

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		11/12/2014	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		04/12/2015	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Nanayaa Ampoma				2014/6544/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
9 Grange Gardens London NW3 7XG				See Decision Notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of first floor extension over existing garage with infill link and single storey rear extension							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	24	No. of responses	06	No. of objections	03
				No. electronic	00		

<p>Summary of consultation responses:</p>	<p>Adjoining neighbours were notified directly. Comments have been received from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flat M 18 Templewood Avenue • Flat L 18 Templewood Avenue <p>These comments can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to development • Development is not suitable for the road and would bring the houses (at Heath Park Gardens) too close together. • It would also reduce privacy • Development would be detrimental to trees and bushes • The houses in Grange Gardens forms part of a composition and the development would take away from external space and block light. • It's totally unsuitable • Would spoil the exterior of the building, character and landscape • Larger building would increase noise <p>Officer response: <i>the application does not propose to harm any current trees and there is no TPO on the site. In addition, as the property is not in a conservation area the current trees are not protected. In relation to comments on noise, officers are not of the opinion that the proposed use as an ensuite bedroom would lead to significant increased noise. The property is currently residential therefore, the proposed use would be in keeping with the residential use of the property. Please see section Amenity for comments on privacy and officer response to design comments can be viewed in the section titled Design.</i></p>
--	--

<p>CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify</p>	<p>No comments have been received.</p>
--	--

<p>Site Description</p>	
<p>The application site relates to a large family house with a separate garage. The property is part of a medium sized estate development off a side road with large family houses. All the properties in the area have been characteristically finished in brown brick work and mahogany wood detailing to their windows frames and doors. The garage is currently not attached to the residential unit.</p> <p>The property is not located within a conservation area, however it's rear boundary borders the Redington Froggnal conservation area.</p>	
<p>Relevant History</p>	
<p>There is no planning history for the site.</p>	

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

The London Plan March 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy (2010)

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS19 Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy

Development Policies (2010)

DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction

DP24 Securing High Quality Design

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Supplementary Planning Policies

Camden Planning Guidance 1 Design (2014) Chapters 1, 2 and 4

Camden Planning Guidance 6 Amenity (2011) Chapters 1, 6 and 7

Assessment

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of an additional floor on top of the existing garage and the creation of a walkway between the main property and the new extension. The new extension would be used as an ensuite bedroom. The ground floor garage would continue to be used as a garage.

The proposed extension would be greater in length than the existing ground floor garage at 7.8 metres (with the length of the garage being 6 metres) and would therefore, overhang the current garage footprint at the front and the rear. However the width of the extension would be the same as the width of the garage at 4.7 metres.

In addition, the application also proposes a more modest rear extension to the ground floor of the main building. This area will form part of the 'snug'.

Current Development

The material considerations are:

- Design
- Amenity

Design

Policies CS5 of the Core Strategy and DP24 of the Development Policies state that the Council will require all developments including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest design standards in terms of the character, sitting, context, form and scale to the existing building and the general area.

CPG1 (p:33) further states that in general extensions should :

- be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
- respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its

architectural period and style;

- respect and preserve existing architectural features,
- not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure;
- In most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged.

The proposed first floor addition over the garage would be larger than its ground floor counterpart and the proposed overhang would look out of character with the host building. The addition appears as though it has been developed without consideration of the main garage area it sits upon. Aside of its materials, its size ignores the scale of the garage, resulting in an incongruous addition. The proposed extension over the garage with the link to the existing dwellinghouse would be an incongruous addition and would compete with the main property rather than appear secondary as the guidance contained in CPG1 requires. The main roofline of the extension would be at a similar height to the main property. Thereby overshadowing the garage below and the main property itself. As a result would harm the appearance of the host building and the local streetscene.

The proposed rear extension to the main property at ground floor is relatively small in size and its position sits within the property's main footprint. Therefore it would not significantly alter the character of the main property and would respect the scale of and size of the building.

In light of the above, the development fails to comply with design guidance and policy.

Amenity

Under Chapter 7 of supplementary planning guidance CPG 6 (Amenity), all developments are required to have some regard for the amenity of existing and future occupants. Policies CS5 of the Core Strategy and DP26 of the Development Policies state that the council will protect the quality of life for existing and future occupiers, as well as neighbours by only granting permission for those developments that would not have a harmful effect on amenity. Such issues include visual privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, outlook, sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels.

Objections have been received from neighbour occupiers of the flats at 18 Templewood Avenue. These objections have also highlighted loss of privacy issues. The proposed first floor garage would create two additional windows to the north of the property at first floor level. Neighbours are concerned that this would result in an additional area of outlook for 9 Grange Gardens towards the flats. However there are already several windows at 9 Grange Gardens looking towards the flats at 18 Templewood Avenue. Additionally, this additional area of outlook is already viewed by the rear windows of the neighbouring property of 8 Grange Gardens. Therefore the level of overlooking would remain largely the same. As such officers are of the view that the additional two windows would not significantly alter the current level of privacy experienced by the occupiers at 18 Templewood Avenue.

In addition, the position of the proposed extension would not lead to a loss of light or significant overshadowing to neighbouring properties. As such, officers are of the opinion that the proposed extension would not unacceptably harm the amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE APPLICATION