

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>10/04/2012</b>
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>29/03/2012</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Jenna Litherland			2012/1115/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
33 Inverness Street London NW1 7HB			Refer to draft decision notice		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
Erection of rear extension at basement and ground floor level including raising of boundary walls, creation of terrace at rear first floor, installation of doors at rear first floor level, new window at rear third floor level, alterations at roof level to create roof garden, alterations to front lightwell including a new staircase and enclosing of part of lightwell all in connection with existing dwellinghouse (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant conditional permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	63	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	03
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Site notice displayed from 05/03/2012 until 26/03/2012. Advertised in the Ham and High 08/03/2012.</p> <p>Three letters of objection received. Objections were on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The works would result in noise during construction which would disrupt people working at Clearwater Yard, 35 Inverness Street. Building work taking place during the working week would be very disruptive. <b>Case officers response: Such issues fall under building regulations however an informative has been placed on the permission advising the applicant of the acceptable hours of construction.</b></li><li>All external areas of the building currently not built on are being infilled. This is significant overdevelopment of the property. <b>Case officers response: The proposal is not considered to be overdevelopment of the site. The site is constrained in terms of size but the proposal would remain subordinate to the existing property.</b></li><li>The additional height of the brick wall will appear imposing. <b>Case officers response: The height of the brick wall is increasing by no more than 1.3 metres. On the western side there will also be a timber screen 0.6 metres above this. The height is much lower than the height of neighbouring properties and will not appear overbearing from any of the neighbouring properties.</b></li><li>The roof terrace will overlook the offices at no. 35 and will create noise in a current quite area. <b>Case officers response: Planning policy does protect offices or commercial building from overlooking. The proposal roof terrace is not considered to result in unacceptable levels of noise.</b></li><li>The existing property at 33 Inverness Street is a nicely proportioned building which sits very well in the streetscape. The proposal of infilling every existing external area to create enclosed space and the ugly roof terrace will completely alter the appearance of the building. <b>Case officers response: The majority of the alterations are not visible from the public realm and are considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the property and conservation area.</b></li><li>The roof terrace from the south will appear as a completely inappropriate extension. <b>Case officers response: The rear roof extension is set in from the rear elevation and in from the side elevation of the building. It will not project above the ridge, as such it will not appear prominent.</b></li><li>In terms of materials, the property currently uses only original building material. The glass to the roof extension and the hardwood screening to the rear terrace are inappropriate additions. <b>Case officers response: The timber screening and trellis are commonly used within the vicinity of the building. The proposed glass balustrade will be to the rear and will not be visible from public view.</b></li></ul>					

**CAAC/Local groups\*  
comments:**  
\*Please Specify

Camden Town CAAC: No objection

## Site Description

The application site is a large 4 storey detached building on the south west side of Inverness Street. The building has been extended in the past by 2 storeys on the side wing and through the unauthorised building up of the front and rear parapet walls.

The building is not listed, but identified as making a positive contribution to the Camden Town Conservation Area. The adjacent buildings at 37 to 43 Inverness Street are Grade II Listed.

## Relevant History

In 2000 planning permission was refused (PEX0000389 ) for the erection of a mansard roof extension. An appeal against the decision was dismissed (ref: APP/X5210/A/00/1048649) on the grounds that it would introduce a discordant feature out of keeping with the elevational treatment of adjacent listed buildings and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

In 2004 planning permission was refused (2004/2371/P) for a mansard roof extension on the grounds of unacceptable design and the additional height of the proposal. The proposed mansard had steeply pitched sides, and was considered to be even more harmful than the previously refused proposal of 2000, because the increased building height would result in an overdominant building that would introduce a discordant feature to the streetscene.

In 2005 planning permission was granted (2005/3195/P) for the construction of a third floor extension to the property.

## Relevant 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  
CS19 – Delivering and Monitoring the Core Strategy

### Development Policies

DP24 - Securing high quality design  
DP25 – Conserving Camden's Heritage  
DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours  
DP27 – Basements and lightwells

## Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG 1) - Design (2011)  
Camden Planning Guidance (CPG 2) – Housing (2011)  
Camden Planning Guidance (CPG 4) – Basements (2011)

## Assessment

Planning permission is sought for erection of rear extension at basement and ground floor level including raising of boundary walls, creation of terrace at rear first floor, installation of doors at rear first floor level, new window at rear third floor level, alterations at roof level to create roof garden, alterations to front lightwell a new staircase and enclosing of part of lightwell.

Amendment – It was originally proposed as part of this application to fully enclose the eastern side of the lightwell with glazing along side the proposed store. This was considered to harm the open character of the front of the property and was subsequently removed from the scheme. It is now proposed to create a 1 metre wide store within the lightwell at the eastern side. The security grilles have also been removed from the rear first floor doors and the windows and doors in the front lightwell.

## Design

Rear Extension and roof terraces - The proposed rear extension at basement and ground floor level will completely infill the rear courtyard of the property. The only aspects of the extension that will be visible from outside the boundary is the site is the increased height of the boundary wall which would be raised by 1.3 metres and the timber privacy screen on the western boundary wall which will serve the roof terrace. The bricks and capping would match those of the existing wall. The roof terrace would be located over the extension at first floor level. Two glazed walk-on roof lights would be located on the roof the extension to allow light to the

rooms below. The proposed 2-storey rear extension and roof terrace is considered to be acceptable as it is modest in size and will represent an appropriate addition to the property. It is also proposed to replace the windows at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level with doors to access the terrace. An additional window is also proposed at third floor level. The alterations to the fenestration are considered appropriate. The proposed alterations are not considered to harm the appearance of the conservation area.

The proposal also includes the addition of a roof terrace on the rear section of the main roof of the property. The balustrade surrounding the roof extension would be no higher than the ridge and would be set in from the rear and side elevations. It would not be visible from the public realm. The balustrade would be glazed and would not appear prominent in views from the rear owing to its position and scale. It is considered that the proposed roof extension would conserve the appearance of the property and the wider conservation area.

Front lightwell – The proposal includes the addition of a gate in the existing railings surrounding the lightwell to access the proposed staircase in the western side of the lightwell leading to basement level. In the eastern side of the lightwell a small side store is proposed. It is also proposed to enclose the area underneath the pathway to the front door. Staircases and small enclosures are common features in lightwells within the vicinity of the site. It is considered that the additions to the lightwell will conserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

### **Basement - Structural stability and hydrology**

The proposed rear extension will involve a limited amount of excavation in the eastern side of rear courtyard. The excavation will result in lowering the ground level to match the existing ground level at the western side of the courtyard and the level within the existing basement. The applicant has submitted a Basement Impact Assessment which confirms that a screening exercise was carried out in accordance with the requirement of policy DP27 and CPG4 in respect of groundwater flow, land stability and surface flow/flooding. The screening results confirm that it is not necessary to take the BIA forward to the scoping stage. It is considered that the proposed limited basement excavation would maintain the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties; avoid adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing other damage to the water environment; and avoid cumulative impact upon structural stability or water environment in the local area.

### **Residential development standards**

The minimum residential development standards contained in the CPG2 - Housing require new basements and extensions to have a room height of 2.3 metres and that adequate natural light is provided to habitable rooms.

The basement will have a head height of 2.3 metres and the ground floor would have a head height of 2.8 metres. Habitable rooms are proposed in the extension at basement level. The main light source into the extension will be from the glazed roof lights on the roof of the extension. The floor of the ground floor would be partially glazed allowing light into the basement level. The rooms created within the extension will be ancillary to the main living areas of the house at upper floor levels and it is considered that the extension allow for an acceptable level of daylight for ancillary habitable rooms. As such the proposal meets Camden's residential development standards.

### **Amenity**

The proposed rear extension would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking, noise, loss of outlook or daylight. The proposed terrace above the extension could potentially result in overlooking of the terrace to the rear of no. 37 at first floor level if the privacy screen on the western boundary of the terrace were to be removed. Therefore, a conditioning requiring the privacy screen to be erected and retain would be included on any permission. The roof terrace at roof level would not result in overlooking of any of the neighbouring residential properties.

### **Conclusion**

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of design, structural stability and hydrology, and amenity.

**Recommendation: Grant conditional permission.**

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> April 2012. For further information see**

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>