

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>18/11/2011</b>	
<b>(Members Briefing)</b>		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>21/10/2011</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Hugh Miller				2011/4705/P & 2011/4730/L			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
4 Lyndhurst Gardens LONDON NW3 5NR				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>							
A: 2011/4705/P - Erection of extension at second floor level rear; installation of iron gates to front entrances in association with the change of use and conversion of 2x2 bedroom flats at upper ground and first floor levels into a 4 bedroom maisonette (Class C3)							
B: 2011/4730/L - External alterations in association with the erection of extension at second floor level rear, installation of iron gates to front entrance; including various internal alterations in association with the change of use and conversion from two self-contained flats at ground and first floor levels to form a 4 bedroom maisonette (Class C3)							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		A: 2011/4705/P – Grant planning permission B: 2011/4730/L – Grant listed building consent					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>32</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
				No. Electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>Advertised in Ham &amp; High 6/10/2011, expired 27/10/2011 Site Notice displayed 29/9/2011, expired 20/10/2011</p> <p><b>Responses summary</b> <u>Flat C; 4 Lyndhurst Gardens: Comment</u> Restrict working hours to 08.00-17.00, none at weekends or on Bank Holidays. Maintain a clean site with low noise impact. (<b>Officer Comment:</b> <i>It is the Council standard practice to include an informative reminding the applicant of the hours of operation during the development works</i>)</p> <p><u>Flat 10, Roscommon House, 2 Lyndhurst Gardens</u> I support the planning application. What is described in the application as a</p>					

	<p>&amp; quote; single story rear extension &amp; quote; looks on the plans like a very minor change to an already existing extension.</p> <p>Reinstating the original staircase between the ground and first floor should benefit the property a lot and would bring back some of the lost original features of this magnificent house.</p>
<p><b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify</p>	<p><u>Hampstead CAAC</u>: Objection: The existing two-storey extension is moderately inoffensive. To add to the presently bland presentation makes it offensive and visible from a number of properties in the road, contrary to what stated in the application. The railings alone we find acceptable. (<i>Officer Comment: paras. 1.0 – 1.6 and paras. 4.1 below</i>).</p>

## Site Description

4 Lyndhurst Gardens, is a detached 4 storey house, (including a lower ground floor level) located on the south side of Lyndhurst Gardens; east of the junction with Belsize Crescent. The street consists predominantly of large detached properties set back from the road and within their own large gardens. Self-contained flats are characteristic of these properties. The building is listed grade II and it is within Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area.

## Relevant History

August 1994 PP Granted - Alteration to doors and windows of the basement flat; ref. 9400719.

August 1994 PP Granted - Roof alterations to the upper maisonette including repositioning of the rear dormer and insertion of a side dormer together with the erection of a four storey lift tower to provide access to the upper maisonette; ref. 9400499

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy

- CS1 (Distribution of growth)
- CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)
- CS6 (Providing quality homes)
- CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

### Development Policies

- DP2 (Making use of Camden's capacity for housing)
- DP5 (Housing size mix)
- DP6 (Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes)
- 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)

## CPG 2011

### Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area Statement

## Assessment

### 1.0 Overview

**1.1** Prior to the building being listed, the house was divided into 4 flats, with a single dwelling on each floor, (no record of this alteration has been found on the planning register). To facilitate this subdivision within the building, a stair tower was constructed at the rear, which provided the only means of access to both the first floor and second floor flats. The Basement flat and Ground Floor flat retained their original independent entrances. In addition to this work, the lower flight of the original main 'house' stair, which originally linked the 3 upper stories of the house, was removed within the ground floor flat; this was to sever the link between the ground and first floors.

**1.2** The remaining two thirds of the staircase is still present within the house in its original condition and serves as the main access to the first floor flat and a fire escape for the second floor flat. The original stair links into the more recent stair tower in a complicated route that bears no relation to the way in which the original house was constructed and intended to be used.

**1.3** The applicant currently owns both the first and ground floor flats and it is proposed these two floors are joined together to form a single dwelling. Re-instating the lower stair flight in its original location would link these two floors together in their original layout in a simple and logical way and would unify the principle rooms within the building to their previous intended arrangement and functions as a single house.

**1.4** Encompassing the original 'House' stair wholly within the ground and first floor dwelling, would leave the second floor flat without access to the fire escape and therefore to facilitate the re-instatement of the main part of the building. It is proposed to extend the fire escape upwards by a storey to meet the exit door from the second floor flat, therefore providing a direct route from the second floor flat, down the fire escape stair to the external door at the rear.

**1.5** It is proposed that re-instating the relationship between the two principle floors of the building, would be advantageous to improving the longevity of this listed building as a family home and the extension to the stair tower is integral to this proposal.

