

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	04/12/2012
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	29/11/2012
Officer			Application Number		
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin			2012/5373/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
1 Albert Terrace London NW1 7SU			See decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal					
Amendments to planning permission granted on 17/07/2012 (ref: 2012/2704/P) for erection of single-storey rear extension at lower ground floor level, alterations to doors/windows at rear lower ground floor level in connection with the conversion of 2 x 2 bed self contained flats at lower and upper ground floor levels into 1 x 4 bed self contained maisonette (Class C3), namely erection of lower ground floor and upper ground floor level rear extension.					
Recommendation:		Refuse planning permission			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

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	02		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 31/10/2012 to 21/11/2012. A press notice was advertised on 08/11/2012 and expired on 29/11/2012.</p> <p>The occupiers of 1 and 2 Albert Terrace Mews and Basement Flat 2 Albert Terrace and owner of Flat 2 2 Albert Terrace objected to the proposal. In summary, the grounds of their objection are:</p> <p>Amenity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The separation distance between the rear façade of the application property and the windows of the habitable rooms of 1 Albert Terrace is already well below current design standards (8 metres instead of the standard 15 metres). The proposed upper ground floor extension would reduce this distance.The proposal would result in increased overlooking, loss of privacy and feeling of closeness and dominance. In particular, the proposed glazed French doors with internal guarding reveals would be likely to exacerbate the levels of overlooking to 1 Albert Terrace Mews.The neighbours' concerns over the loss of light and privacy were not satisfactorily addressed during the assessment of the previous application (ref: 2012/2704/P).The proposal would block a significant proportion of daylight available to the adjoining basement flat's conservatory (at 2 Albert Terrace) <p><i>Response: Please refer to the assessment part of the report.</i></p> <p>Others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The occupiers of 1 Albert Terrace Mews and Basement Flat 2 Albert Terrace requested a site visit from the planning officers. <i>Response: The case officer sent an e-mail to the occupiers of Basement Flat 2 Albert Terrace to arrange a site visit during the assessment of this application but no response from these occupiers received. The case officer visited 1 Albert Terrace Mews to assess the impact of the proposal on this property.</i>The occupiers of 2 Albert Terrace Mews did not receive a notification letter for this application. <i>Response: According to the Council's records a notification letter to 2 Albert were sent on 25th October 2012.</i>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>Primrose Hill CAAC referred to their advice dated 6 June 2012 for the previous application (2012/2704/P) and considered the loss of further garden space to cause unacceptable harm to the significance of the conservation area.</p> <p>In summary, the previous advice: According to the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Appraisal the range of open green spaces is characteristics of the conservation area, part of its special significance. The loss of substantial part of the small garden to this property would damage the recognised character and significance of the conservation area.</p>					

Site Description

The application site is a 3 storey plus attic and semi-basement level end-of terrace property on the west side of Albert Terrace and opposite Primrose Hill Park in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. The property has been identified as a positive contributor to the appearance and character of the conservation area and divided into two flats and two maisonettes.

The property has a small rear garden which is communal and accessed via the main entrance hall.

Relevant History

Application property:

2012/2704/P – Planning permission was granted on 17/07/2012 for the erection of single-storey rear extension at lower ground floor level, alterations to doors/windows at rear lower ground floor level in connection with the conversion of 2 x 2 bed self contained flats at lower and upper ground floor levels into 1 x 4 bed self contained maisonette (Class C3).

25517 – Planning permission was granted on 12/01/1978 for the erection of a roof extension.

1 Albert Terrace Mews:

PEX0000359 - Planning permission was granted on 12/06/2000 for the erection of a conservatory at ground floor level covering the entire rear garden (This planning permission has not been implemented).

2 Albert Terrace:

2009/4906/P – Planning permission was granted on 11/01/2010 for the replacement of window and door on front elevation to first floor level balcony with french doors.

PEX0000069 – Planning permission was granted on 27/06/2000 for the erection of glazed lean-to conservatory to residential unit at ground level side and rear elevations and alteration of picture window to folding (french) doors.

TP3105/23175 – Planning permission was granted on 04/05/1961 for the extensions to provide additional bathroom and bedroom accommodation to existing flats.

TP79768/11162 – Planning permission was granted on 19/11/1956 for the erection of an addition at rear and to form two additional flats.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS5 - Managing the impact of growth and development

CS13 - Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards

CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

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

CS16 – Improving Camden's health and well-being

Development Policies

DP22 – Promoting sustainable design and construction

DP23 - Water

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

DP32 – Air quality and Camden's Clear Zone

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG 1 - Design (Section 4)

CPG 6 – Amenity (Section 6 and Section 7)

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (2000)

Pages: 9, 24 and 33.

Assessment

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of extension at rear lower ground floor and ground floor level. The proposed floor plans are based on the approved floor plans for the conversion of the lower ground floor flat and the upper ground floor flat into a four bedroom maisonette.

The proposed lower ground floor element on its own would be identical to the approved ground floor rear extension as part of the previous planning permission (ref: 2012/2704/P). Therefore, its re-assessment is not necessary under this application.

The proposed upper ground floor element would replace the existing projecting windows and would be in line with the projecting rear part of the building at the south east corner. It would be set back by 0.7m from the existing outrigger close to the rear centre of the building and would have stucco render finishing.

Design and Appearance

Policy DP24 states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to be of the highest standard of design and respect character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties and character and proportions of the existing building. Policy DP25 seeks to preserve and enhance important elements of local character in order to maintain the character of the conservation areas.

CPG 1 for rear extensions states that rear extension should be secondary to the building being extended, respect and preserve existing architectural features and retain a reasonable sized garden. In terms of width of the extensions CPG1 expects rear extensions to respect the rhythm of existing rear extensions.

Page 33 of the Conservation Area Statement also acknowledges that 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. The Conservation Area Statement advises that in general, rear extensions should be no more than one storey in height.

None of the properties, which are similar to the application site in terms of age and style, have rear extension more than one storey high except 2 Albert Terrace which is the adjoining pair to the application property. The rear elevation of the property has been substantially altered by unsympathetic extensions and alterations. The rear elevations of 3-6 Albert Terrace are pretty much intact. The alterations to 2 Albert Terrace were done more than 10 years ago. Since then the Council design policies changed in favour of preservation and enhancement of conservation areas.

The proposed lower ground floor element of the proposal (without the upper floor element) is considered to be acceptable in design terms as it would be mostly enclosed by the existing high boundary walls. However the upper ground floor element of the proposal would remodel 65% of the lower ground floor elevation and would require cutting through the central outrigger below the first floor level. The proposed fenestration detailing of the proposed upper ground floor level would be characterised by modern full height casement windows secured by internal railings behind. These windows by reason of their positioning, size and style would not respect the hierarchy and style of the existing windows. Consequently, the form of the proposed extension is considered not be sympathetic or subservient to the existing building as it would have an uncomfortable relationship to the existing features. The proposed fenestration detailing of the upper ground floor element would be out of keeping with the appearance and character of the conservation area.

Amenity

There is a direct overlooking from the existing rear windows of the host building to the rear habitable windows of 1 Albert Terrace Mews within 8m. It is considered that the proposed extension would not be likely to worsen the existing overlooking condition between these two properties. The glazed side section of the proposed lower ground floor element would be approximately 3.5m from the rear windows of 1 Albert Terrace Mews and the view from the glazed section to the rear windows of that property would be from very oblique angles.

The proposed lower ground floor element would not be likely to significantly worsen the daylight to the habitable windows of the neighbouring properties as it would be slightly higher than the existing rear boundary wall with 1 Albert Terrace (approximately between 30cm and 60cm) and would project 1.6m beyond the existing rear extension at the adjoining property (2 Albert Terrace). The flank windows of the rear conservatory at the adjoining property would be blocked by the proposed rear extension. At present there is an overlooking from that conservatory to the rear garden of the application property. The proposed rear extension would prevent this overlooking. Given the rear conservatory is mainly served by largely glazed windows on its roof and rear elevation the proposed rear extension is considered not to significantly reduce the daylight to that conservatory.

Given the minimal projection of the upper ground floor element that part of the proposal would be unlikely to affect the neighbouring properties' daylight. The replacement windows on the proposed upper ground floor element would be projecting between 0.4m and 0.3m more than the existing windows and would not be likely to significantly worsen the existing overlooking situation.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the Council's guidance for daylight and sunlight and the privacy of the adjoining occupiers and in accordance with the aims of policies CS5 and DP26.

Other concerns

Given the proposal would not increase the residential floor space more than 100sqm CIL is not applicable in this case.

Conclusion

Cumulatively, the proposed extension although relatively modest in depth would read as a double height extension spanning across a significant proportion of the rear elevation. In particular, the architectural composition of the proposed upper ground floor element would neither respect the historic features of the existing buildings nor enhance the appearance and character of the existing building and the wider conservation area. The proposal would be unacceptable in design terms and contrary to policies CS14, DP24 and DP25.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.

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