Delegated Rep		<b>port</b> Analysis sheet		t	Expiry Date:	16/10/2012		
			N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	04/10/2012		
Officer				Application Nu	umber			
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin				2012/4176/P				
Application A	Address			Drawing Numbers				
8 Berkley Roa								
London NW1 8YR				See decision notice				
PO 3/4	Area Team Signatu		C&UD	Authorised Of	Officer Signature			
		5			5			
Proposal								
Erection of gla dwelling (Clas		nsion from fire	st floor to roof I	evel on rear elev	vation in connect	ion with existing		
Recommend	ation:	Refuse Plan	anning Permission					
Application 1	уре:	Householde	r Application					

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice								
Informatives:									
Consultations					I				
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	21	No. of responses	04	No. of objections	04			
			No. electronic	03					
Summary of consultation responses:	<ul> <li>A site notice was displayed from 05/09/2012 to 26/09/2012. A press notice was advertised on 13/09/2012 and expired on 04/10/2012.</li> <li>The occupiers of 4 Berkley Road, 34D Chalcot Square 1 Eglon Mews and 2 Eglon Mews objected to the proposed lift. In summary, their concerns are: <ul> <li>The proposed lift does not fit with the surroundings.</li> <li>The proposed lift would be a conspicuous feature to residents. Although opaque glass panels would be slightly less conspicuous than copper cladding matching London stock brick cladding would harmonise with other buildings in this conservation area.</li> <li>The proposal is not necessary. Any lift system should be internal.</li> <li>When the property was re-developed the excavation of basement has caused damage to the adjoining property in terms of severe cracking and continued movement. The proposal may further disturb the foundations of the adjoining property (34 Chalcot Square) and exacerbate movement.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>								
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<b>Primrose Hill CAAC</b> raised no objection to the proposed lift in design terms but raised concerns over the impact on daylight received by the neighbouring properties and recommended that daylight study should be carried out.								
Site Description	·								
The application property Berkley Road and Chalo Conservation Area. The Chalk Farm Baptist Chu The application property	cot Square next to property joins the irch (a modern chu	the ga terrac urch bu	ated entrance of Eglor e of houses on Chalc uilding) to the north-we	ot Squ est.	s in the Primrose Hill are to the south and				
Statement.									

**2012/4177/P** – Planning permission was granted on 16/10/2012 for the erection of copper clad rear extension on first, second and third floor levels to accommodate lift in connection with existing residential dwelling (Class C3).

**2012/0262/P** - Planning application was withdrawn on 15/03/2012 for the erection of 5-storey rear extension to accommodate lift in connection with existing use as residential dwelling (Class C3). The applicants withdrew the application following the case officer's concerns for the following aspects of the proposal:

• The lift addition would be a prominent feature in the mews. It would stretch the full height of the existing tall rear elevation of the building and would project from the rear elevation by a

considerable margin, measuring ca 2.8m L x 1.8m W X 16m H.

• The bulk, size and full-height nature of the proposed lift would result in a prominent addition which would obscure the existing building lines and result in a loss of legibility of the building.

**2007/4480/P** – Planning permission was granted on 04/12/2007 for the change of use of first, second, third and fourth floors from dual office/residential use on the first floor and residential on the second to fourth floor to a 4-bedroom residential unit over first to fourth floor level (Class C3).

**2007/3863/P** - Planning permission was granted on 30/11/2007 for the excavation to create a new basement area.

**2007/0310/P** – Planning permission was granted on 13/04/2007 for the amendment to planning permission ref. 2006/1895/P involving alterations to roof extension.

**2006/4168/P** – Planning permission was granted on 10/01/2007 for the amendment to planning permission (2006/1895/P) including alterations the fenestration, roof extension and balustrades.

**2006/1895/P** – Planning permission was granted on 23/06/2006 for the change of use from office (Class B1) to alternative use for continued office use (Class B1) or residential use (Class C3) at first floor level.

# **Relevant policies**

## LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

# **Core Strategy**

CS5 - Managing the impact of growth and development

- CS14 Promoting high Quality Places and Conserving Our Heritage
- CS15 Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity

### **Development Policies**

DP24 - Securing High Quality Design

DP25 - Conserving Camden's Heritage

- DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours
- DP28 Noise and vibration
- DP29 Improving access

# Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG 1 – Design (Section 4 and Section 11)

CPG 6 – Amenity (Section 6, Section 7 and Section 9)

# Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (2000)

Pages: 18-21, 24, 29, and 33.

### Assessment

#### Proposal:

It is proposed to erect a glass lift shaft/enclosure between the projecting rear wing and the shared boundary with 34 Chalcot Square. The proposed lift would allow disabled accessibility from ground to fourth floor levels. Due to the existing ground floor rear extension the first, second, third and fourth floor levels of the proposed lift would be an external addition to the building.

