

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>07/04/2020</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>13/04/2020</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Obote Hope				2020/0666/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
10 Netley Street London NW1 3EJ				See 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(s)</b>							
Erection of a single storey rear ground floor extension.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>	
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>			
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		A site notice was displayed on 20/03/2020 to 13/04/2020. No comments received as a result of the consultation process.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify		N/A					

## Site Description

The site comprises a three storey terraced property on the south side of Netley Street. The site is not located in a conservation area and is not locally listed. Planning permission was granted for the redevelopment of the site in Netley Street to include the erection of a terrace of three-storey buildings to provide two town houses, four maisonettes and eight flats. The buildings do not appear to have been altered from their original construction.

It should be noted that the development does not benefit from Permitted Development Rights by virtue of condition 3 of planning permission 8401221.

## Relevant History

**2015/5152/P** – LDC (Proposed) for the erection of single storey rear extension. **Granted** on 02/10/2015.

### Original permission for the development

**8401221** – Planning permission for redevelopment by the erection of a terrace of three storey buildings to provide two town houses four maisonettes and eight flats as shown in drawings numbered 726/6 7 and 8. **Granted** on 24/10/1984

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2019

#### London Plan (2016)

#### Draft London Plan (2019)

#### Camden Local Plan (2017)

A1 – Managing the impact of development

D1 – Design

### Camden Planning Guidance

#### CPG Design March 2019

- Chapter 2 (Design Excellence)
- Chapter 3 (Heritage)

#### CPG Altering and extending your home March 2019

- Chapter 3 (Extension rear and side)
- Chapter 5 (Gardens, garden building and biodiversity)

#### CPG Amenity March 2018

- Chapter 3 (Daylight and Sunlight)
- Chapter 2 (Overlooking, privacy and outlook)

## Assessment

### 1.0 Proposal

**1.1** The proposal is for the erection of a single storey rear extension measuring approximately, 2.6m at its highest point, 2.5m in width x 3.0m in depth.

### 2.0 Assessment

**2.1** The main issues for consideration are:

- Design; the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance on the host property, as well as the wider area;
- Amenity; the impact of the proposal on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers;

### 3. Design

**3.1** The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy D1 requires extensions to consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; the quality of materials to be used; and the character and proportions of the existing building.

**3.2** The size of the proposed rear conservatory appears disproportionately large in its setting due to the size of the rear garden which is 3m in length by 4.4m in width. Policy D1 stipulates that development should be of the highest standard of design and should consider the character and proportions of the existing building. The proposed extension would project up to the ground floor kitchen, dining room window and would not leave any breathing space. The extension jars with the ground floor and crowds the ground floor level as a result of its siting and width. This would be considered harmful to the host building in terms of its appearance.

**3.3** Camden is a densely built-up borough, and it is paramount that development which involves the erection of extension or conservatory, the design should respond creatively to its site and its context. These are concerns for both smaller-scale alterations and extensions or larger developments, the design and layout of which should take into account the pattern and size of blocks, open spaces, gardens and streets in the surrounding area (the 'urban grain').

**3.4** Due to the narrow width of the property and its modest rear garden the extension would appear overly large in terms of its size taking up the whole length and over half of the width of the garden. It is acknowledged that the extension would fall below 50% coverage of the rear garden at taking up 49% of the garden. However, due to the width and the extension the proposal would have an uncomfortable relationship with the existing ground floor window and combined with its length the proposal would fail to be subordinate to the original building in terms of its scale and situation and would be considered unacceptable rear addition.

### 4 Impact on Neighbours

**4.1** Policy A1 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the quality of life of neighbouring occupiers. The factors to consider include: visual privacy and outlook; sunlight, daylight and overshadowing; artificial light levels; noise and vibration.

**4.2** The proposal, given its residential nature, is unlikely to result in undue harm to neighbours in terms of noise impacts. The properties to the west include integral garages on the ground floor so there would be no impact to their amenity in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight or outlook. The existing eastern boundary with the neighbouring property is a low level slatted timber fence. The proposal

would include a gable wall that would extend the length of the boundary for 3m at 3m in height. The nearest window is the ground floor patio door and windows in the neighbouring property to the east that appears to serve a living room. Outlook from this living room is already restricted by its single storey extension to the east that is occupied by the kitchen area and the large industrial building that lies 4m to the south of the properties. The proposed extension together with the gable wall at 3m would result in a sense of enclosure and would restrict the outlook to this habitable room that would be considered harmful to the amenity of the neighbouring property. This would be considered unacceptable.

4.3 In terms of daylight and sunlight the window that would be most affected would be the ground floor of the neighbouring property to the east. To help determine whether a daylight and sunlight report is needed the Council will have regard to several tests, taken from the BRE guidance that is detailed in the Amenity CPG. The 45 degree test is an assessment of daylight and can be applied to this situation. The extension would break the 45 degree line when taken from the midpoint of the ground floor living room window in plan but it would meet the 45 degree line rule when taken in elevation (point taken 1.6m from the floor level as the neighbouring living room is served by patio doors). Consequently it is considered that the extension would not harm the daylight levels to neighbouring properties windows and would be considered acceptable in this regard.

4.4 No.12 William Road is in industrial use and its amenity would not be harmed by the proposal.

## **5.0 Recommendation:**

5.1 Refuse Planning Permission.