend the basement under the proposed rear extension or provide a rear lightwell.

- 6.17 The front lightwell, as constructed, is of the same size as that approved as is the bay window beneath that at ground floor level. Minor changes are proposed to the alignment of the stairwell to ensure access can be appropriately achieved as well as relocating the approved entrance door from the eastern to western side of the basement level. The original tiled pathway would be re-installed as per the approved scheme, with a new covered bin store sited as previously agreed.
- 6.18 The reduction in the size of the basement to the rear has no impact on the conservation area whilst the removal of the rear stairwell and lightwell simplify the appearance of the rear elevation. The changes to the front stairwell and elevation details do not materially impact on the character of the property or the conservation area having regard to the extant permission that exists.

#### **Boundary Treatments and External Alterations**

- 6.19 The front boundary wall has been deemed structurally unsound and will require demolition and rebuilding. It is proposed to rebuild the wall to the same height, detailing and materials that currently exist. A new low level timber gate will be positioned at the entrance from Glenilla Road and this would match similar gates located along Glenilla Road. The works along the front boundary would enhance the appearance of the property, reinforce local distinctiveness and conserve the significance of the conservation area.
- 6.20 A 2.3m high brick wall around the rear garden of the property was approved under 13/5538/P. The wall has been constructed at a height of 2.8m and retrospective consent is accordingly sought. The wall is sensitive in design and does not appear visually incongruous or overbearing. It provides a simple and robust means of enclosure, with materials in keeping with those in the local context. The wall is not

visually intrusive and does not detract from the character of the area or the significance of the conservation area.

### **External Alterations**

- 6.21 The Drawings detail the considerable attention given to restoring this Edwardian property, to enhance its functionality as a family home and its appearance as part of a larger terrace. The windows are to be replaced with replica double glazed sashes, in keeping with the period and appearance of the property.
- 6.22 The property benefits from existing rooflights on both the front and rear elevation, as do other properties along Glenilla Road. The principle of rooflights cannot therefore be objected to. It is proposed to replace an existing rooflight on the front elevation, of similar proportions and position. This would not cause harm to the visual amenities of the area. The proposed roof lights on the rear elevation would be flush on the roof and are not highly conspicuous in public views within the Conservation Area. The rooflights would not detract from the architectural integrity of the property nor would they appear visually intrusive in the conservation area. Indeed, this aspect of the proposal was previously approved under extant permission 13/5538/P.
- 6.23 Many other aspects of the works shown on the proposed details do not require express consent, including the repair of existing chimneys and pots, the parapet wall, roof and ridge tiles, the front door and lead work, brick work and painting. These details together with the proposed works demonstrate the commitment to upgrading the appearance of this neglected property which will in turn enhance the visual amenities of the area the conservation area.
- 6.24 To conclude, the proposals are based on principles of good design and rely on high quality materials and finishes. The works fully accord with development plan policies and the design guidance of CPG1 and the NPPF.

## BASEMENT IMPACT

- 6.25 Policies DP27 and CPG4 state that developers will be required to demonstrate with methodologies appropriate to the site that schemes for basement maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties; avoid adversely affecting drainage and run-off or cause other damage to the water environment and avoid cumulative impact upon structural stability of the water environment in the local area.
- 6.26 Under application 13/5538/P the applicants submitted a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) in accordance with requirements of Policy CPG4, a copy of which is appended hereto. As noted in paragraph 3.4 of the Officer report pertaining to 13/5538/P, the BIA considered groundwater, slope stability, surface water flow and flooding and the overall potential for one of these aspects to cause detrimental impacts to not only the host property but those neighbouring. A Construction Method Statement was also provided. The BIA for this larger scheme fully considers the structural implications of the basement and found;

*“that the proposed basement development is within the expected norm for a small scale residential basement excavation and that the proposed development has no triggering factor which initiates an instability problem in an area which otherwise would have remained stable for the foreseeable future.*