The proposed lift extension would be set back by 70cm from the shared boundary and would have a depth of 2.8m, a width of 1.7m and a height of 12.9m (above the existing ground floor rear extension).

During the assessment of this application a sun path analysis was included in the proposed floor plans.

The height and bulk of the proposed extension would be similar to the one detailed in the withdrawn scheme (ref: 2012/0262/P) but the detailing of the proposed lift shaft would be different. The lift shaft would be in opaque glass panels in galvanised steel frames (instead of zinc finish).

## Access:

Policy DP24 requires consideration to be given accessibility. In more detail, policy DP29 states that the Council will seek to promote fair access and remove the barriers that prevent people from accessing facilities and opportunities.

According to the design and access statement the proposed lift would help the movement of one of the occupiers with a degenerative disease. The principle of a lift extension to ease access through the floor levels for all occupants is considered to be acceptable in principle. However, the proposal lift needs to be sympathetic to the appearance and character of the existing building and the wider conservation area.

### **Design and Appearance:**

Before this proposal is assessed in design terms, it important to note that a concurrent application by the same applicant was recently approved (2012/4177/P). It was for a similar lift but fundamentally it was clad in a more appropriate material of copper and was 10.6m high, so 2.6m lower that what is proposed here. Thus one full storey below eaves height.

The application building and its neighbours (all positive contributors) have a high quality of detailing and finish. The rear elevation of the building where the lift extension is proposed is simply detailed with yellow brick work and traditional sash windows and face onto Eglon Mews.

According to the advice given in CPG1 rear extensions should be secondary to the building being extended and should not be higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level. In addition to that this guidance suggests that building service equipment where, because of its nature, it cannot be integrated within the building should not be a dominant feature of the building and cause visual blight. Given the layout of the existing house an internal lift through floors would not be practical and therefore a lift extension which does not appear to be dominant and alien feature to the existing building and its surrounding is considered to be acceptable in principle at this location.

Although the five storey part of the building is a later addition above the original roof it reads as part of the original rear elevation of the building due its matching brick work detailing to the existing. The proposed lift extension would stretch the full height of the existing tall rear elevation (including the roof addition) and would exceed the height guidance in CPG1. In addition to that the use of opaque glass panels and their detailed design would not be sympathetic to the existing yellow brick work on the rear elevation. Given the height, bulk, materials and detailing of the proposed lift enclosure the proposed lift extension would not be a subservient addition to the existing building.

The proposed lift extension would not be visible from Berkley Road but it would be open to views on Eglon Mews. It would be much higher than most of the building in this mews and would be a prominent feature which would harm the appearance and character of that part of the conservation

#### area.

### Amenity:

The proposed lift extension would be 1.7m from the row of closest windows serving habitable rooms at the rear of 34 Chalcot Square. Although the proposed lift would project beyond a line drawn at 45° from the centre of the closest rear windows that serve the habitable rooms at the rear of 34 Chalcot Square it would not be likely to result in loss of unacceptable levels of daylight to these neighbouring windows. The existing rear wing of the application property is also within the 45° line and the rear of 34 Chalcot Square is west facing. Given the orientation the proposed lift extension would not be significantly worsen the existing situation. The sun path analysis submitted by the agent also demonstrates that there would not be unacceptable overshadowing impact to the neighbouring windows. It is also noted that some daylight would penetrate through the proposed opaque glass panels.

In terms of loss of outlook the proposal would not significantly worsen the existing situation as there would be sufficient distance (1.8m) between the closest neighbouring windows and the proposed lift extension. The proposed opaque glass would also prevent overlooking from the proposed lift to the neighbouring windows.

Policy DP28 states that the Council will only grant permission for plant or machinery if it can be operated without cause harm to amenity and does not exceed the noise threshold in Table E (on page 133 of Camden Development Policies).

The proposed lift would be enclosed by glass panels. The Council's environmental health officer considered that the proposed would be unlikely to cause unacceptable noise nuisance when in operation because of the enclosure. A condition to ensure that noise levels at a point 1 metre external to sensitive facades would be at least 5dB(A) less than the existing background measurement (LA90), expressed in dB(A) when all lift equipment (or any part of it) is in operation should be adequate to address the noise issue.

### Others:

The proposal would not result in additional floor space more than 100sqm therefore the CIL is not applicable.

# **Conclusion:**

The proposed lift extension by reason of its height, bulk and inappropriate materials and detailed design would harm the appearance and character of the existing building and the wider conservation area. Therefore the proposal would not be acceptable in design terms and contrary to policies CS14, DP24 and DP25.

**Recommendation:** Refuse planning permission.

<u>Disclaimer</u>

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