

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		16/04/2008	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		27/03/2008	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Tania Skelli-Yaoz				2008/0622/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
54 Coity Road London NW5 4RY				See decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
				HWalker- DS 31/3/08			
Proposal(s)							
Erection of slate clad and glazed rear extension at basement and ground floor level (following demolition of existing outhouse) in connection with the existing single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Grant planning permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	02	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		<u>52 Coity Rd</u> : do not object provided there is no loss of daylight and sunlight.					
CAAC comments:		There is no CAAC for this conservation area.					
Site Description							
The application site is a 2-storey with basement terraced period house on the northern elevation of Coity Road, within the West Kentish Town Conservation Area. The surrounding area is characterised as predominantly residential.							
Relevant History							
None.							
Relevant policies							
Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 S1, S2, SD1, SD6, B1, B3, B7							
Camden Planning Guidance 2006							

Assessment

Permission is sought for the demolition of the existing outhouse at basement level and replacement with a 2-storey part-width flat roofed extension, clad with glazing and slate. This includes alterations to the rear elevation at basement level to provide double glazed doors, instead of a sash window.

The original proposal included the replacement of the second sash-window at rear ground floor level with a modern window in aluminium to match the new extension. This window was also proposed to be re-positioned, so as to be set away from the traditional fenestration of the windows at first floor level. This, together with the proposed height of the extension, was considered to harm the character and appearance of this elevation and thus failed to preserve the character and appearance of the CA and was therefore unacceptable.

The proposal was revised to be 1m lower; now 7.5m high and aligning with the top of the ground floor window. The side sash window is retained as original, including its original position. The proposed extension is therefore considered much improved in terms of bulk and height and acceptable in its context with the existing building's fenestration.

The basement elevations' treatment includes glazing to most parts with new landscaping into the nearest part of the garden. Whilst the loss of the existing sash window is regrettable, it is considered acceptable at this height on a rear elevation. The proposed glazing is also considered acceptable.

The remaining point of concern was raised with regard to the proposed slate as a cladding material and its context with the existing terrace. The agent has justified his proposal by referring to it as a material extensively used as a building material in the construction of Victorian terraces. Whilst this would normally be on roof elevations, he states that whilst 'stock brick would be an obvious choice; this may create a hulk of a form as it would merge with the neighbouring 2-storey extension and could look awkward given the huge height differences'. Moreover, the contrasting sharpness of form and tone of the slate cladding against the original soiled brick work may 'complement the material characteristics in both the new and the old structures'. This is considered to be a reasonable justification and given the varied existing rear extensions (e.g. nos. 46 and 56) viewed on site, the proposed material is considered to add interest and quality to this terrace without harming the character and appearance of the CA. It is also noted that the extension cannot be seen from the public realm.

The amenity of neighbours was assessed and not considered to be affected. The proposed extension is set behind that of no. 56 and is due NE. Officer daylight and sunlight measurements were carried-out with regards to the impact on the first floor most adjacent rear window at no. 52 and no adverse impact established i.e. the proposal complied with the parameters set out in the BRE guidelines.

Whilst a green roof may be a sustainable improvement to this proposal, the inclusion of a large rooflight within the proposed roof and the roof area not being very large may render this option not viable.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with all relevant policies and it is recommended to grant planning permission.

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613