

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	19/07/2012
(Members Briefing)		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	28/06/2012
Officer			Application Number		
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin			2012/2704/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
1 Albert Terrace London NW1 7SU			See draft decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal					
Erection of single-storey rear extension at lower ground floor level, alterations to doors and 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).					
Recommendation:		Grant 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	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice was displayed from 30/05/2012 to 20/06/2012. A press notice was advertised on 07/06/2012 and expired on 28/06/2012.					
	<p>The occupiers of 1 and 2 Albert Terrace Mews and Flat 2 2 Albert Terrace objected to the proposal. In summary, the grounds of the 3 objections are:</p> <p>Amenity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confirmation for no access from ground floor level onto the new roof is required.• The height of the proposed extension should not be higher than boundary wall.• The proposed glazing on the side of the proposed extension would result in overlooking and privacy problem.• The proposed extension would reduce daylight. <p>Response: Please refer to the assessment part of the report.</p> <p>Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed extension would considerably add to the building density and disproportionally increase the footprint of the host building in the area. <p>Response: Please refer to the assessment part of the report.</p> <p>Others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The alignment of the boundary treatment between the application property and 1 Albert Terrace Mews is not shown.• The proposed extension would be located on the network of drains and therefore access chambers either side of the building to each pipe run needs to be provided.• No provision of rainwater collection is shown, any gutter should be within the development profile.• The proposed extension would reduce to the capacity for natural drainage of surface water.• The lines shown on top of the new roof plan (15-100A) cannot be reconciled with those on section AA (15-120A), section BB (15-121A) and elevation (15-110A).• Building works would cause devaluation of the property value by compromising the light and privacy to Flat 2 2 Albert Terrace. <p>Response: The agent of this application submitted additional information concerning drains, sewers, gutter details, access to the roof and overlooking. In summary, this information confirm the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The applicants have a licence from the freeholders of 1 Albert Terrace to amend and build over the drains serving 1Aalbert Terrace. They would also seek agreement from Thames Water for the proposed works as they are in 3m of a sewer serving 1 Albert Terrace.• An externally mounted gutter would be located between the extension and the boundary wall. Details of the gutter and any flashing would be					

	<p><i>determined through a party wall agreement.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The glazed section of the proposed rear extension would be perpendicular to the rear windows of 1 Albert Terrace Mews and therefore the visibility of the first floor rear windows of that property would be at a very oblique angle. The angles of these windows are such that the interpolated BRE guidelines suggest a minimum distance of 2.5m.</i> • <i>The access to the roof of the proposed extension would be limited from the maintenance of the sedum roof.</i>
<p>CAAC/Local groups comments:</p>	<p>Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee strongly objected to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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><i>Response: Please refer to the assessment part of the report.</i></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:

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

Neighbouring properties:

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

2 Albert Terrace – Planning permission was granted on 19/11/1956 for the erection of an addition at rear and to form two additional flats (ref: TP79768/11162).

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS5 - Managing the impact of growth and development

CS6 – Providing quality homes

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

DP2 – Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing

DP5 - Homes of different sizes

DP6 – Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing

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

CPG2 – Housing

CPG 6 - Amenity

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Appraisal

Assessment

Proposal: It is proposed to join the two bedroom flats on the ground floor and lower ground floor levels with private garden space including a single storey rear extension and alterations to the rear lower ground floor elevation.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be 5.6m in depth, 5.2m in width and maximum height of 2.6m. The proposed extension would be immediately adjacent to the side boundary with 2 Albert Terrace and the rear boundary wall with 1 Albert Terrace Mews. The roof of the proposed extension would have sedum roof sections and a rooflight.

The proposed alterations to the rear elevation would include replacement of sash window which would not be covered by the proposed extension with new doors and replacement of communal access door to the rear garden with another door.

As part of the proposal the communal entrance to the rear garden would be blocked and the rear garden space would belong to the proposed maisonette.

Land Use: Policy CS6 seeks to maximise the supply of homes and minimise their loss. In detail, according to policy DP2 the Council will resist developments that would involve the net loss of two or more homes unless they comply with the set criteria (in page 22 of Camden Development Policies 2010). Given the proposal will only result in the loss of one self-contained residential unit it is considered to comply with the aims of policies CS6 and DP2 and is acceptable in principle.

Mixes of units: The proposal would result in the loss of the existing two bedroom flats in order to gain a four bedroom maisonette. "Dwelling Size Priorities Table" of policy DP5 (Homes of different sizes) identifies the two bedroom units as a higher priority than four or more bedroom units. Given large houses and generously sized residential accommodation being typical in this area and the proposed maisonette would be used by various types of householders including families the proposal is considered to comply with the aims of this policy.

Living Standards: The proposed house would be approximately 150sqm and could accommodate 6 to 10 people comfortably in accordance with the Council's floorspace standards for self-contained dwellings on page 54 of Camden Planning Guidance (CPG2).

The proposal would not worsen the existing accessibility conditions through the building. The proposed layouts of the lower and upper ground floor levels indicate that the room sizes would be enlarged and there would be more circulation space in the hallways. Given that the site is in a conservation area and the existing constraints (e.g. stepped main entrance) it would be unreasonable to expect compliance of all 16 lifetime homes criteria. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the aims of policy DP6.

Design and Appearance: The proposed rear extension would have a very simple modern design with glazed fenestration detailing on the south elevation.

The existing rear garden space is a small area and has not been maintained well. The proposal would provide a more useable space, albeit of a smaller area than that existing. The proposed rear extension would cover nearly half of the existing rear garden space and would have a sedum roof. Given the rear garden of the property is enclosed by high boundary walls the site coverage of the proposed rear extension would not detract from the open character of the area. It is considered that the proposed sedum roof would compensate the loss of green space in the rear garden. A condition for the details of the proposed sedum roof is recommended in that respect.

In terms of location, form, scale, proportions and dimensions the proposed conservatory is considered subordinate to the existing building and would respect and preserve the character of the existing building and the wider conservation area.

The proposed alterations to doors and windows on the rear elevation would be very minor and would not harm the appearance of the host building and therefore be acceptable in design terms.

Amenity:

The proposal is unlikely to significantly worsen the amenities of the adjoining properties in terms of loss of daylight, outlook and privacy.

The glazed section of the proposed extension 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. In addition to that there is a direct overlooking from the existing rear windows of the host building to the rear windows of that neighbouring property within 8m. It is considered that the proposed extension would not be likely to worsen the existing overlooking condition between these two properties.

The proposed rear extension would not be likely to significantly worsen the daylight to the habitable windows of the neighbouring properties. The proposed rear extension 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 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.

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 policies CS5 and DP26.

Other concerns: As the proposal would result in the reduction of self-contained units in the building there would be no impact on the existing transport conditions.

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

Conclusion: The proposal is considered not to compromise the Council's housing stock, harm the appearance and character of the host building or the conservation area and amenities of the neighbouring properties.

Recommendation: Grant conditional planning permission.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 16th July 2012. For further information please click [here](#).