Delegated Report			Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	20/12/2013			
			N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	19/02/2013			
Officer				Application No	umber(s)				
Fergus Freen	еу			2015/0246/P					
Application A	Address			<b>Drawing Num</b>	bers				
93 Hillway				J					
London									
N6 6AB				See decision notice					
PO 3/4	Area Tea	m Signature	C&UD	<b>Authorised Of</b>	ficer Signature				
					_				
Proposal(s)									
τ τοροσαί(σ)									
enlargement of slope, extension level on the fr	of the rear of the electric of the contract of	ground floor to xisting front p on in connecti ed scheme re	erraced area, in orch including on with existing	nstallation of a d enlargement of g use as a single	oval of existing e lormer window on the terraced area e family dwelling ( 014 to increase le	the side roof at first floor (Class C3).			
		Refuse Plan	lanning Permission						
Recommend	ation(s):								
		Householde	useholder Application						
Application Type:									

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice									
Consultations  Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	02	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00				
Summary of consultation responses:	Site notice: 28/01/2015 – 18/02/2015 Press notice: 30/01/2015 – 12/02/2015  No comments received									
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	Holly Lodge CAAC – Object on the grounds that the development will be over development of the site, the extension would overly large. Concerns with regard to BIA not taking into account a recently discovered spring in the area; lack of construction management plan and unclear drawings.									

## **Site Description**

The site is located on the west side of Hillway. It comprises a two-storey semi detached dwelling house. The property is not listed, but is located within the Holly Lodge Conservation Area.

#### **Relevant History**

14/07/1995- Permission granted for the installation of a dormer window at the rear and two velux windows at the side and alterations to the fenestration at the rear (Ref: 9500735)

14/07/1095- Conservation Area Consent granted for the demolition of an existing rear dormer (Ref: 9560091)

07/02/1997- Permission refused for the retention of summerhouse. (Ref: P9600733)

02/02/2006- Permission refused for the erection of a conservatory to rear of house (Class C3). (Ref: 2005/5181/P)

18/04/2006- Permission granted for the erection of a conservatory-style extension to the dwelling house (Class C3). (Ref: 2006/0830/P)

11/10/2007- Permission refused for the erection of a first floor front extension to the side wing of single-family dwelling (Class C3). (Ref: 2007/3724/P)

30/09/2013 – Permission granted for the erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension, following removal of existing extension, enlargement of the rear ground floor terraced area, installation of a dormer window on the side roof slope, extension of the existing front porch including enlargement of the terraced area at first floor level on the front elevation in connection with existing use as a single family dwelling (Class C3) (ref: 2013/4511/P)

04/11/2014 – Permission granted for Erection of single storey rear extension and associated excavation works to replace swimming pool internally. (ref: 2013/7128/P)

20/01/2015 – Permission granted to Extend partial front elevation at first floor and roof level. (ref: 2013/6887/P)

25/02/2015 – Permission granted for Amendments to planning permission 2013/6887/P (dated 12/03/2014) for the partial extension to the front elevation - to relocate an existing window on the front elevation; install two rooflights on the side elevation and on the flat roof at 2nd floor level; and to alter the windows at the existing rear dormer window. (ref: 2015/0244/P)

#### Relevant policies

# **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

#### Core strategy:

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development policies:

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

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

DP27 (Basements and lightwells)

# **Revised Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

CPG 1 Design- Chapters: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5

CPG 6 Amenity - Chapters: 6 &7

Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2012 London Plan 2011

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

#### **Assessment**

#### Proposal:

Permission is sought to erect a larger rear extension and extend the existing swimming pool. The proposed extension would be larger than the extension previously approved under 2013/4511/P and would extend rearwards by an additional 2m.

#### Assessment:

### Design

The previous permission (see planning history above) granted permission for an L shaped rear extension and new balustrade to the swimming pool area. The proposed amendments would see the approved extension around the swimming being extended by an additional 2m.

The amended extension would measure approx. 14.9m in length x 4m in width x 3m in height. The total length of the approved extension would be approximately 12.9m (with all other measurements being the same).

The extension would be constructed from white rendered walls, timber clad walls and timber louvres. It would contain aluminium framed sliding doors and solar thermal collectors. It would be of a contemporary design.

The increased footprint of the pool extension is considered to result in an excessively large extension and is therefore considered unacceptable. Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1: Design) advises that rear extensions should be subordinate to the building being extended in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing.

The proposed extension with the additional 2m would result in a building which is longer than the depth of the main building with measures approx. 13.7m (the depth of the main building from front to back, excluding the small existing rear closet wing extension which the proposed extension wraps around)

It is considered that this is excessively long and would no longer read as a subordinate addition to the host building. Furthermore it would set an unwelcome precedent in the street for excessively large extensions of this nature. It is not considered there are any exceptional circumstances to justify an extension of this nature.

As the property is located towards the top of a steep hill the rear garden can be viewed from surrounding properties and therefore the impact of the extension on the conservation area must be considered. As it would be viewed as an overly large, dominant feature it fails to preserve and enhance the conservation area in accordance with Policy DP25.

#### **Amenity**

The proposed extension would protrude approx. 70cm above the existing fence. The neighbouring boundary contains dense vegetation. Furthermore the main building line of the adjoining property

is set back behind the rear building line of the application site.

Therefore it would be hard to demonstrate that the proposed extension, set well away from the rear of the neighbouring property would harm sunlight/daylight levels or outlook from neighbouring properties or result in a sense of enclosure.

#### **Basement**

The proposal would see some modest additional excavation to the approved scheme. A BIA was submitted with the previous scheme and independently assessed, no issues were raised. Although a full BIA has not been submitted or independently assessed as part of this scheme, a letter from a qualified engineer has been submitted in relation to the additional excavation proposed and no issues are raised with this modest extension.

#### Summary

The proposed extension would be overly large and would fail to be secondary to the main building, contrary to DP24 and CPG1: Design. It would also fail to preserve and enhance the appearance of the conservation area contrary to policy DP25

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission.