

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>17/07/2015</b>
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>16/07/2015</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number</b>		
Anna Roe			2015/2902/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
76 Croftdown Road, London, NW5 1HA			Please refer to 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>					
Erection of a single storey rear extension.					
<b>Recommendation:</b>		Refuse application.			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

<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>10</b>	No. of responses	<b>02</b>	No. of objections	<b>02</b>
			No. Electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>Advertisement in Ham and High 18/06/2015 – 09/07/2015  Site Notice displayed 17/06/2015 – 08/07/2015  Initial consultation period 12/06/2015 – 03/07/2015</p> <p>The owner/occupier of 78 Croftdown Road objected to the application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The application lacks consideration for the conservation area.</li> <li>2. The application lacks consideration for the neighbouring houses. The structure will block the sunlight in the sunniest part of the garden.</li> <li>3. The design of the extension will put our sewer pipe and other drain pipes under the floor of the proposed extensions. This raises serious concerns about access in the event of a fault/blockage. The owner mentioned moving the pipes but I do not want to change the features of the original house.</li> <li>4. The proposed roof is of concern. The material is dark brown zinc with a roof light. The materials do not resemble the existing building.</li> <li>5. The roof would sit underneath all our garden side windows and would obstruct the view from our window.</li> <li>6. The extension occupies the entire area of their concrete part of the garden. Currently we have a non-locking gate (like the other properties on the estate) and there is a common understanding in the community that these areas are used for general access and for tasks such as weekly rubbish collections. The residents of these estates have a strong sense of community. Building this extension would interrupt this function for residence on both sides.</li> </ol> <p><i>Officers response:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Section 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013 requires for buildings in conservation areas that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park conservation area has been carefully considered in section three of this delegated report.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden’s residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. The impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers is discussed in section four of this delegated report.</i></li> <li>3. <i>When a decision is made on a planning application, only certain issues can be taken into account; referred to as ‘material planning</i></li> </ol>					

	<p><i>considerations'. Matters controlled under building regulations such as drainage details do not constitute a material planning consideration and cannot be taken into account by the local planning authority.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. <i>The design of the proposed extension is discussed in section three of this delegated report.</i></li> <li>5. <i>The impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers is discussed in section four of this report.</i></li> <li>6. <i>Private rights of access are considered to be a private issue between neighbours and cannot be taken into consideration by the local planning authority. However, the estates openness is considered to contribute to its character and appearance.</i></li> </ol>
<p><b>CAAC comments:</b></p>	<p>The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee objected on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The previous officer's pre-application advice was based on a fundamental lack of knowledge of this very significant 1920s estate, the Brookfield 'Homes for Hero's' Estates designed as similar to Hampstead Garden Suburb by A. Thomas, Lutyens' right-hand assistant. The application site is among the houses listed as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.</li> <li>2. The houses are very ingeniously designed to present the appearance of houses, semi-detached or terraced, though are in fact flats and maisonettes interwoven with communal grounds and service paths at the rear, enabling rubbish collection and access to drains and sewerage. The proposed extension will cover the service path.</li> <li>3. The rear façade, with sliding door and full length window will fundamentally and adversely affect the character of the hitherto homogeneous block.</li> <li>4. The roof introduces a new material to the detriment of the adjoining properties. The changes would serve as a dangerous precedent through this largely homogenous estate and should be rejected.</li> </ol> <p><i>Officers response:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Pre-application advice represents an initial informal officer view based on the information available at the time. It is not binding upon the Council, nor should it prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.</i></li> <li>2. <i>When a decision is made on a planning application, only certain issues can be taken into account; referred to as 'material planning considerations'. Matters controlled under building regulations such as drainage details do not constitute a material planning consideration and cannot be taken into account by the local planning authority when making a decision on an application.</i></li> <li>3. <i>The impact of the proposal on the historic pattern of rear elevations is discussed in section three of this delegated report.</i></li> <li>4. <i>The design of the proposed extension is discussed in section three of this delegated report.</i></li> </ol>

## Site Description

The application site is located on the eastern side of Croftdown Road and comprises a ground floor maisonette in the vernacular style of a rural cottage.

The property is part of the Brookfield Estate which was built as a development of flats and maisonettes to provide working class housing after WWI, as a direct result of the subsidies local authorities were able to claim under the Addison Act of 1919 in order to build 'Homes for Heroes'.

The Estate was laid out between 1922-30, designed by Albert J Thomas, Edwin Lutyens' principal assistant between 1902-35. The layout of the estate has echoes of Lutyens' Hampstead Garden Suburb and follows the garden suburb principles, including the assumed limitation of the amount of building in relation to the area of open space.

The garden areas were originally open and were provided to encourage self-sufficiency in the residents much like the allotments found in many other early C20th garden suburbs. The rear gardens were later sub-divided into individual units by low wooden fences and hedged boundaries however the open character of the estate has been largely maintained.

The houses are built in a simple cottage style with brown tiled roofs, red brick walls and white painted casement windows subdivided by glazing bars. The buildings present the appearance of short terraces or semi-detached cottages, though are in fact flats and maisonettes. This block consists of only two flats and two maisonettes. The hedged boundary is an important feature in the streetscape. The design stresses uniformity.

