

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>03/11/2015</b>
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>29/09/2015</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number</b>	
Carlos Martin			2015/5082/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
1 Oak Village London NW5 4QR			Refer to draft decision notice	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal</b>				
Demolition of existing two story rear flat roof and side extension and erection of new two story rear extension and associated alterations to roof.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Refuse			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Householder Application			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>62</b>	No. of responses	<b>07</b>	No. of objections	<b>07</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>7 objections received. The main grounds of objection are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed extension is too big and dominating.</li> <li>• Proposal would set a dangerous precedent for future planning applications allowed in Oak Village.</li> <li>• The black stained timber cladding is completely inappropriate and historically inaccurate.</li> <li>• This property is a non-designated heritage asset. The degree of intactness, uniformity and high level of preservation is cited as the main reason it is a striking and attractive townscape.</li> <li>• Architecturally the skylights at the front and the gables at the rear are completely at odds with the architecture of the whole of Oak Village.</li> </ul>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>	None; not in a conservation area.					

## Site Description

This application site is located on the corner of Oak Village and Lamble Street and comprises a detached residential property with a two storey flat roofed extension to the rear. The dwelling is not in a conservation area but it is a non-designated heritage asset on Camden's local list along with other neighbouring properties described as picturesque two storey cottages with large timber framed sliding sash windows. The property has a single storey side and rear extension.

## Relevant History

- TP4660/16215: Erection of a garage and formation of a new means of vehicular access. Granted 20/11/1963.
- TP4660/7381: Alterations and additions to provide bathroom and additional bedroom. Granted 29/08/1963.

### Neighbouring sites:

- 2005/1176/P: Alterations to the roof space including installation of a new pitched roof and two rooflights within the rear roof slope at no.21 Oak Village. Granted 18/05/2005.

## Relevant policies

### **NPPF 2012**

### **The London Plan 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011**

### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010**

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

### **Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG1 (Design) 2015, chapters 3 (Heritage), 4 (Extensions, alterations and conservatories) & 5 (Roofs, terraces and balconies).

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011, chapters 6 (Daylight and sunlight) & 7 (Overlooking, privacy and outlook).

### **Camden's Local List 2015**

### Proposal

1. Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing two story rear flat roof and side extensions and the erection of a new two story rear extension with gables, a new single storey side extension and associated alterations to the roof to raise the ridge height.

### Main planning considerations

2. The main planning considerations relate to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and its significance as a non-designated heritage asset and the impact of the proposal on the streetscene and the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the surrounding residential properties.

### Design and conservation of the non-designated heritage asset

3. The host building is part of a group of properties identified as non-designated heritage assets for their architectural and townscape significance. These are Nos.1-7 & 15-55 Oak Village, 1-4 Julia Street and 9-35 Elaine Grove. This group of buildings is a vestige of wider mid-19th century townscape centred on Lismore Circus which was later demolished for post war housing. Houses in Oak Village were built by 1853, with those on other streets by the 1860s. They are described on Camden's Local List as picturesque two-story cottages with large timber framed sliding sash windows and set behind shall front gardens, either semi detached (on Oak Village) or terraced with deep recesses between pairs to give the impression of semi-detached villas. To the east the houses have shallow pitched slated roofs with overhanging eaves; to the west the roof is hidden behind a parapet wall. There is Stucco to the ground floor, stock brick above, and on Elaine Grove a stuccoed parapet cornice. The degree of intactness, uniformity and high level of preservation creates a striking and attractive townscape. York stone paving, historic lamp posts and an Elizabeth II pillar box contribute to the integrity of this group's historic character.
4. Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design) - CPG1 - sets out how non-designated heritage assets are identified, how they are assessed and what it means to be a non-designated heritage asset. CPG1 advises that when considering any proposal that would either directly or indirectly affect the significance of a non-designated heritage asset the Council will treat the significance of that asset as a material consideration when determining the application. A balanced judgment should be made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset affected. In this case, the significance of the heritage asset is "*the degree of intactness, uniformity and high level of preservation which creates a striking and attractive townscape*".
5. The proposed alterations are of a more contemporary design, which would appear at odds with this picturesque 19<sup>th</sup>-century cottage and the group which it forms part of. Rear extensions with gable roofs extending up to the ridge of the main roof, contemporary elongated windows and timber cladding are not characteristic of a property of this age and style and would introduce discordant elements within this group of non-designated heritage assets which would be harmful to their significance. This impact would be exacerbated given the end of terrace location of the application site and the visibility of the rear from the public realm.
6. The proposal also involves raising the ridge of the main roof. It is noted that in 2005 a similar proposal was approved (ref. 2005/1176/P) at No.21, which is directly to the rear of No.1. This decision, however, pre-dates the Council's LDF Core Strategy, Development Policies and

planning guidance and at the time, the group of buildings had not been identified as non-designated heritage assets. This approval does not therefore set a precedent or justify the current proposal.

### **Amenity considerations**

7. The proposal would not result in any significant loss of amenity for neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy. Although the proposal includes a substantial increase in the overall height of the back-addition, the extension proposed above the current height would slope away from the boundary with the adjoining property, No.2, thus reducing its impact and limiting any significant loss of daylight or sunlight.
8. In terms of privacy, the proposal does involve the introduction of 2 new rear facing windows at second floor level where there is currently only a rooflight. Given the distance between the host property and its neighbour to the rear at No.21 would be approximately 20m, well above the 18m minimum distance required for directly facing habitable room windows, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any substantial loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties.

### **Recommendation**

9. Refuse planning permission.