

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		27/08/2012	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		25/10/2012	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Sam Fowler				2012/3091/P 2012/3520/L			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Flat 1 29 Gloucester Crescent London NW1 7DL				Refer to draft decision notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of two-storey rear extension at lower ground and ground floor level, infill of front alcove, and rear garden access via a set of stairs to the existing dwelling (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	17	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	02
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		Site notice: 04/10/2012, expired: 27/09/2012 Ham and High advertisement: 07/10/2012, expired: 25/10/2012 In the responses from the public, the following issues were raised: Detrimental impact to the design and appearance of the building Potential impact to residential amenity Risks to personal safety					

CAAC/Local groups comments:

Primrose Hill CAAC:

1. The additional projection at the rear is seriously damaging to the footprint and plan of the Listed Building, while the solid addition proposed at the first floor is an alien intrusion, fundamentally against the original pattern of back additions in this group. It is seriously harmful to the Listed Building. It fails to recognize the distinction between a light, glazed, infill structure which contrasts with the masonry structure within which it is located, and proposes another masonry structure which alters the essential balance of the elevations.

2. We object strongly to the addition proposed on the front elevation, which would seriously harm the distinctive appearance of the side porch which is an important element in the Listed Building and the street. By bringing forward the elevation of the side addition at the rear of the porch, the proposal would diminish the quality of a porch which is seen as attached to the main house but also free-standing to the side. The proposal would damage the significance of the Listed Building and be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Site Description

The site is located on the eastern side of Gloucester Crescent, in a residential area near Camden Town. The application concerns Flat 1 No. 29 which occupies the lower ground and ground floor of this listed Victorian house which stands at the end of one of the set terraces of this part of Gloucester Crescent. Flat 1 benefits from a wider than average plot and has an uncharacteristic and substantial historic extension which extends well in to the garden.

The building is a Grade II Listed Building, and the site is located in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.

Relevant History

Subject Property:

CTP/J11/2/7/6172: The provision of a car bardstanding and a means of access to the highway at No. 29 Gloucester Crescent, Camden.
Granted, 13/03/1969

CTP/J11/2/7/14035(R): Building up over front entrance porch to provide kitchens and bathrooms for upper three floors thereby converting part of house to provide three self contained dwelling units at 29 Gloucester Crescent, NW1
Granted, 14/01/1973

CTP/J11/2/7/27590(R): Continued use as 5 self-contained residential units, comprising basement and ground floor maisonette, two flats on first floor, one flat on second floor and one flat on third floor.
Granted, 10/01/1979

PE9700853: Retention of glazed conservatory to rear.
Granted, 17/07/1998

28 Gloucester Crescent:

2012/3019/P & 2012/3081/L, Erection of two-storey rear extension with glazed roof lantern at lower ground and ground floor level and internal alterations to existing dwellinghouse (Class C3).
Refused.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy:

CS1 (Distribution of growth)

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)

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAAMS)

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 (Design)

CPG3 (Sustainability)

CPG6 (Amenity)

Assessment

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey rear extension at lower ground and ground floor level, extending an area that has already been infilled with a 20th century conservatory. Also proposed is an infill extension to the front side access passage and the creation of garden access from the upper ground floor via a metal staircase.

Design and appearance

Development plan policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the Council's LDF require all developments to be of a high standard design and take into consideration the character, setting, context, form and scale of the host building and surrounding properties, and Policy DP25 requires new development to both preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas.

Camden's Design Guidance states that rear extensions should be:

- secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
- respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;
- retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity, including that of neighbouring properties, proportionate to that of the surrounding area.
- The width of rear extensions should respect the rhythm of existing rear extensions.

Further to this, under "Rear Extensions/conservatories" of the Primrose Hill CAAMS, states that:

"PH25 Extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. Some rear extensions, although not widely visible, so adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached that the character of the Conservation Area is prejudiced.

PH26 Rear extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or the Conservation Area. In most cases such extensions should be no more than one storey in height, but its general effect on neighbouring properties and Conservation Area will be the basis of its suitability.

PH27 Extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace or group of buildings. The acceptability of larger

extensions depends on the particular site and circumstances.”

It is considered that the proposed development, with particular regard to the upper ground floor rear extension, would fail to comply with the above policies. The creation of a virtual solid double height full width rear extension to a listed building would enforce the negative visual dominance of the existing addition, as well as have an adverse impact on the appearance of the listed building and the wider architectural character of the conservation area. Due to the overall bulk and form, the proposed upper ground floor rear extension would essentially overwhelm the proportions of the original rear elevation. Therefore, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the existing building or surrounding conservation area, and it is considered to be contrary to Policies DP24 and DP25 of Camden's LDF 2010. It also fails to comply with Camden's Design Guidance and policies contained within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAAMS).

Insofar as the proposed staircase to the rear, this is not considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of dwelling. It is of a modest size and would relate well to the architectural qualities of the existing dwelling.

With regard to the infill front extension, this part of the proposal would occupy a small area which is considered unique to the dwelling, when viewed in the surrounding street scene. While the principle of developing this area with an infill front extension is generally considered to be acceptable, particular concern is raised in relation to the materials of the proposed infill. A white timber hardframe window is proposed, when the infill should be designed in more traditional materials. Any future application should therefore seek to be more sympathetic to the characteristics of the original dwelling.

In conclusion, the entirety of the proposal is refused on grounds of unacceptable bulk, form, and loss of historic fabric, being contrary to policies DP24 and DP25.

Impact to the Listed Building

English Heritage London Terrace Houses states:

“As a general rule alterations should preserve the structure, character and appearance of the building. In a conservation area it is vital to consider the way the house fits into the wider context of the street and any alterations should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area..... Alterations should not impair or destroy the overall shape and proportions of a house, or detract from its historic character, in particular its roof profile or the shape, design and appearance of windows and door openings”.

By creating the proposed bulk and form at upper ground floor it would also fail to take into account the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, and therefore fail to comply with the guidance above. It is also noted that the upper ground floor extension would be creating a new bedroom at the loss of an existing rear window, and the subsequent expense of natural light to an existing kitchen. This is considered unacceptable in terms of the loss of historic fabric and the negative impact on the spatial quality of the kitchen. Therefore the proposal would result in harm to the historic and architectural significance of this listed building and is again contrary to policy DP25.

Amenity

Under 4.10 of CPG1, it states that rear extension developments should be designed to “not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure;”

The proposed development is located along the shared boundary with no. 28 Gloucester Crescent, and would be creating a two storey rear extension within close proximity to this property. As mentioned above in the “Relevant History” section, a similar application to undertake a two storey rear extension to this property was submitted and was recently refused. The applicant for this property still

has the right to appeal this decision, and should it be subsequently approved, then both of these applications could be undertaken without the other planning permission been undertaken as well. The proposal therefore has to be treated based on its own merits and the existing nature of the neighbouring property at no. 29.

In this regard, there is a primary window for a bedroom at lower ground floor, and a window for a living room at ground floor within the rear elevation of no. 28 Gloucester Crescent. The two storey extension would be extending significantly past these windows, and would break a notional 45 degree line taken from the sill of these neighbouring habitable windows. The proposal therefore fails to comply with the standards of the Building Research Establishment, as referenced in CPG2.

Therefore, due to the orientation of the properties, the creation of a two storey rear extension would likely cause a significant loss of sunlight and daylight to those windows located in the rear elevation of no. 28. The applicant has not submitted a daylight and sunlight study and, due to the absence of this information, failed to demonstrate that the development would not cause harm. . Therefore, in the absence of a daylight and sunlight assessment the proposal is considered unacceptable, as it would cause an undue loss of amenity to the neighbouring property.

Insofar as no. 30 Gloucester Crescent, it is considered that the existing extension would screen the majority of development from this property. However, it is noted that the proposed staircase would run along the flank boundary shared with this property, and there is a flank window to the projecting bay window feature at no. 30 Gloucester Crescent. The proposal would therefore cause a loss of privacy to this window. This issue could be resolved by the implementation of a screen along this flank boundary, but it is noted that issues could arise with regard to the screen's design and appearance. Regardless, in the absence of a proposed screen, the proposed development would cause detrimental impact to the residential amenity of the occupiers of this property as well.

The proposal would therefore cause an undue loss of residential amenity to the neighbouring properties and for this reason it should be refused as well.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission and Listed Building Consent

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444