

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	01/11/2013
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	17/10/2013
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Miheer Mehta			2013/5756/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
51 Princess Road Primrose Hill London NW1 8JS			Refer to decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of an additional floor including amenity terrace to rear closet wing of dwelling house (Class C3).					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Permission			
Application Type:		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice
Informatives:	

Consultations

Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	12	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
-----------------------------	--------------	-----------	------------------	-----------	-------------------	-----------

<p>Summary of consultation responses:</p>	<p>A site notice was displayed between 26/09/2013 and 17/10/2013 A press notice was published between 18/09/2013 and 09/10/2013</p> <p>2 letters of objection were received on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not in character, - overdevelopment - increased light pollution and decreased privacy - intrusive and loss of privacy <p>Response: <i>The matters raised have been covered within the main report.</i></p>
--	--

CAAC/Local groups comments:	Primrose Hill CAAC - No comments received.
-----------------------------	--

Site Description

The subject site is a three storey with basement terraced dwelling-house located on Princess Road and within Primrose Hill conservation area. The surrounding area is predominately residential with similar three storey terraced buildings. The subject building is noted as a positive contributor in the conservation area.

Relevant History

2013/5674/P - Non material amendment to planning application granted 05/08/2013 (ref 2013/2509/P) for the erection of a mansard roof extension, namely for a flat roof to replace the approved pitch roof and repositioning of the front dormers. *Granted* 26/09/2013.

2013/2509/P - Erection of mansard roof extension with internal roof terrace to the rear elevation all in connection with existing residential dwelling (Class C3). *Granted* 05/08/2013.

2011/0398/P - Erection of mansard roof extension with internal roof terrace and glazed infill rear extension to the lower ground floor of existing dwelling house (Class C3). *Granted* 11/04/2011.

2011/3712/P - Amendments to planning permission granted 11/04/11 (2011/0398/P) for erection of mansard roof extension with internal roof terrace and glazed infill rear extension to the lower ground floor of existing dwelling house (Class C3), namely creation of external staircase from rear roof to terrace to main roof of building and installation of balustrading to main roof to allow use as a terrace. *Refused* 23/09/2011.

Other extensions to existing back additions on Princess Road:

49 Princess Road

9300397 - Erection of an additional storey to an existing two storey rear extension & enlargement of three existing windows at ground and basement level to the rear elevation. Construction of new doorway and one new window to the rear existing structure and a new bin area to the front. *Granted* 26/08/1993.

55 Princess Road

2009/3411/P - Erection of additional storey to existing 2 storey rear extension of dwelling house (Class C3).

Granted 08/09/2009.

57 Princess Road

Erection of mansard roof extension with dormer windows in front roof slope and roof lights in rear roof slope and rear first floor level extension to closet wing with roof terrace above at second floor level all in connection with existing dwelling house (Class C3). *Granted 25/07/2011.*

Relevant policies

The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London: 2011 LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2011

Core Policies

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

Development Policies

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 Design (Chapter 4 - para 4.9 to 4.18 & Chapter 5 para 5.23 to 5.24)

CPG6 Amenity (Chapter 6 & 7)

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2000)

Assessment

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of an additional floor to the existing back addition and ancillary terrace area. The rear extension would be the depth of the existing back addition which would house a study and would propose a terrace area at roof level with an access door.

Assessment

The main issues of concern are **a]** the design and impact on the appearance of the host building, and on the character and appearance of the conservation area and **b]** neighbour amenity.

Design

The proposed extension would be the full depth of the existing outrigger. The height would form a further storey and the terrace above would also consist of railings at 1m high. The application property sits within a group of properties which have largely been unaltered to the rear and retain two-storey back additions.

The overall increase in height and the total depth of the extension would create an out-of-character feature. Other nearby extensions are not as high nor are they the full depth of the existing outriggers and therefore the proposal would be considered to be a bulky rear addition which would be visually obtrusive. It is considered that the proposal would be unacceptable due to its height, size and bulk.

The principle of a terrace of the size proposed at roof level is considered to be unacceptable. The addition of railings would also create a further visual increase in height that would go further to create an unpleasant environment. The properties on either side of the application property do not have railings and other railings further away from the application site do not all benefit from planning permission and are located at lower levels.

Other similar proposals for extensions above existing back additions have previously been granted by the Council (see planning history), however, these have had different circumstances to that of the application property and the level of harm proposed was not considered significant at the time of the assessment. In

particular, no. 49 had gained consent in 1993; therefore the relevant policies have changed significantly since then. Nos. 55 and 57 have a different relationship to the application site in that the height is lower than the proposal and are more squat in appearance. Furthermore the rear windows to the raised ground floor at nos 55 and 57 are set in line with the rear elevation of the existing back additions, thereby providing no impact to light intake to rooms served by these windows.

Amenity

It is considered that the proposed height and depth of the rear extension would cause harm to the amenity of no.49 Princess Road, in terms of access to sunlight and outlook from the windows to the bedroom served to the rear elevation of the main building at raised ground floor level, by virtue of its location and position.

Furthermore, the proposed terrace would propose additional harm to the impact on privacy to adjoining occupiers by way of overlooking, disturbance and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. The rear gardens and properties to the rear have a tight relationship in terms of distance and overlooking and it is considered that a terrace would exacerbate the existing situation creating unacceptable harm on amenity. Overlooking would also not be overcome by a privacy screen as this would not be acceptable in design terms.

A daylight and sunlight study has been provided as part of this application. However, the assessment does not demonstrate that the impact to the light intake and overshadowing into the habitable rooms to no.49 would be within BRE guidelines.

The extension would cause significant harm to neighbouring amenity and therefore the proposal would fail on amenity grounds.

Conclusion

It is considered that the proposal is an overdevelopment of the application property, providing a dominant and bulky addition to the host property which would fail to be sub-ordinate or subservient to the main property and provide unacceptable harm in the form of impact on both privacy and light intake to adjoining occupiers.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission