

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	19/08/2015	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	31/07/2015	
Officer			Application Number(s)			
Matthias Gentet			2015/3567/P			
Application Address			Drawing Numbers			
32 Lowfield Road London NW6 2PR			Tree Report; [32LR] 01; 02; 03; 04; 05; 06.			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature			
Proposal(s)						
Erection of a lower ground floor single storey rear extension with patio to residential flat (Class C3).						
Recommendation(s):		Refused				
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission				
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice				
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	17	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		The statutory consultation were carried out in the form of consultation letters to the relevant parties (expiry date: 29/07/2015) and a Site Notice (erected on 10/07/2015 and expiry date: 31/07/2015)				
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		N/A – Not in a Conservation Area				

Site Description

The site address is located to the southern end of Lowfield Road and is one of three-storey with lower ground floor terrace houses forming a uniform row of frontages with access stair to elevated ground floor and hip to gable pitch roofs.

The application site is not in a Conservation Area.

Relevant History

Host Site:

2005/0895/P – (refused on 17/05/2005) - Erection of rear mansard roof extension to provide additional habitable accommodation for the 1st & 2nd floor maisonette, plus 2 x new rooflights to the front roofslope and replacement of window at rear 2nd floor level with new French doors and railings to form a balconette.

Adjacent Sites:

2015/4494/P – (granted on 06/10/2015) - Erection of two storey rear extension at basement and ground floor level - **27A Lowfield Road;**

2014/3943/P – (granted on 15/08/2014) - Single storey rear extension with two roof lights - **21A Lowfield Road;**

2014/3418/P – (granted on 12/08/2014) - Erection of a single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level to residential flat (Class C3) - **26 B Lowfield Road;**

2014/2151/P – (granted on 10/06/2014) - The erection of a single storey rear infill extension - **36 Lowfield Road;**

2011/4100/P – (granted on 10/10/2011) - Erection of a two storey rear extension to existing ground and first floor flat (Class C3) - **Flat A, 29 Lowfield Road;**

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategies Policies

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

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

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 (Design) 2, 3, 4, 5 (as amended 2015)

CPG6 (Amenity) 6, 7 (as amended 2013)

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan 2015 (Consolidated with amendments since 2011)

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 Permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level which would extend over the existing side patio and out into the garden creating a full width addition. The extension would project out by approximately by 3m from the existing rear extension and would also include a small internal courtyard which would provide natural light to the back room.

1.2 The overall size of the extension is 3.3m in height x 5.1 in width x 3m in depth (from the existing extension) x 6.7m in depth (including the infill) with four bi-folding door to the rear elevation and a flat roof with a small parapet. The proposed window within the courtyard is to be obscured glazing.

1.3 The height of the existing extension will not be altered by the subsequent addition of the proposed extension.

1.4 The extension would be constructed using bricks to match existing.

2. Assessment

2.1 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are design, impact on the amenity and impact on the rear streetscape.

Design

2.2 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within policy DP24 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the quality of materials to be used.

2.3 Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1 – Design) states that a rear extension should be designed to be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing and allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden.

2.4 Although the rear streetscape provides examples of rear extensions in Kylemore Road and Lowfield Road, the extensions already in situ, along with others recently approved (*please see Adjacent Sites in Relevant History*), have produced less prominent rear additions which are not extending over 2m out into the garden area and thus are subordinate to the host buildings.

2.5 In terms of the area the proposed extension is to cover – being approximately 6.8sqm and excluding the existing rear extension – this would almost double the overall foot print of the front part of the property. As such, the proposed addition would not be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation contrary to CPG1 - Design.

2.6 The proposed rear extension is at a size and scale which is harmful to the host building and the rear streetscape. The addition would be overly large, resulting in a dominant and incongruous feature which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider rear

streetscene. The development is considered inconsistent with development policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and CPG1 Design and unacceptable overall in terms of scale and design.

2.7 The materials – bricks matching the existing brick work and felt for the roof, are considered to be acceptable.

Amenity

2.8 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG6 seeks for developments to be "designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree."

2.9 The bi-folding doors, measuring 3.5m in width x 2m in height, are of a reasonable size allowing for a significant "brick frame" which provide a well balance rear elevation and limit the amount of overlooking from adjacent properties. The presence of a generous amount of vegetation including a very large and mature tree to the far end of the garden also provides a natural screen minimizing the potential impact from light pollution.

2.10 The overall height of the extension would not protrude above the boundary fence to such an extent that it would be the cause of loss of sunlight. The south facing boundary fence is edged by vegetation within the adjacent property which would in turn shield any protruding aspect of the proposed extension. The window on the south facing elevation within the courtyard is to be obscured and thus will not produce light pollution or overlooking.

2.11 In terms of loss of garden area, the extension would reduce the rear amenity space by approximately a third but would still leave a substantial amount of garden area and would thus not have a negative impact on the rear streetscape.

3. Recommendation

3.1 The proposed rear extension fails to comply with CPG1 (Design) in terms of design and scale, requiring for rear extensions to be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions and dimensions. The proposed addition would not respect the original proportion of the existing front part of the host property and would add an oversized feature.

3.2 The proposal, in terms of size, scale and location, is considered to be unacceptable and detrimental to the character and appearance of the rear streetscape and the host and adjacent buildings contrary to Development Policy DP24 and Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 (Design).

3.3 It is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused.