

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet N/A / attached	Expiry Date: 27/05/2011	Consultation Expiry Date: 09/05/2011
Officer Gavin Sexton		Application Number(s) 2011/0723/P : Planning 2011/0725/L: Listed building		
Application Address 47 Arlington Road London NW1 7ES		Drawing Numbers Refer to decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s) Erection of two storey rear extension at lower and upper ground levels; additions and alterations to rear roof terrace at second floor; excavation of existing front vault, alterations to fenestration, doorway and entrance lean-to at front lower ground level; retrospective addition of mouldings to upper floor windows to front elevation and raising of roof ridge height, all to dwelling house (Class C3).				
Recommendation(s):		Grant planning permission and listed building consent		
Application Type:		Householder Application		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	02	No. of responses No. electronic	02 01	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The applications were advertised in the press and by way of site notice, subsequently made invalid due to irregularities and inconsistencies identified during the site visit and then re-advertised in the press on 28/04/2011 and by site notice from 20/04/2011.</p> <p>Comments were received from the same parties in respect of both consultations. Only those comments received in respect of the latter consultation have been summarised below.</p> <p>Response from 45 and 43 Arlington Road Scaffolding still at rear of building after 14 months The terrace is vulnerable to subsidence Depth of excavation would likely hit water line as it did at 39 This is first proposal to excavate under front cellars. Combined structural strain for front and rear alterations would be tremendous. Equipment for work would have to be accommodated in rear garden. No party wall agreement could cover the likelihood of structural damage to neighbours. Under-pavement bathroom would be harmful to frontage of house and detrimental impact on continuity and significance of listed terrace Applicant's intention to convert basement to self-contained flat is gross over expansion. Rear extension would be environmental disaster.</p> <p>Application is incoherent, inconsistent and poorly presented Details relating to structural drawings are unclear and a cause for concern Drawings appear to post-date consultation notification New height of raised ridge is unclear Increase in wall height to 49 would have detrimental impact on their amenity Design and Access statement is collection of answers to unknown questions and cannot be substantive evidence in support of the application Potential enormous cost of remedying damage to several houses from the work would be beyond individual means</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>	<p>Camden Town CAAC: Object to bulk and height of tank on the roof Object to addition of moulded window surrounds to second floor front windows History of previous permissions is confusing. Object to ground floor extension and the stair which obscures rear elevation, raises boundary wall with 49 with resultant impact on amenity of 49.</p>					

Site Description

The application site comprises a 3-storey mid-terrace house with basement and a mansard roof extension and rear terrace located on the west side of Arlington Road. The premises are Grade II listed and date back to c1840.

Relevant History

Application site

In July 2006 planning permission (2006/2453/P) and listed building consent were **granted** for “Construction of a rear extension at ground floor level to dwelling house (Class C3).”

In June 2003 planning permission and listed building consent were **granted** (PEX0200162 & LEX0200163) for the construction of a rear extension at basement level with terrace over and a staircase to the garden; alterations to enlarge the front basement window and conversion of the front basement vault into a bathroom.

In August 2001 planning permission and listed building consent were **granted** (LEX0100222 & PEX0100221) for Alterations to rear of mansard to provide a shower room, replacement of water tank on roof and installation of new timber glazed doors to rear elevation.

In November 2000 planning permission and listed building consent were **refused** (PE9900955 & LE9900956) for alterations to window opening to front basement area, replacement of rear window with French doors, relocation of existing water tank and construction of small extension at top terrace level to provide a shower room.

51 Arlington Road

A number of applications of relevance have been approved including (2008/0271/P) for “Erection of single-storey rear basement level extension with terrace over and ramp to garden, alterations to rear boundary treatment.” and various subsequent amendments to same.

53 Arlington Road

A number of applications of relevance have been approved including (2007/381/P) for “The erection of a mansard roof with rear balcony as an extension to the existing single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3)” and 2007/6422/P: “Erection of basement extension to the rear.”.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 (Distribution of growth)

CS4 (Areas of more limited change)

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

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)

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)

DP27 (Basements and lightwells)

Assessment

Overview : This application was originally submitted as amendments to an approved scheme (2006/2453/P). During a site visit it became apparent that the permission had not been implemented, nor had PEX0200162 (of 2003). Furthermore the only clearly discernible work which had been commenced on site, consistent with previous applications, were changes to the water tank on the roof. The application was made invalid and clarity was sought from the applicant on a number of issues.

