

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>17/02/2010</b>
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	03/02/10
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin			1) 2009/5728/P & 2) 2009/5729/L	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
92 Albert Street London NW1 7NE			See 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>				
<p>1) Alterations and additions including erection of mansard roof extension and raising of party walls and chimney stacks, excavation to create rear extension at basement and ground floor levels, installation of staircase in front light well and replacement of front windows at lower ground and ground floor levels, to dwelling house (Class C3).</p> <p>2) Internal and external alterations and additions including erection of mansard roof extension and raising of party walls and chimney stacks, excavation to create rear extension at basement and ground floor levels following demolition of two existing single storey rear extensions, replacement of front windows at lower ground and ground floor levels, installation of staircase in front light well, replacement of lower ground floor staircase, rearrangement of internal access, and associated repairs and refurbishment.</p>				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<p>1) Refuse Planning permission 2) Refuse Listed Building Consent</p>		
<b>Application Type:</b>	Householder Application			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>
<b>Informatives:</b>	

### Consultations

<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>09</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		

<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	A site notice was displayed from 13/01/10 to 03/02/10. No reply to date is received.
---	---

<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify	No reply to date is received.
--	-------------------------------

### Site Description

The application relates to a Grade II listed mid-terrace house, one of a terrace of 15 dating from c1845 on the east side of Albert Street in the Camden Town conservation area. It is built in yellow stock brick, with rusticated stucco ground floors and associated attached cast-iron railings with tasseled spearhead finials to areas.

### Relevant History

#### Application Property:

**8402005** – Planning permission was granted on 16/01/1985 for the erection of a two storey rear extension. The associated listed building consent was also granted on 16/01/1985 (ref: 8470308).

**8501529** – Planning permission was granted on 12/03/1986 for the construction of a single storey rear extension at basement level to provide a bathroom. The associated listed building consent was also granted on 12/03/1986 (ref: 8570305).

**8700078** – Planning permission was granted on 11/03/1987 for the external alterations including the installation of a new window and door at basement-level. The associated listed building consent was also granted on 11/03/1987 (ref: 8770018).

#### Neighbouring Properties:

**90 Albert Street** – Planning permission was granted on 20/08/1998 for the retention of a roof extension and alterations to rear addition by the provision of a glazed pitched roof in association with the refurbishment of a single family dwelling (ref: P9603221R1). The associated listed building consent was also granted on 20/08/1998.

**94 Albert Street** – Planning permission was refused on 23/03/2009 for the erection of three storey rear extension (following demolition of existing two storey rear extension), installation of staircase in front basement lightwell and gate in front boundary railings, and conversion of single-family dwellinghouse to two self-contained flats (ref: 2008/1552/P). The associated listed building consent was also refused on 23/03/2009 (ref: 2008/1386/L).

## Relevant policies

### Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 – Amenity for Neighbours and Occupiers  
B1 – General Design Principles  
B3 – Alterations and Extensions  
B6 – Listed Buildings  
B7 – Conservation Areas

### Camden Planning Guidance 2006

### Camden Town Conservation Area Statement

## Assessment

### Proposal

Planning permission and listed building consent are sought for the internal and external alterations including replacement of front windows at the lower ground and ground floor levels, rearrangement of internal access, replacement of the lower ground floor staircase and associated repairs and refurbishment, mansard roof extension including raising of party walls and chimney stacks, new rear extension at basement and ground floor levels with associated rear patio (following demolition of two existing single storey rear extensions) and installation of new staircase in the front light well.

### Design

#### Roof extension:

The application property is one of only two properties within this terrace which are unaltered at roof level. The adjoining property (no.90) and no. 96 have existing mansard roof extensions with dormer windows. The existing roof of the application property has been re-covered with modern tiles, but retains its historic valley form. It is proposed to form a mansard roof extension with dormer windows. The principle of a mansard roof extension is considered to be acceptable in this location subject to the appropriate detailing.

The Council guidance states additional storeys and roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and the character of the building and have a similar form to the established pattern of development in the area. The Council's guidance also gives advice on the form, scale, size and positioning of dormer window extensions in relation to the roof area and the windows on the lower levels of the existing building. In summary dormer window extensions should:

- relate to the façade below and the surface area of the roof in number, form, scale and pane size;
- appear as separate small projections from the roof surface;
- relate to the façade below and the surface area of the roof;
- appear as separate small projections from the roof surface; and
- generally be aligned with windows on the lower floors and be of a size that is clearly subordinate to the windows on the lower floors and be of a size that is clearly subordinate to the windows below, with the overall width and height no greater than the windows below.