*We therefore can conclude that the proposed development is unlikely to result in any specific issues relating to land or slope stability, the hydrogeology and hydrology of the site. Suitable construction methods will ensure slope stability at the site and there should not be any negative impact on the groundwater.*

*We are of the opinion that the proposed basement construction has no long term detrimental impact to either the water environment or the neighbouring properties.”*

**Hedley Clark**

Karen@hedleyclark.co.uk  
www.hedleyclark.co.uk  
Tel: 01420 489851 or 07766 650569

- 6.27 Paragraph 3.6 of the Officer report further states that the BIA, as appended hereto, is commensurate with the scale of development proposed and the proposal is compliant with Policies DP23 and DP27 of the LDF.
- 6.28 The basement works pursuant to 13/5538/P have been partially implemented, as have the necessary procedures under the Party Wall Act. The basement is smaller than that approved by reason of it no longer extending under the proposed extension and omission of a rear lightwell. The works have been carried out in accordance with the BIA and there has been no reported problem with the stability of neighbouring properties or the water environment.
- 6.29 No further excavation works are necessary and none are sought as part of this submission. In this instance, there is no requirement for a Construction Management Plan to protect local amenity given the excavation works are complete.
- 6.30 It is therefore concluded that the basement element of the works and the BIA which deals with the extant consent are compliant with development plan policy and guidance and appropriately protect neighbouring occupiers and the water environment.

#### **NEIGHBOURING AMENITY**

##### **Basement**

- 6.31 Policies CS4 and DP26 seek to protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The basement level works are smaller than those previously deemed permissible and have been completed. No further excavation is proposed and no harm would therefore result in this regard.
- 6.32 The front lightwell would not cause harm to neighbouring amenity.

**Rear Extension**

- 6.33 No.3 Glenilla Road lies to the east of the property and benefits from a single storey rear extension immediately adjacent to the shared boundary. A single storey rear extension of greater height and depth was previously deemed permissible and benefits from extant consent.
- 6.34 The amended design for the rear extension now results in an extension with a height of only 2.8m immediately adjacent to the boundary with no.3, with the height stepping up to 3.5 set in 600mm from common boundary. It is therefore concluded that the revised design of the single storey rear extension provides an improved relationship with no.3 and would not detrimentally impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
- 6.35 The rear extension now extends up to the rear garden boundary of 34/36 Belsize Gardens. Given the modest proportions and flat roof design of the extension, boundary treatment and the separation distances involved, the rear extension would not cause harm to the amenities of these occupants by reason of overlooking, visual intrusion, overbearing impact, loss of privacy or daylight.
- 6.36 The rear extension would be over 12m distant from the properties to the rear that front on to Tudor Close. This separation distance and the height, form and design of the extension ensure no material harm would result.

**Rooflights**

- 6.37 The rooflights would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers by reason of loss of privacy or overlooking. Their position remains largely as previously approved. If considered appropriate and necessary, the low level window required as a means of escape could be conditioned to be obscure glazed.

**Rear Boundary Wall**

- 6.38 The rear boundary wall has been constructed at 2.8m in height (500mm greater than the boundary wall which benefits from extant permission). Mature landscaping lies within the gardens of neighbouring properties.
- 6.39 Having regard to the alignment of the wall, the separation distances with neighbouring properties, mature vegetation and tree cover together with the high quality appearance of it, the wall does not appear visually overbearing or intrusive and does not cause a material or harmful loss of daylight to any neighbouring occupier.
- 6.40 The external changes to the property would not generate harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
- 6.41 It is therefore concluded that the works subject of this application afford appropriate protection to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and are compliant with development plan policy.

**TRANSPORT**

- 6.42 Retrospective consent is sought for the basement level works (which essentially comprise the partial implementation of permission 13/5538/P) and no further excavation work is necessary or proposed.
- 6.43 In view of the above, the remaining works for which consent is sought (single storey rear extension, rooflights and replacement front boundary wall) will not cause material or significant implications for road uses outside the curtilage of the planning unit. Similarly, the works will not cause disruption to the transport network, pedestrian safety or any material disruption from noise, dust and general construction.
- 6.44 There is no requirement for a Construction Management Plan via a condition or legal agreement in these circumstances.

