

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	25/06/2013
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	13/06/2013
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Sam Fowler			i) 2013/2542/P ii) 2013/2617/L	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
13 Prince Albert Road London NW1 7SR			Refer to draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of a first floor side extension with rooflight, minor external alterations to raise parapet and install access door at second floor level, and minor internal alterations to dwelling house (Class C3).				
Recommendation(s):		i) Refuse planning permission ii) Refuse Listed Building Consent		
Application Type:		i) Householder Application ii) Listed Building Consent		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	11	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	03
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Neighbours were consulted by letter, a site notice was placed outside the property on the 15th May 2013 for three weeks and a press notice was published on the 23/05/2013.</p> <p>Three objections were received from neighbouring occupiers that raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area • The development would cause a loss of light and overshadowing to neighbouring properties • The development would cause overlooking • The proposal would cause general disturbance to neighbouring properties 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>Primrose Hill CAAC: Strong objection. The addition now proposed is in quite a different character from the character of the main building, and would be visually alien and intrusive. We note that no sightlines have been produced to show the impact in the longer views which are visible along Prince Albert Road.</p>					

Site Description

Nos.1-15 (consecutive) is a group of related detached and semi-detached stucco villas dating from the mid 19th century. No 13 adjoins no. 12. All the buildings are Grade II listed and form part of the Crown Estate. They are aligned on the north side, at the eastern end of Prince Albert Road within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. All of the buildings differ in terms of design but are defined as one composition by their rendered facades, their spacious and leafy settings, their alignment and their boundary treatments. They are thought to have been built by J Guerrier and P Pearse and were designed in the Nash style to appear as grand villas within spacious plots. The Primrose Hill CA Statement notes "located opposite the parks are the grandest properties within the Conservation Area, in terms of height, decoration and relationship to plot. Notable examples are the cream coloured Crown Estate villas on Prince Albert Road". Prince Albert Road was part of Nash's original plan for Regent's Park and reflective of this is the design of the buildings which were intended to appear as large country houses set within a parkland setting (obviously on a smaller scale), of which symmetry in many cases played an integral part.

The site is roughly rectangular in shape, measuring approximately 30 m by 15 m. It is occupied by a semidetached villa of five storeys, including a lower ground level. The house is centrally positioned on the site with a hard covered driveway to the front and garden at the rear. The rear garden is at lower ground floor level and is accessed by steps on the western side of the house and comprises a central lawn with bushes along the northern and western boundaries, a paved path runs along the back of the house and a small patio area is present in the east of the garden. There are two semi-mature silver birch trees located on the southern boundary of the site.

It was noted at the time of the site visit that the site is currently a construction site, although works had been stopped.

Relevant History

Subject site

2012/2388/P & 2012/2445/L - Erection of extension at first floor level on the side elevation in connection with existing residential unit (Class C3). **Refused** – 05/07/2012

Note: These applications were later appealed and subsequently dismissed. Appeal reference APP/X5210/A/12/2180777.

2011/6227P & 2011/6460/L - Enlargement of lower ground floor under front garden and excavation of basement including alteration of front lightwell, erection to rear extension at lower ground and ground floor level to accommodate WC, and associated alterations to front and rear elevations to dwelling house. (Class C3). **Granted** - 26/04/2012.

2010/5962/P and 2010/5966/L - Repositioning of existing gate post to widen entrance way to dwelling (Class C3). **Refused** - 04/01/2011.

2010/5966/L - Removal of internal chimney breast at second floor level to dwelling (Class C3). **Refused** – 04/01/2011

2011/0035/P & 2011/0040/L - Creation of basement under the existing lower ground floor level and front garden to accommodate plant room, swimming pool, gym, sauna and games room with lightwells at front and rear, erection of lift shaft extension to rear roof slope and associated external alterations to dwelling (Class C3). **Refused** – 08/04/2011

2011/0042/P & 2011/0040/P - Erection of a 3 storey side extension at 1st, 2nd and roof level with dormers to front and rear roof slope to dwelling (Class C3). **Refused** – 22/03/2011.

2011/1924/P & 2011/1948/P - The retention of a relocated gate post to widen entrance way to dwellinghouse and replacement wooden electric sliding gate (Class C3). **Granted** -23/06/2011.

2011/4500/P & 2011/4530/P - Excavation of basement with front and rear lightwells, enlargement of lower ground floor under front garden, extension at rear lower ground and ground floor level all in connection with existing dwelling (Class C3). **Withdrawn**. The application was withdrawn by the applicant to address concerns of Council officers.

Adjoining semi-detached dwelling at 12 Prince Albert

2008/4473/P and 2008/4560/L - Alterations and extensions including erection of a two storey side extension (ground floor and basement floor), excavation to extend the existing basement level to create additional accommodation and swimming pool and installation of new condensing unit in the rear garden to single family dwellinghouse. **Granted** - 03/11/2009.

