

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>02/09/2013</b>
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>22/08/2013</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Numbers</b>	
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin			1) 2013/4286/P & 2) 2013/4379/L	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
48 Mornington Terrace London NW1 7RT			See decision notice	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposals</b>				
1) Erection of rear extension at lower ground floor level of existing dwelling (Class C3) and associated landscaping. 2) Erection of rear extension at lower ground floor level of existing dwelling (Class C3), associated landscaping and internal alterations.				
<b>Recommendations:</b>		1) Refuse planning permission 2) Refuse listed building consent		
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Full Planning Permission</b>		

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

### Consultations

Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>23</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
			No. electronic	<b>01</b>		

Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 24/07/2013 to 14/08/2013. The press notice was advertised on 01/08/2013.</p> <p>One neighbour made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This grade II listed property has been subject to subsidence problems.</li> <li>• A thorough survey needs to be carried out on the property before the proposed works are authorised.</li> <li>• Any undermining could have a detrimental effect on adjacent properties.</li> <li>• Any works should be in keeping with the Victorian architecture.</li> </ul>
------------------------------------	--

CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p><b>Camden Town CAAC</b> objected to the proposal. In summary, the grounds of their objection are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All the houses in this terrace, which is the grandest of all the terraces in our Conservation Area, have existing half-width rear extensions - which are historic features.</li> <li>• The proposed full-width extension at the lower ground floor level would give an undesirable precedent.</li> <li>• The paving of the roof of the extension will only encourage its use as an inhabited part of the ground floor.</li> <li>• The length of the proposed extension will not necessarily improve the natural light in the basement rooms.</li> </ul>
-----------------------------	---

### Site Description

The application property is a four storey with basement level Grade II listed mid-terrace house on the east side of Mornington Terrace in the Camden Town Conservation Area. The property is constructed of yellow stock brick with rusticated stucco ground floors and forms part of a terrace of 27 houses dating from the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century. The general pattern to the rear of the terrace is that of relatively small, two storey closet wings.

### Relevant History

#### Application property:

**2013/2239/P** – Planning permission was refused on 13/06/2013 for the erection of basement and ground floor rear extension with first floor rear extension above, new rear lightwell with associated landscaping and glass canopy over front lightwell to existing dwelling (Class C3). Reasons for refusal:

- 1) *The proposed extensions, by reason of their inappropriate detailed design, scale, bulk and height on the rear elevation would be an incongruous and obtrusive addition to the building which would detract from the appearance and special architectural and historic interest of this terrace of Grade II listed buildings and the wider Conservation Area contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.*

- 2) *The proposed glass canopy would be an uncharacteristic feature to the existing building and would have an adverse impact on the special architectural interest of the listed building, contrary to policy CS14 (Promote high quality places) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.*
- 3) *By virtue of their size and position the proposed rear extensions would have a detrimental impact on the daylight received by the residents at 49 Mornington Terrace. This would be contrary to policy CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and to policy DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Plan.*

**2013/2343/L** – Listed building consent was refused on 13/06/2013 for the erection of basement and ground floor rear extension with first floor rear extension above, new rear lightwell with associated landscaping, glass canopy over front lightwell and internal alterations to existing dwelling (Class C3).  
Reasons for refusal:

- 1) *The proposed extensions, by reason of their inappropriate detailed design, scale, bulk and height on the rear elevation would be an incongruous and obtrusive addition to the building which would detract from its appearance and special architectural and historic interest contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.*
- 2) *The proposed glass canopy would be an uncharacteristic feature to the existing building and would have an adverse impact on the special architectural interest of the listed building, contrary to policy CS14 (Promote high quality places) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP25 (conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.*
- 3) *The proposed internal alterations at second floor level would harm the historic plan form of the listed building and thereby detract from its special interest, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy, and policy DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.*

**28246** – Permission was refused on 06/06/1973 for the change of use of the first, second and third floors, including works of conversion, to provide three self-contained flats.

**34063(R1)** - Permission was granted on 17/09/1984 for the change of use of the basement to a self-contained dwelling unit, including works of conversion.

Neighbouring properties:

50 Mornington Terrace – An application for a two storey extension with access steps to the garden to rear of maisonette and associated landscaping was withdrawn on 26/04/2013 (refs: 2013/0841/P and 2013/0947/L).

46 Mornington Terrace - A similar proposal involving erection of a rear basement extension and a rear conservatory at ground-floor level with external steel staircase to the garden was refused on 20/08/2002 (ref: PEX0101054). The proposed extensions by virtue of their height and bulk were considered to dominate the rear elevation, detrimental to the character and appearance of the terrace.

37 Mornington Terrace - A similar first floor rear extension to the proposed one was refused on 08/09/2004 (refs: 2004/3039/P and 2004/3040/L) and dismissed at appeal on 22/04/2005. The

inspector considered that the rear façade of the building would be badly affected by the first floor extension.

