

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	02/01/2012
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	15/12/2011
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Nicola Tulley			2011/5335/P & 2011/5351/L		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
4 Primrose Hill Studios Fitzroy Road London NW1 8TR			000A; 001; 002; 003; 004; 005A; 007; 008A; 009; 011A; 012A; 013B; 014A; 015A; 017; 018A; 019A; 030; 040.		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of single-storey rear extension with green roof (following demolition of existing rear extension), replacement/refurbishment of ground and first floor level rear windows, installation of clay ridge tiles and associated external alterations to dwelling-house (Class C3).					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission & Listed Building consent			
Application Type:		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	12	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	00
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed on 18/11/2011 to 09/12/2011. A notice was published in the Ham & High on 24/11/2011.</p> <p>12 neighbours were notified of the proposals; no letters of comment or objection have been received.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>	<p>Primrose Hill CAAC have provided comment on the proposals, the following points have been raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The particular importance of: the roof profile and detailing; the balance of open space; and the importance of internal volumes. • The proposal would address the uncomfortable junction of the present rear extension with the main roof and would allow the reinstatement of the original form of the eaves including the timber fascia. • Welcome the reinstatement of the original gallery. • Concerned with the loss of open green space, but accept that the loss proposed is very small. • Advise to approve planning and listed building consent subject to conditions which ensure the benefits to the listed building are realised: reinstatement of original eaves (legal agreement); a green roof is grown with grasses as proposed with full watering and maintenance ensured; details of reinstated gallery be subject to further submission; ensure consistency with the special significance of the listed building. 					

Site Description

The subject site is an end of terrace, single storey with mezzanine, Grade II Listed building located in Primrose Hill Studios. The building forms part of an enclave of artists' studio houses built by Alfred Healey in 1877-82, which consists of four different house types arranged around a rectangular courtyard.

Relevant History

Subject site

2010/4617/P & 2011/4630/L: Planning permission and Listed Building consent was refused for, Excavation of a basement, a lightwell to the rear, replacement of existing roof light and replacement of existing window with double glazed sash window at first floor level following demolition of existing single storey rear extension, a solar panel and a replacement timber fence for an existing dwelling house (Class C3)

1 Primrose Hill Studios

2003/3101/P Planning permission was refused for, Erection of a single storey rear extension and replacement doors in ground floor rear elevation of dwelling-house.

Relevant policies

The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London: 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

Core Policies

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

Development Policies

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 Design

CPG6 Amenity

Conservation Guidance

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan

PPS5 Planning for the historic environment

Assessment

The subject site has an existing single storey rear extension that was likely constructed in the 1970's, although no planning history exists. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing extension with an added green roof; replace ground and first floor rear windows; install clay ridge tiles as per the original studio; including internal refurbishment works.

Single storey rear extension

Amendments:

Revisions were sought regarding the proposed rear extension, in particular relating to its design and projection. Revised drawings received on the 19th December 2011 which: reduced the depth by 500mm; altered the brick colour/texture to a material that matches the existing building; and has altered the design/scale of the side window.

The existing single storey rear extension is approximately 2.45m in depth and 3.4m wide which provided internal space suitable for a small kitchen. The proposed extension would increase the depth of the projection by approximately 1.5m and would replace the shallow lean to roof to a flat green roof 2.4m in height. In view of the existing extension, its replacement is considered acceptable in principle. However; the proposal in its current form is unacceptable for the reasons outlined in detail below.

The listed building is relatively modest in terms of its scale and proportions, with a low eaves line and prominently steeped roof slopes. Although the applicant has set the roof of the proposed extension below the original eaves so these can be reinstated, the scale and roof form of the existing extension allows the structure to sit comfortably in relation to the main listed building, particularly the long sweep of the rear roofslope which helps to soften its profile.

The proposed extension is overtly contemporary in comparison, with a rectilinear form. This approach, combined with simple brickwork and steel windows, would be appropriate in many instances. However, when considered in relation to the listed building's characterful composition of steep roof pitches, tall chimneys and unusual internal volumes, the proposed would be too harsh and utilitarian in character. The window proposed to the side elevation is overly large in scale and extends to ground level, with a detailed design that would not enhance the character and appearance of the extension.

Site inspection revealed that whilst the proposed extension may appear as a modest extension to an existing structure, it became apparent that the increased projection and detailed design of the proposal would have a harmful impact on the listed building, appearing overly dominant in relation to its diminutive scale and proportions. Although, there are some extensions to neighbouring properties in the locality, larger projections are not characteristic to the wider complex of listed buildings. As such the extension proposed when viewed in relation to the characteristics of the listed building is deemed too harsh and utilitarian in character.

External works:

The following external works are proposed and considered acceptable and would result in enhancing the special interest of the listed building:

- *Reinstatement of the traditional clay ridge tiles to the roof, to match those at Number 5 as closely as possible;*
- *Replacement of plastic guttering with new cast iron pipework;*
- *Small scale repointing and brickwork repairs;*
- *Replacement of Georgian wired glass within the large non-original metal framed rooflight is to be replaced with slimline double glazing set within a metal frame;*
- *Replacement of large window/door in the rear elevation of the building to be replaced with a crittal framed double*

glazed system;

- *Increased height of boundary fencing by 200mm.*

The side boundary fence as existing requires repair and maintenance. The metal spikes along the boundary would be removed with the increase in height of 200mm to the close boarded timber fence. The increased height would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers nor would it adversely impact the character and appearance of the listed building.

Internal works:

The following internal works to refurbish the habitable space have been proposed:

- *Replacement of 1970s fireplace;*
- *Original skirting to be reinstated, following the pattern of surviving skirting remnants;*
- *Walls relined and repainted;*

The heritage statement notes that the walls are being relined and repainted. Although the plaster is patchy with sections that have been replaced over time, large sections of plaster should be retained. A skim coat could be used to even out the appearance and surface finish. The historic dado should also be retained.

- *Removal of chipboard partition to mezzanine;*

The removal of the chipboard partition of the mezzanine is welcomed however; if the space is to be reinstated as originally conceived officers would have welcomed the replacement of the decorative balustrading as previously proposed. There are other properties within this complex have also reinstated this feature which can be viewed from the public realm.

- *Underfloor heating and new flooring;*

The heritage statement indicates that underfloor heating and new flooring is to be installed as part of the proposed works. The simple narrow pine boards form part of the original fabric of the building and as such would need to be retained and would be secured by condition if the proposals were considered acceptable.

Conclusion

In general the proposed internal and external works of refurbishment to the property are deemed acceptable in that they seek to improve the special interest of the listed building however, these should not excuse the development of an extension which does not respect the proportion, form, and detailed design of the listed building and should therefore be refused for the reasons noted above. The proposed single storey rear extension is thus deemed unacceptable and contrary to policies: CS14; DP24; and DP25 of Camden's Local Development Framework 2010.