Revisions: On officer advice the proposals for a rooftop hottub with vertical glazing screen and canopy have been removed from the proposals. Minor changes have also been made to the partition wall at the new entrance in the front basement area.

Assessment: The application seeks consent for:

- Rear extension at garden level with roof terrace and glazed stairwell access box providing link between basement and the roof terrace above.
- Glazed canopy to rear extension to cover green wall
- Raise ridge height of roof to accommodate additional insulation (retrospective)
- Addition of bathroom and new glazing at rear roof level
- Addition of moulding to 1st and 2nd floor window surrounds on front elevation (retrospective)
- Alterations to basement including excavation of approx 600mm in part of front vault

Rear extension, glazed rear canopy : The rear garden level extension with glass box above is similar in design, height and form to the approved extension of 2003 (amended by the consent of 2006). The new opening in the rear wall of the listed building at basement level would be the same as in the previously consented scheme. The lower extension would be partial width with extensive glazing on the rear elevation and would project 5.65m from the rear elevation, which is the same depth as permitted at 51 and 53. A small area of garden would have shallow excavations to accommodate the floor slab for the new extension. The garden rises considerably from the rear patio and the new extension would be only partly sunk within existing ground. Evidence of trial pit investigations at the location of the rear extension have been provided, in addition to a risk assessment for the structural work and a report in the inspection of the rear party/boundary wall with 49. These documents point to the need for careful preparation of the site and appropriate care and attention to be paid to propping and structural measures. Further details of the structural support required to prop the rear elevation during the works would be secured by condition, in accordance with DP25 and DP27.

The sloped side wall to the extension would be planted with a green wall. Details of the planting, construction and maintenance scheme would be sought by condition in order to ensure the long term viability of the proposals. The roof terrace above would be surrounded by frameless glass balustrading to the side and rear and a glazed canopy from balustrade to the party wall with 45 would cover the link from upper ground to the garden. The internal stair link from the basement to the roof terrace would be enclosed in a frameless glazed box, similar in design and form to the approval of 2006. A condition would be added securing final design details of the box which would sit on the side of the rear elevation close to the rear window at upper ground floor. The adjoining boundary wall with 49 would be raised by approx 0.8m in order to accommodate the glazed box. The rear of the terrace is fairly secluded and views of the new extension from neighbouring properties would be limited and therefore it is considered that it does not raise sufficient concern in respect of the setting and special interest of the listed building to merit refusal of the application.

Roof alterations : The increase in ridge height is not overly apparent from the street and the retrospective increase in height by approx 150mm to allow for increased internal insulation is acceptable. Officers recall the visible presence of the water tank going back to the early 2000s and the applicant has stated that the water tank itself was not raised in height as a result of the additional insulation. It is considered that the water tank does not raise sufficient concern in respect of the setting and special interest of the listed building to merit refusal of the application.

To the rear, the application site, along with three adjoining neighbouring properties has an altered roofline which incorporate mansard additions. The most recent of these at number 53 dates from 2007/8. These four roofs form a reasonably cohesive appearance with large windows set back behind simple metal railings. The proposed alterations to the rear roof element at 47 would be generally consistent with the approach on neighbouring properties, which would retain the railings and the exposed brick chimney stack. The addition of the angled glazed roof above the bathroom addition would be generally consistent with the consents of 2001/2002 and is acceptable. As noted above the proposals for a hottub and vertical glazing to replace the railings has been removed. The existing patio doors would be moved closer to the rear balustrade by approx 500mm. However a clear visual gap would remain between the location of the eaves and the rear glazing of the patio doors. The alterations at this level are acceptable.

Mouldings to front elevation windows

The applicant has submitted 1:1 details of mouldings taken from a neighbouring property which were subsequently applied as window surrounds at 1st and 2nd floor. The presence of moulded or prominent white-painted window surrounds is consistent with many of the properties on the street and it is considered that their addition is not out of character nor does it detract from the setting or special interest of the listed building.