The mansard roof extension would be clad with natural slates on the front and rear elevations. The dormer windows would be of timber with lead clad finishing. The raised parapet walls and chimney stack would have matching brick work and detailing to the existing. The proposed roof extension in terms of its profile and materials are considered acceptable. However, the proposed dormer windows to the front are set a little higher than the recommended positioning detailed in the Council's guidance for mansard roof extensions. The rear dormer which would incorporate double doors would be also over-sized and out of scale with the fenestration on the floors below.

Dormer windows are intended to light a roof space and should be no wider or taller than the window on the floor below, in order not to appear out of scale with the roof or over-dominant on the elevation. The provision of a door at this level may require a barrier or railing to be erected, which would detract from the appearance of the building. No details of the railing are submitted with the applications.

#### Alterations to Front elevation:

It is proposed to replace the non-original casement windows at ground and lower ground floor with single glazed timber sliding sashes in a pattern to match the others in the terrace, replace the modern tiled step covering with stone repair defective window hood mouldings, reinstate a metal staircase within the front area

(the gate remains), and reinstate railing head and finals where these have broken off. The alterations are considered acceptable and repairs welcomed.

The new metal staircase which would be located in the front lightwell would not be visible from the streetscene or harm the special interest of the listed building therefore it is considered to be acceptable.

#### Lower ground floor and ground floor rear extension:

There are two non-original extensions to the rear, one is a two storey rendered extension which gives access from the ground floor to the garden, and the other a 1980s single storey brick extension at lower ground level, against the side elevation of the large rear extension to no 90 to the south. There are a number of tall brick and some deep, heavily framed conservatory extensions along the rest of the rear of the terrace.

It is proposed to remove the existing rear extensions and form a basement and ground floor extension which will take the form of a solid element to the north with rendered north wall, flat roof and timber door/screen to the rear, and to the south, a simple frameless glass enclosure at lower ground and ground floor. The contemporary detailed design of the rear extension and the bridge over the patio are not considered to compromise the special interest of the building, but the height of the glass infill is considered to be out of scale and will obscure part of the original rear elevation of the building (particularly rear ground floor sash window). The English Heritage guidance "London Terraced Houses" states that "full-width extensions should not normally be allowed, except at some cases at basement level." A glazed infill at the lower ground level, in place of the existing 1980s brick extension, would be in scale with the host building but the obscuring of the upper ground floor will detract from the special interest of the building. That part of the proposal would be contrary to policies B3, B6 and B7 of the UDP.

Repairs to rear elevation brickwork and replacement of non-original faulty downpipes will be undertaken and are not considered to harm the appearance and special interest of the listed building.

#### Interior Alterations:

Throughout, much of the original decorative fabric has been lost with the exception of the cornices within the hallway and the ground and first floor front rooms, and architraves at this level, which will be retained. There are no original doors in the building. The stair balustrade has been altered; the stick balusters are not original and the turned ends of the mahogany handrail have been cut off and replaced, so it is proposed to splice replacement ends in to match the original. This is welcomed.

At ground level it is proposed to reinstate the timber window shutters which have been lost, which is also welcomed. It is also proposed to form a double door opening between the front and rear rooms at first floor level, which will preserve the original room volumes and floor plan by retaining nibs and a downstand. Other minor works of alteration to partitioning at lower ground and second floor level will not have an adverse effect on the building's special interest, and are considered acceptable.

At first floor level it is proposed to re form the opening between the front and rear rooms to create a large principle drawings room, remove the existing ceiling and cornice and replace with a new plaster ceiling at the front room and install a new plaster cornice to the rear room. Removal of the existing cornice in the first floor front room is considered to be unacceptable as it would harm the remaining historic fabric in the building.

The proposed internal works are generally considered to be acceptable with the exception of the removal of the rear sash window at ground floor level (shown on the existing rear elevation) and associated widening of its opening and the formation of an internal double width door opening into the rear dining room at ground level. The ground floor rear sash window should be retained as it relates to the scale of the room and the fenestration pattern on the rear elevation. The existing door opening to the rear dining room on the ground floor should be retained as its size and position relate to the scale of the room and the original plan form / room layout which is a part of the building's special interest.

Overall, the proposal would have an adverse impact on the appearance and special interest of the building; and contrary to the English Heritage guidance and policies B1,

#### **Amenity**

The proposal would not have any adverse impact on the amenities of the adjoining residents in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook or privacy.

The impact of the proposed rear extension on no.90 would be ameliorated by the existing three storey rear extension at that adjoining property. Although the proposed external staircase from the lower ground floor level

to the garden level and the bridge from the ground floor level to garden (over the rear patio) would be close to the shared boundary with no. 94, it would not significantly worsen the impact of the existing house on the residential amenities of no. 94. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with policy SD6.

**Recommend:** Both planning permission and listed building consent should be refused as the proposal would be harmful to the special architectural interest of the building and the appearance and character of the wider Conservation Area.

**Disclaimer**

*This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613*