

Delegated Report	Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	06/11/2019	
	N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	10/11/2019	
Officer		Application Number(s)			
Nathaniel Young		2019/4615/P			
Application Address		Drawing Numbers			
39 Croftdown Road London NW5 1EL		See decision notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of a single storey infill extension to the rear with the incorporation of the existing lightwell internally within the dwellinghouse.					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission			
Application Type:		Householder			
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		See Decision Notice			
Informatives:					
Consultations					
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:		Site notice: displayed from 11/09/2019 Press notice: published on 12/09/2019 <i>No comments received.</i>			
Site Description					
<p>The application site is 39 Croftdown Road, a three-storey plus lower ground floor mid-terrace single family dwellinghouse (Class C3) situated on the northern side of Croftdown Road.</p> <p>The application building is located within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, it is not listed but is identified as making a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area. The application property is also located within the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan Area and would be subject to the relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies and considerations.</p>					
Relevant History					

Site

2019/2922/P: Erection of a single storey infill extension to the rear with the incorporation of the existing lightwell internally within the dwellinghouse (Class C3). Approved 18.07.2019.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

The London Plan 2016

New London Plan intended to publish 2020

Camden Local Plan 2017

A1 Managing the impact of development

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan 2020

DC3 Requirement for good design

DC4 Small residential extensions

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG)

CPG Altering and extending your home (2019)

CPG Design (2019)

CPG Amenity (2018)

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement 2009

Assessment

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 Planning permission is sought for:

- Erection of a single storey extension measuring measure 7.20m (d) x 7.90m (w) x 4.30m (h) which would wrap around the existing two storey outrigger.

2.0 ASSESSMENT

2.1 The material considerations for this application are as follows:

- Design and Conservation;
- Residential Amenity

2.2 Design and Conservation

2.2.1 Camden Local Plan Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) and Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan Policies DC2 (Heritage assets), DC3 (Requirement for good design) and DC4 (Small residential extensions) are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. Camden Local Plan Policy D1 requires development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, which improves the function, appearance and character of the area; and Camden Local Plan Policy D2 states that the Council will preserve, and where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas and listed buildings.

2.2.2 Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan Policy DC3 requires that all developments demonstrate good quality design, responding to and integrating with local surroundings and landscape context; in Dartmouth Park good design involves relating developments to the urban landscape value of the street setting, including respecting the established orientation and grain of existing development, and also ensuring that any extensions or modifications to existing buildings are subordinate to the existing development and in keeping with its setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties. Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan Policy DC4 supports proposal for small residential extensions, where in the case of roof dormers, respects the existing roof form in terms of design, scale, materials and detail and is restricted to the rear except where it is part of the established part of the local character.

2.2.3 CPG Altering and Extending your Home states that a rear extension should be secondary to the building being extended, in relation to its location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing; be built from materials that are sympathetic to the existing building wherever possible; respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style; respect and preserve existing architectural features; respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space; not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to daylight, sunlight, outlook, light pollution/spillage, privacy; allow for the retention of a reasonably sized garden; and retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity, including that of neighbouring properties, proportionate to that of the surrounding area.

2.2.4 The proposed single storey rear extension is considered to be unacceptable. The extension would measure 7.20m (d) x 7.90m (w) x 4.30m (h) and wrap around the existing two storey outrigger. The entire terrace grouping remains unimpaired by L-shaped wrap around extensions. In all cases where there are extensions to the rear of the property, there is a distinct rear element which extends off the rear elevation of the outrigger, and a distinct side infill element which remains completely separate from any rear elements. This is considered to be an important characteristic within the terrace grouping and wider conservation area. The separation of the rear and side infill extensions allows the existing, original, two-storey outrigger to remain clearly legible. A similar proposal for an L-shaped wrap around extension was submitted under application ref: 2019/2922/P on the subject site. Officers, at the time, did not consider this to be acceptable, and as such, sought amendments in order to preserve the legibility of the outrigger while also reducing the overall bulk, mass and footprint of the extension. The applicant revised the scheme accordingly, separating the rear and side infill elements of the

development, which resulted in permission being granted on 18.07.2019. This permission, at the time, was considered to be the maximum level of ground floor level development the property could host, and any further enlargement beyond this would be resisted.