## **2.0 Proposal**

- Change of use and conversion of 2x2 bedroom flats at upper ground and first floor levels into a 4 bedroom maisonette
- Erection of extension at second floor level rear;
- Installation of iron gates to front entrance
- Internal alterations

**2.1** The main considerations are: **a]** loss of residential unit; **b]** residential mix / standard **c]** design, **d]** impact on the appearance and historic fabric of the listed building and on the conservation area, **e]** neighbour amenity.

## **3.0 Land Use**

### Loss of residential unit

**3.1** The proposed loss of one residential unit to create a larger single residential unit is considered to be in line with policy DP2 as it does not involve the loss of two or more residential units. The provision of 4 x bedrooms is akin to the creation of a family sized dwelling which will provide a good standard of residential accommodation.

**3.2** All new homes should comply with Lifetime Homes criteria as far as possible under DP6. The applicant has submitted a Lifetime Homes assessment which addresses some of the 16 points of the criteria. The constraints of this conversion scheme are such that not all of the criteria can be met, but the measures proposed are considered acceptable in this instance.

**3.3** As the property would result in the net loss of one unit on site it would not result in any increased pressure to on street car parking.

### Residential mix / standard

**3.4** The proposal would result in the loss of 2 x 2 bedroom units and the creation of 1 x 4 bedroom maisonette. The new maisonette would comprise 3 double bedrooms all larger than the minimum required and a single bedroom also larger than the minimum suggested. The proposed is a good sized family sized unit and in terms of its size, layout would be compliant with the Council's CPG residential space standards.

## **4.0 Design and appearance**

### External

**4.1** At the rear, the host building has an existing 2-storey (lower and upper ground floors) wing referred to as the stair case/ fire escape tower and it comprise flat roof plus railings. The proposed extension would replace the roof terrace and railing and it would match the depth and width of the existing tower both in terms of details and use of materials. Its roof would comprise part pitched and part flat which is to accommodate the new fire escape door whilst retaining an existing window. The extension height would terminate just below the main roof eaves, which is not strictly in compliance with the Council's CPG guidelines which states that "in most cases extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level will be strongly discouraged". The CPG does however acknowledge that where a higher extension is appropriate a smaller footprint will generally be preferable to compensate for any increase in visual mass and bulk caused by the additional height. In this instance it is considered that the principle of the additional storey can be justified in listed building terms; as it would result in the reinstatement of the main staircase which is considered to outweigh the harm caused by blocking of two original rear windows and the lack height separation between the proposed extension and the roof eaves.

On the east side, new replacement enlarged timber framed glazed sash window of similar style and proportion would replace the existing smaller casement window and are considered acceptable.

### Internally alterations

#### Reinstate staircase

- The principal floor locations are upper ground and the first floor levels. The re-instating of the lower stair flight in its original location would link upper ground and first floor levels and retain the host building in its original layout. Moreover this modification would unify the principle rooms within the building to their previous intended arrangement and functions as a single dwelling house. The reinstated staircase is considered satisfactory as no harm would be caused to the buildings historic fabric.

#### Upper ground level

- The proposal includes: new door openings; enlarged existing door opening; new opening to bathroom; enlarged window and removal of non-original partition wall to relocated sitting/ playroom. These proposed alterations are considered satisfactory.

#### First Floor level

- The proposal includes: new door openings; blocked –up door & window openings; removal of non-original partition wall to allow for reinstated staircase. These proposed alterations are considered satisfactory as they are considered not to be harmful to the fabric of the historic building.

**4.2** The substantive internal alterations (new kitchen location; new door openings; blocked –up doors; removal of partition etc) to facilitate the enlarged maisonette are considered acceptable whilst some would be dealt with by way of condition; i.e. matters relating to reversibility of blocked-up doors.

**4.3** In summary the works of alteration are considered to preserve the building's special interest and comply with policies DP24, DP25 and CS14.

### **5.0 Neighbour amenity**

**5.1** The host building is detached and the staircase tower projects forward of no.6 building line at the rear. No. 6 lies due east and with windows orientated due south would ensure that the proposed extension would not cause harm through loss of sun/daylight or impact on outlook / loss of view. Neither would it cause a sense of enclosure.

**5.2** The proposed enlargement of the window on the east elevation would not lead to any additional unacceptable material harm to neighbouring residential occupiers in terms of overlooking or cause loss of privacy and is satisfactory. The proposed accords with LDF policy CS5.

**Recommendation: Grant** Planning permission & Listed building consent.

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 14<sup>th</sup> November 2011.**

**For further information see**

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