## **TREES AND LANDSCAPING**

- 6.45 There are no trees within the application site but 4no. are located adjacent to the perimeter of the rear garden area. An Arboricultural Report, prepared by Tim Moya Associates is submitted in support of the application. This independent assessment concludes:

*“The proposal does not involve works that will significantly affect trees and all retained trees can be adequately protected...the proposal complies with the requirements of National, regional and local policies and guidance in relation to the trees and their important setting.”*

- 6.46 The applicants are willing to accept a condition securing the protection of trees in adjoining sites, as per condition 4 of approval 13/5538/P. The proposal is compliant with national advice and development plan policy in this regard.

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

- 6.47 The works to 1 Glenilla Road meet the needs of the current owners without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own, thereby comprising a sustainable form of development.
- 6.48 The development is part of a significant programme of works to refurbish the property and upgrade its appearance, relying on principles of good design which in turn will enhance the significance of the conservation area and reinforce local distinctiveness.
- 6.49 The internal works will involve retrofitting the property with more sustainable initiatives, including double glazed thermally efficient glass in the replacement sash windows, low energy fittings and water goods, all of which will help reduce the carbon footprint of the property.

6.50 Policy DP22 states that schemes should incorporate green and brown roofs wherever possible. The proposed single storey rear extension includes the provision of a sedum roof which will be appropriately planted and require minimal maintenance. The proposal therefore positively furthers the objectives of sustainable development in this regard.



## **7.0 OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Fall Back Position**

- 7.1 As identified above, a significant material consideration is the extant planning permission (13/5538/P) for works to the property.
- 7.2 This extant consent forms a realistic fall-back position should be afforded significant weight in the decision making process, as endorsed in numerous appeal decisions.

### **Benefits of a current scheme V's the Fall Back Position**

- 7.3 The current proposal represents less development on site than previously approved notably through the smaller basement and omission of the rear lightwell.
- 7.4 The design of the rear extension is simplified and affords a more balanced appearance to the rear elevation, as detailed above. It remains a lightweight structure and enables the original proportions and detailing of the property to remain visually dominant. The current proposal thus offers material design improvements over that which benefits from consent.

## **8.0 CONCLUSIONS**

- 8.1 Following the grant of planning permission under 13/5538/P for the erection of a single storey rear extension, installation of new windows throughout and 6 skylights at roof level and the enlargement of an existing basement including the addition of front and rear lightwells, work commenced on site. During these works, a number of amendments evolved. The current submission thus seeks consent for the amended details. The fall-back position of the extant consent is highly material.
- 8.2 The proposed development would meet the needs of the occupiers without compromising future generations to meet their own needs and is therefore sustainable development consistent with the NPPF.
- 8.2 The basement, as constructed and in accordance with the BIA, is smaller than approved and no longer includes a rear lightwell. It extends only under the core of the original property and causes no harm to the built or water environment or the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
- 8.3 The retention of the boundary wall causes no harm to the significance of the conservation area or the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
- 8.4 The amended design of the rear extension offers an opportunity to secure a more sensitive solution, based on principles of good design. It is wholly subordinate to the main property and balances the rear elevation. The rear extension would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
- 8.5 The rooflights are largely as approved and would not cause harm to the conservation area or neighbouring amenities.
- 8.6 The replacement front boundary wall would match that existing, with a low timber gate installed replicating those found along Glenilla Road.

- 8.7 The proposals are based on principles of good and sustainable design, incorporating a green roof and lowering the carbon footprint of the property.
- 8.8 The proposal complies with all relevant development plan policies and with central government advice in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. In our judgment no other material considerations weigh against it.
- 8.9 Accordingly we trust the Council will determine that the application for planning permission can be approved.