2.2.5 As with the previous, original submission, the current application is considered unacceptable. The combination of the low quality, wrap-around design, and the excessive bulk, mass and footprint results in an overly dominant addition which would not only dominate the host building, particularly the original outrigger, but would also further reduce the size of the already restricted rear garden (beyond what was previously approved). The proposal is not sympathetic to the original design and proportions of the building, it fails to respect and preserve the legibility of the original outrigger and is out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development present within the terrace grouping. The granting of the previous permission does not justify any further enlargement or erosion of the character and appearance of the subject property or wider conservation area.

2.2.6 Para 196 of the NPPF (2018) states that 'where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'. The proposal would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the character, appearance and historic interest of the conservation area as well as to the host property. The addition of a 'dayroom' to the existing property does not contribute sufficient public benefit to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the conservation area. Considerable importance and weight has been attached to the harm and special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance conservation area, under s. 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013.

2.2.7 The proposed single storey rear extension, by reason of its design and excessive bulk, mass and footprint represents an overly dominant and incongruous addition which would fail to appear subordinate to the host building and would fail to preserve the legibility of the original outrigger. As such, the proposal would cause unjustified harm to the character and appearance of the subject property, terrace grouping, and surrounding conservation area contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Local Plan (2017), policies DC3 and DC4 of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan (2020), the London Plan (2016), the London Plan intended to publish (2020), and the NPPF (2019).

2.3 Residential Amenity

2.3.1 Local Plan Policy A1 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. The quality of life of occupiers and neighbours are protected by only granting permission for development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes factors such as light, outlook, privacy, noise and disturbance. Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan Policy DC4 seeks to only support extensions which do not harm the amenity of neighbouring properties (in particular in respect of privacy, overlooking and loss of light).

2.3.2 The proposal, given its residential nature is unlikely to result in undue harm to neighbours in terms of noise impacts. Similarly given its single storey nature, it would not impact on the level of overlooking to neighbouring properties.

2.3.3 The north-east flank wall of the proposal extension would sit along the boundary shared with No. 41 and would measure up to 4.30m in height (as measured from the natural ground level) and 7.20m in depth (as measured from the rear elevation of the main building).

2.3.4 It is noted that the garden of the site faces north-west, and so the neighbours would be impacted in terms of sunlight at the beginning and end of the day. The room contained within the ground floor of No. 41's outrigger is served by windows on both the side and rear elevations, and therefore would continue to have sufficient access to light and outlook post-construction of the proposed development. However, the main rear elevation windows of No. 41 at lower ground and ground floor levels both appear to serve bedrooms, the layout of No. 41 does not match the subject property's as it is subdivided into

flats. Due to the excessive height and depth of the proposed extension, along the shared boundary between the subject property and No. 41, it is considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact in terms of daylight and sunlight. No daylight/sunlight report or similar information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate compliance in this regard, and refusal is warranted on this basis.

2.3.5 It is considered that the proposal would also result in an unneighbourly sense of enclosure to No. 41 Croftdown Road. The extension would serve to increase the boundary height up to a total of 4.3m (sloping down to 4.0m before dropping to 3.6m for the flat roofed element) and for a depth of 7.2m. Given the terraced nature of these properties, their orientation, and the surrounding context of development, the proposal is considered to unduly impact on these neighbouring in terms of outlook/sense of enclosure.

2.3.6 Having an entirely glazed rear elevation and an almost entirely glazed roof, it is likely that the proposal would result in light overspill to neighbouring properties, particularly the upper floor flats of No.41.

2.3.7 Given the above assessment, the proposal is considered to result in undue harm to neighbouring occupiers, particularly regarding levels of light overspill, loss of light and sense of enclosure, thereby failing to comply with policy A1 of the Local Plan (2017) and policy DC4 of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan (2020).

3.0 Recommendation

3.1 Refuse permission