Delegated Report	Analysis sh	Analysis sheet		16/10/2012 04/10/2012		
(Members Briefing)	N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:			
Officer		Application	Number			
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin		2012/4177/P				
Application Address	Drawing Numbers					
8 Berkley Road London NW1 8YR		See decision notice				
PO 3/4 Area Team Signate	ure C&UD	Authorised	Officer Signature			
Proposal						
Erection of copper clad rear extension with existing residentia	•		oor levels to accomi	modate lift in		
Recommendation: Grant co	Grant conditional planning permission					
Application Type: Househo	Householder Application					

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Defends Dest	\!_	un Madia a							
Informatives:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice									
Consultations		1		1		1				
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	21	No. of responses	06	No. of objections	05				
Summary of consultation responses:	was advertised of Chalcot Square the owner of Flasummary, their of Design: Both 8 Be contribution of keeping material and Response: Flasummodate practical. Amenity: The proposition of the proposition	on 13/0 f 4 Berand 3/4 t C 34 t C 34 concerneration to the concerneration state of the	Road and 34 Chalcot he conservation area. The area and the coppes not fit with the surrefer to the assessment would be a promine hal. Uncil's Access officer orporation of internal andards on all levels and ards on all levels and area and Access Statem acoustically encased tring information inclusive for the assessment assessment excavation of the acceptate movement. The projection of the daylight to the acceptance of the assessment excavation in the acceptance of the acceptance of the acceptance in the acceptan	lews, 2 Id Butte Id I	Eglon Mews, 34C ery & Watson on ber the proposed lift. In e make a positive roposed lift would be dding is not a tradition gs. for the report. ure and any lift syste Building Control Secund compromise the lift arefore it would not be ear) would be close to d be beyond a line of the outlook from that ow. ggests that the "lift use no nuisance" no oise data is submitted for the report. Itions of the adjoining troposed and the pro- try wall it is unlikely adjoining properties form of development	e out onal em ction) iving e othe trawnuld t				

CAAC/Local groups comments:

Primrose Hill CAAC 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.

Response: Please refer to the assessment part of the report.

Site Description

The application property is a four - five storey plus basement level property at the corner between Berkley Road and Chalcot Square next to the gated entrance of Eglon Mews in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. The property joins the terrace of houses on Chalcot Square to the south and Chalk Farm Baptist Church (a modern church building) to the north-west.

The application property is identified as a positive contributor in Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement.

Relevant History

2012/4176/P – Planning application for the erection of glass lift extension from first floor to roof level on rear elevation in connection with existing use as residential dwelling (Class C3) –made valid on 21/08/2012 and not determined yet.

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

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG 1 – Design

CPG 6 – Amenity

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (2000)

Assessment

Proposal:

It is proposed to erect a copper clad lift shaft between the projecting rear wing and the shared boundary with 34 Chalcot Square. The proposed lift would allow disabled accessibility from the ground floor to the third floor levels. Due to the existing ground floor rear extension the first, second and first 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 1.75m and a height of 10.6m.

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

Difference between the similar withdrawn scheme and the propose scheme:

- The height of the originally proposed lift was reduced from the roof parapet level to one storey below the roof parapet.
- The cladding and glass detailing was improved.

Design and Appearance:

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 due its matching brick work detailing to the existing. The proposed lift extension would be one storey below the roof parapet level and would be subordinate to the existing building by reason of its height, bulk and positioning and detailing.

A vertical small section immediately adjacent to the existing rear wall would be glazed. The rest of the

external surfaces of the proposed lift would be covered with copper cladding. The proposed copper cladding would be a high quality material and would complement the existing yellow brick work and would add an interest the appearance of Eglon Mews. The proposed lift would not be visible from Berkley Road.

It is considered that the proposed lift extension would not harm the appearance and character of the existing building and the wider conservation area and therefore is acceptable in design terms.

Amenity:

Initial concern regarding loss of daylight, outlook and noise were raised by the neighbours.

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.

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.

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 submitted Design and Access statement ensures that lift workings would be acoustically enchased to cause no noise nuisance. Domestic lifts such as the proposed one are not generally designed to cause unacceptable noise levels during operation. A condition to ensure that the proposal would comply with the Council's noise standards is also recommended.

Others:

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

Conclusion:

The proposed lift extension would not cause unacceptable harm to the appearance and character of the existing building and the wider conservation area and amenities of the neighbouring properties. The proposal subject to safeguarding conditions would comply with policies CS5, CS14, CS15, DP24, DP25, DP26 and DP28.

Recommendation: Grant conditional planning permission.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 15th October 2012. For further information please click <u>here.</u>