34 Mornington Terrace - A single storey conservatory type rear extension at lower ground floor level was approved on 01/09/2009 (ref: 2009/2679/P).

### **Relevant policies**

#### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)**

#### **London Plan (2011)**

#### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies (2010)**

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

DP29 (improving access)

#### **Camden Planning Guidance (2011)**

CPG1 (Design) – Sections 2, 3 and 4

CPG6 (Amenity) – Sections 6, 7 and 9

#### **Camden Town Conservation Area and Appraisal and Management Plan (2007)**

Pages: 4-5, 20-21, 23, 28-29, 41, 42 and 44.

### **Assessment**

#### **Background:**

The proposed scheme was revised to address some of the design concerns raised by the Council's listed building specialist.

In summary, these concerns were:

- The proposed scheme would harm the historic proportions and significance of the historic interior and rear elevation.
- The proposed enlargement of the existing extension and the addition of a side infill would create a solid full width rear extension with a particularly deep plan, virtually doubling the footprint of the house at basement level.
- Internally the proposed basement with its very long plan, would become exceedingly dark and the historic proportions and spatial characteristics of the lower ground floor would no longer be of primary architectural importance but subsumed in a substantially larger footprint.

In response to the above concerns the depth of the proposed rear extension was reduced from approximately 8m to 5.8m, the depth of the proposed rear lightwell was reduced from 1.6m to 1m and new steps from the roof of the proposed extension to the rear garden have been added.

#### **Proposal:**

It is proposed to erect a single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level with rear lightwell and new steps to the rear garden level. The proposed rear extension would infill the gap between the rear addition at the application property and the rear addition at 47 Mornington Crescent.

The roof of the proposed extension would be used as a roof terrace on ground floor level and it would

be connected to the rear garden via few steps secured by glass balustrade.

### **Impact on Listed Building and Conservation Area:**

Policy DP25 aims to preserve and enhance the borough's listed buildings and states that the Council will only grant consent for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where it considers this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building.

The supporting text in paragraph 3.22 of CPG1 states that the Council will consider the impact of proposals on the historic significance of the building, including its features, such as:

- original and historic materials and architectural features;
- original layout of rooms;
- structural integrity; and
- character and appearance.

### The proposed rear extension:

To the rear of the building there is currently a very long half width addition at ground floor and lower ground floor levels, projecting around 8m from the rear of the house. This appears to date from the mid to late 20<sup>th</sup> century. This rear addition is already entirely out of proportion with the listed mid 19<sup>th</sup> century house. At basement level the projecting rear addition is shallower due to the rising ground level at the back of the house. There is a small open basement courtyard area accessed by steps from the upper garden level.

The proposed rear extension would be in a solid box form and its roof would be used as a terrace which would be accessible from the existing side doors on the ground floor level. There would also be new steps over the proposed lightwell to connect proposed roof terrace to the rear garden level. Although the proposed extension would be set back by approximately 2.1m from the existing rear addition at the application property it would project 0.9m beyond the existing rear addition at the adjoining property (no. 47). As the existing rear addition at the application property projects further from the rear additions at the rest of the properties in this terrace (except no 49) the proposed extension would be approximately 1m deeper than the approved rear lower ground floor extension to no. 34 (ref: 2009/2679/P).

The proposed infill extension would create a solid full width rear extension with a particularly deep plan on the basement / lower ground floor level. This would be harmful to the spatial characteristics of the lower ground floor level.

The use of the roof of the proposed rear extension as a terrace would also harm the setting of the listed building as this would not be a characteristic feature to this listed terrace of properties.

The proposed balustrade would further harm the adverse visual impact of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the listed building.

Internal alterations: The existing layout of the lower ground and ground floor levels would be retained. The existing fittings would be restored and all the existing joineries would be restored and maintained.

The proposed rear extension detailed in the revised drawings is still considered to be unacceptable in design terms as it would not respect the historic form and rear elevation of the listed building.

### **Neighbouring Amenity:**

Policy DP26 aims to protect the quality of life of neighbours that might be affected by developments. The proposed rear infill extension by reason of its location would not be likely to affect the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties any worse than the existing situation.

**CIL:**

The proposed additional residential floorspace would be below 100sqm therefore the proposal would not be liable to MoL's CIL.

**Conclusion:**

The proposed rear extension by reason of its solid form and excessive depth would harm the special architectural and historic interest of the listed terrace and the character and appearance of the wider conservation area. The proposed roof terrace and associated balustrade would also exacerbate the negative impact of the proposed rear extension the character and appearance of this listed building and rest of the terrace.

**Recommendation:** Refuse both planning permission and listed building consent

LB