11 Prince Albert

2010/5636/P and 2010/6544/L - Erection of a three storey side extension at lower ground, ground and first floor levels of single dwelling (class C3). **Refused** – 21/12/2010. The application was refused due to loss of symmetry between the pair of semis and the impact on the listed building and also amenity impacts on neighbours. The applications were appealed (Ref: APP/X5210/E/11/2149277 and APP/X5210/A/11/2149781) and both appeals were **dismissed** by the Inspector.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS13 Tackling climate change through providing higher environmental standards

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage.

CS15 Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity

DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction

DP24 High quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

DP27 Basements and light wells

DP28 Noise and vibration

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 (Design)

CPG6 (Amenity)

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement 2001

Assessment

Proposal

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the construction of an additional level at first floor level. It would be located on top of the existing single storey side extension. The extension would be painted render to match the existing dwelling, and the roof would comprise lead and a conservation rooflight. A parapet to the front of the side projection would be raised.

The main issues for consideration are design, internal alterations, and amenity.

Design:

No.13 was built as a semi detached dwelling (the other half being number 12, to the south), but designed with a symmetrical façade so as to read as one large villa, which is typical of the period and of Nash's overall design concept. The well considered symmetry of the façade is an integral part of the special interest of this building.

Planning and listed Building consent (ref: 2008/4560/L and 2008/4473/P) were granted for erection of a two storey side extension (ground floor and basement floor) at No.12 Prince Albert Road. No. 12 and No. 13 are a semi detached pair which together form a symmetrical composition. The application involved the addition of a double height extension to the side, one level below ground and one level above ground. This single storey side extension visible above ground was in response to the existing single storey side extension at No. 13. The symmetrical mirror image was the key consideration in granting these consents.

This application seeks to introduce a further floor to the side extension sitting behind the parapet. In principal, it is considered that the addition of any form of new storey above the single storey extension will upset the balance of the symmetrical composition of the paired houses. The erection of a first floor side extension would not only significantly unbalance the symmetry of the principle façades shared by the subject property and no. 12, it would still be evident from Prince Albert Road, and the detrimental impact to the symmetry would be further exacerbated by a need to raise the parapet wall in an attempt to obscure the majority of the bulk of the proposed extension works

While it is acknowledged that the level of bulk and massing that was proposed at the time of the previous application, Council ref 2012/2388/P & 2012/2445/L, has been significantly reduced, it is still considered that the development would be unacceptable. During the course of the appeal for the previous application, the Planning Inspectorate made the following comments:

“By adding an additional floor, the extension would be a more visually significant feature; the lack of balance between the pair would become more pronounced to the detriment of the character of the group.”

In light of the recent appeal decision it is considered any additional height should be resisted. The incremental development upwards, any additional infilling of the gap between the buildings, the internal alterations required and the disruption of the symmetrical composition are considered harmful to the buildings special interest, harmful to the appearance and architectural integrity of the semi-detached pair of listed buildings, and would not preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The Inspector's comments above are still considered to be applicable, and the proposed additional storey is unacceptable. The proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property, the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties and surrounding Primrose Hill Conservation Area, and fails to comply with LDF policies CS14, DP24 and DP25. As such this application is recommended for refusal.

Internal alterations

It is noted that the dwelling has been noticeably altered since it was originally constructed, and the historical fabric has been altered. At the time of the site visit for the appeal, it had been suggested to the Planning Inspector that placement of the internal door to the extension within the dining room may not be acceptable, and a possible alternative could be to place the door within the study. The Planning Inspector made the following comment:

“This would remove the harm to this important room, although it would result in the walls of the relatively small study being dominated by four doors and a window.”

The proposed door in the study would still therefore be unacceptably harmful, and with the loss of this part of the fabric of the building, contrary to Policy DP25.

Amenity:

Given the separation distance between the proposed development and the neighbouring properties, it is not considered that the proposal would cause a significant loss of daylight or sunlight, nor would the bulk of this extension create any significant perception of sense of enclosure neighbouring properties. It is acknowledged that the outlook would be different, but the extension would not have an unacceptably overbearing or oppressive impact on the occupiers of the adjoining dwellings in Regent's Park Road or Prince Albert Street, that would harm their living conditions. It is not considered that the development would increase overlooking to any of the neighbouring properties due to the amount of overlooking to the rear gardens and rooms that already exists. It must be noted that the impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers was considered satisfactory and did not form a reason for refusal as part of the previous application nor the appeal that was dismissed.

Conclusion: Refuse planning permission and Listed Building Consent