Vault excavation and related basement alterations

The replacement of the 20th century window to the front basement with a historically detailed timber sash window is welcome. All new window joinery should exactly replicate the existing examples of historic vertically sliding sash window joinery to be found either within No 47 or a neighbouring house in the terrace and details of the window would be secured by condition. The existing lobby entrance with sloped roof within the lightwell would be replaced with a structure of comparable dimensions albeit with flat roof. This lobby form would not be uncharacteristic of the terrace and it is considered that the relatively modest alterations would not harm the special interest of the listed building.

A floor area of 1.1m by 1.16m within one of the front vaults would be excavated by approx 0.9m to accommodate a new shower room. Some structural details of the works have been submitted however they are not worked to a sufficiently detailed level and further details would be secured by condition. The works to the vault would preserve the arched roof and are considered to be minor enough that they would not have a detrimental impact on the special interest of the listed building.

The applicant has indicated that the tanking works to the front vault would be undertaken by a specialist contractor. Details would be secured by condition and an informative would be added setting out that SIKA render or equivalent, which involve unacceptable degree of irreversible intervention would not be an acceptable approach.

A condition would be added to secure design details of the entrance door and structural details and method statement in respect of the alterations to the front vault.

Ground floor internal layout: Concerns were raised during the assessment about the internal layout of the ground floor of the property which has seen a central wall removed and an open plan arrangement, with supporting pillar, installed. The building was listed in Dec 1999. The applicant has stated that she purchased the property in 1996 and no substantial works were carried out prior to the consent applied for in 2001 (relating to roof and basement level works) which was refused. The 'existing ground floor' drawing submitted as part of the 2003 consent appears to show the same arrangement as currently exists. It is considered that there is insufficient contrary evidence to initiate

proceedings in respect of alterations possibly being made without listed building consent in the interval between 1999 and the consent of 2003.

Impact on amenity : The additional height of approx 800mm to the boundary wall with 49 to the depth of the rear extension is considered unlikely to result in a significant impact on the amenity of neighbours in the adjoining dwelling. A single storey structure abuts the boundary wall in 49 adjacent to the proposed rear extension to 47. There would be no overlooking from the new terrace into number 49.

The existing boundary wall with 45 adjacent to the main house would be retained. The rear extension would sit below this wall and therefore the addition of the rear extension and glazed box would have no impact on the sunlight/daylight amenity of neighbours in 45 or their rear garden. The roof terrace would be set approx 1.5m from the boundary extension is set in from this boundary which would prevent overlooking to a degree, however, there would be some visibility into No.45. Number 45 has some vegetative screening above the boundary wall. The main garden set apart from the new extension has very low walls on the boundary with 45 and considerable mutual overlooking occurs between properties from various points in the rear garden. It is not considered that the additional degree of overlooking from the terrace is great enough to recommend refusal and is thus considered acceptable with the height of the boundary wall and the set back of the extension from the boundary.

General comment: Concerns have been raised about the structural implications of the proposals and the general consistency, clarity and coherency of the submission. Some details of the structural work has been provided but conditions would be added to secure further information. It is considered that the degree of excavation and basement level work, consistent with that previously consented, is sufficiently small scale that no further information is required at this stage.

While the submission does comprise drawings and details from a variety of sources and dates it is considered that sufficiently clear information has been provided to allow assessment of the proposals. A condition would be added to ensure that only the works detailed are undertaken.

Other issues

The originally submitted plans appeared to show that the building was to be sub-divided into self-contained basement flat, separate from the dwelling above. Revised drawings have been submitted which clarify that this is not the case. Discussions with the applicant indicate that the intention is to retain the basement as accommodation which is ancillary to the upper floors. An internal staircase would be retained between ground and basement levels. The self-containment of the basement would potentially give rise to concerns about privacy and overlooking, due to the proximity of the roof terrace (accessed primarily from the basement) to the habitable rooms at upper ground floor. A condition would be added to ensure that the basement elements remains ancillary in order to protect against such an issue.

Recommendation:

Grant Planning Permission

Grant Listed Building Consent

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members.

For further information see

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