

**Date:** 06<sup>th</sup> August 2015  
**Our Ref:** 2015/3549/PRE  
**Your Ref:**  
**Contact:** Elaine Quigley  
**Direct Line:** 020 7974 5101  
**Email:** [Elaine.Quigley@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Elaine.Quigley@camden.gov.uk)

**Development Management  
Regeneration and Planning**  
London Borough of Camden  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
5 Pancras Square  
London  
N1C 4AG

Tel 020 7974 4444  
[planning@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planning@camden.gov.uk)  
[www.camden.gov.uk/planning](http://www.camden.gov.uk/planning)

Val Petrushechkin  
MAA Architects  
The Boathouse  
27 Ferry Road  
Teddington  
TW11 9NN

Dear Val

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)  
**RESPONSE TO ENQUIRY, REFERENCE 2015/3549/PRE  
9 GRANGE GARDENS, LONDON, NW3 7XG**

Thank you for your recent enquiry regarding the erection of an extension to the existing single family dwelling (Class C3) at 9 Grange Gardens, London, NW3 7XG. Your email was accompanied by Pre-planning enquiry statement dated June 2015 that was submitted on 26/06/2015.

The response is given specifically in relation to the potential development of the site as suggested by the pre-application documentation submitted. Should your pre-application scheme be altered this advice may become redundant; and this advice may no-longer be considered relevant if adopted planning policies at national, regional or local level are changed or amended; other factors such as case-law and subsequent planning permissions may also affect this advice.

The letter has been broken into sections for the ease of dealing with each of the planning considerations. The sections do overlap and need to be read collectively in order to provide a comprehensive response.

### **Background**

This pre-application enquiry has been submitted following the recent refusal of planning permission in April 2015 for the erection of first floor extension over existing garage with infill link and single storey rear extension (2014/6544/P). The original planning application for the erection of a first floor extension over the existing garage was refused on its siting, scale, and detailed design that

was considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and wider streetscene.

## **Design**

Three options have been suggested providing alternatives to try to address the recent reason for refusal detailed above. Each of the options includes the demolition of the existing single storey detached garage building that lies to the west of the main house. There are no issues with the loss of the existing garage.

Each of the options seem to address the earlier reason for refusal however having reviewed each of the options the preferred options are either Nos. 2 or 3 from a design perspective. These designs appear to follow the original design ethos and the proposed two storey side extension (and single storey front extension in option 3) remains clearly subordinate. It is considered that either option 2 or 3 would not harm the setting of the Redington/Frogna Conservation Area that lies to the northern boundary of the site and providing the materials and new work would exactly match the existing main house there would be no objections to the proposed extensions.

## **Amenity**

### **(i) Loss of daylight**

In options 2 and 3 the proposed two storey side extensions would be set away from the shared boundary with no. 8 by 1.5m and 2.5m respectively. The eastern flank elevation of no. 8 has a row of high levels windows at ground and first floor level that appear to be secondary windows. Currently the ground floor windows are already compromised by the existing garage building. Given the separation distance between these windows and the proposed two storey side extension, both options 2 and 3 would increase the level of daylight into these windows and would be considered acceptable. The flats at no. 18 Templewood Avenue lie to the north approximately 20m away. Given that the two storey side extension in both options 2 and 3 would not project any closer to the boundary with these properties than the existing building it is considered that there would be no loss of daylight to these flats. The dwelling at no. 10 lies to the south approximately 18m from the new two extension side. The proposed two storey side extension would not project any closer to this property than the existing building at no. 9 and would not result in any further loss of daylight.

Option 3 includes a single storey front extension that would be used as a garage. Although it would measure 6m in length, it would be single storey in height and would appear to be mainly contained behind the existing 2.5m high boundary wall. It would not appear to result in any loss of daylight to neighbouring properties. However this would be further assessed on site as part of any future planning application.

### **(ii) Overlooking/loss of privacy**

The proposals would include the removal of the existing single storey detached garage building that is located adjacent to the shared boundary with no. 8. Both options 2 and 3 would not include any new windows in the western side elevation and would not result in any loss of privacy to the

neighbouring occupier at no. 8. New window openings would be inserted in the front and rear elevations of the new extension in both options 2 and 3 fronting onto the flats to the north at no. 18 Templewood Avenue and to the south at no. 10 Grange Gardens. Given the separation distance between no. 9 and the flats at no. 18 Templewood Avenue that measures approximately 20m and 18m to the closest windows of no. 10 there would be no harmful overlooking to these properties.

**(iii) Outlook / sense of enclosure**

In options 2 and 3 the proposals would result in the new two storey side extensions being set away from the shared boundary with no. 8 by 1.5m and 2.5m respectively. The eastern flank elevation of no. 8 has a row of high levels windows at ground and first floor level. The ground floor windows are already compromised by the existing garage building. The proposed options 2 and 3 would increase in the separation distance between these windows and the new two storey side extensions and would therefore improve the outlook from these windows and would be considered acceptable.

**(iv) Noise**

It would appear that a sauna room would be created on the ground floor as part of the new floorspace. If any new plant equipment is proposed any future planning application may need to be supported by an acoustic report (to show compliance with the Council's Environmental Health Noise standards) and detailed drawings (elevations and floor plans to denote the exact extent of the plant. Please see policies DP26e (supporting text paragraphs 26.6 and 26.7), DP28 (and supporting text) and DP32 (and supporting text) and CPG6 Chapter 2 and 4 for more information in respect of noise / disturbance matters.

**Mayor of London CIL/Camden CIL**

The Mayor of London CIL came into force from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 and the Camden CIL came into force from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. It is not clear from the drawings submitted if the proposed extensions would create 100 sq. m net additional GIA floorspace over the existing building. If this is the case you may be liable to pay CIL. As part of the application you will need to denote the sq. m size of the extension (both GIA and GEA). The amount charged by the Mayor CIL is £50 per sqm in LB Camden. The amount charged by the Camden CIL is £500 per sq. m.

I hope this information is of use to you. The advice in this letter is an officer's informal opinion and is without prejudice to further consideration of this matter by the Development Management Team or to the Council's formal decision.

Yours sincerely,

**Elaine Quigley**  
**Senior Planning Officer**  
**Planning Solutions Team – Development Management**