The property falls within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and is listed as a positive contributor.

## Relevant History

14/11/1973 The construction of double ventilation dormers to the front elevations of 74 and 76 St. Albans Road, 118, 120, 122, 124 & 126, Croftdown Road in the Brookfield Housing Estate, N.W.5.  
14/11/1973 Conditional.

2011/6216/P Installation of flue terminals to the facades of the residential blocks in association with provision of boiler units to each residential flat (Class C3). 17/05/2012 Granted.

2012/0571/P. Installation of 2 communal satellite dishes, a new antenna, 2 cabinets and new external cable each to the residential blocks (Class C3). 19/03/2012 Granted.

## Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan 2015, consolidated with amendments since 2011

Camden LDF Core Strategy 2010

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

Camden Development Policies 2010

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's Heritage

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (updated 2015) – paragraphs 2.11, 4.7, 4.10, 4.11, 4.12, 4.13, 4.14, 4.15, 5.21, 5.22

CPG1 Amenity (updated 2011) – paragraphs 7.4, 7.5

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement (Adopted 22 January 2009)

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

2. Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension, with four conservation style rooflights.
3. The proposed new rear extension would measure 7.5m wide x 2.9m deep x 2.2m high (with a pitched roof element rising to 3.4m high).
4. The extension will be constructed from red brick, with a dark brown zinc roof and sliding doors (3.2m wide x 2.1m high) and full height window (1m wide x 2.1m high).

### 2. Assessment

The principal considerations material to determining the application are as follows:

- Design (principle of development and detailed design)
- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

### 3. Principle of development

1. The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement maintains that within the conservation area there are many interesting examples of historic rear elevations many of which are exposed to public views from the surrounding streets. The original historic pattern of rear elevations within a street or group of buildings is an integral part of the character of the areas and as such rear extensions will not be acceptable where they would diverge significantly from the historic pattern. Similarly, CPG1 (Design) paragraph 4.15 states that the rear of some buildings maybe architecturally distinguished, either forming a harmonious composition, or visually contributing to the townscape. The Council will seek to preserve these where appropriate.
2. The rear elevations of this group of buildings are highly distinctive and are considered to contribute to the character of the area. No rear extensions have been erected along the rear of this group of buildings, maintaining the historic pattern of rear elevations. The proposed rear extension would diverge significantly from the traditional rear built form.
3. The application site has a greater openness from public views to its rear elevation and any rear additions are likely to be visible from the street scene. Similarly, the rear gardens are divided by low wooden fences and hedged boundaries therefore the proposal would be visible from the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties.
4. A Design and Access Statement accompanies the application within which it is stated that the proposal would not be visible from the street scene providing the existing hedges remain at

their current height. Hedge height is beyond council control; therefore if the hedges were cut the proposal would be visible from the street.

5. Section 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013 requires for buildings in conservation areas that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. It is considered that this proposal will harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and this heritage asset.

#### **4. Detailed design**

1. Policy CS14 aims to ensure the highest design standards for developments. Policy DP24 states that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and respect the character, setting, form and scale of neighbouring properties and the character and proportions of the existing building.
2. Rear extensions should be secondary to the building being extended in terms of location, form, proportions, dimensions and detailing in accordance with paragraph 4.10 of CPG1 (Design). The width combined with the height of the rear extension dominates the majority of the rear elevation and would make the proposal an incongruous and excessively bulky addition.
3. CPG1 Design states that the materials for alterations should complement the colour and texture of the materials in the existing building. The proposed rear extension would be constructed from red brick. This traditional material is considered to be the most appropriate complement to historic areas. The proposed zinc roof however would fail to replicate the original surface finish of the clay roof tiles, detracting from the character of the building and the sites wider context.
4. Under this application permission is sought for four conservation style rooflights within the sloping roof of the proposed rear extension. Despite being flush with the roof profile they would not be subordinate in size and number and are considered to have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the building.
5. Where it is necessary to alter or replace windows and doors that are original they should be replaced like with like in order to preserve the character of the property and the surrounding area (CPG1 Design, paragraph 4.7). The existing windows are white painted side hung casement windows, subdivided by glazing bars, with flat segmental arches above. The proposed full height window and sliding doors are considered out of character with the host building and neighbouring properties by virtue of their scale and design. Furthermore, due to the open nature of the rear gardens they would detract from the appearance of the conservation area.

#### **6. Amenity**

1. Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. 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.
2. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed extension would impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupier to the south in terms of loss of natural light to the dining room, the impact is not consider sufficient to warrant a refusal. It should also be noted that efforts have been made to mitigate the impact, by setting the proposal back from the western boundary.

3. Due to the angle of view and the close proximity between the existing rear windows at first floor level and proposed roof lights (less an 1m), there is the potential for overlooking. If the proposal was otherwise acceptable a condition requiring the roof lights to be obscure glazed could be added.

## **7. Conclusions**

1. The proposal is considered to be a dominant and bulky addition that would detract from the appearance of the host building. It would be out of keeping with rear elevations of buildings within this group of properties and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.