

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		11/11/2009	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		21/10/2009	
Officer				Application Number			
John Sheehy				2009/3469/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
17 Princess Road London NW1 8JR				Refer to draft decision			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal							
Raising of parapet, erection of opaque glass railings and replacement of rear window with door in association with the creation of a roof terrace above existing rear extension for existing second floor maisonette.							
Recommendations:		Refuse permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	5	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	2
				No. electronic	2		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>Site notice displayed from 30th September to 21st October.</p> <p>Two objections received from the occupier of 15 Princess Road. In summary the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inaccurate drawings with no measurements indicated; • Impact on neighbour privacy with views into habitable rooms; • Potentially significant loss of sunlight and daylight to neighbours; and • Grant of permission would set a precedent for other properties on Princess Road. 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		No response to date.					

Site Description

A 3-storey with basement mid-terrace property dating from the 19th century. The building is finished in brown brick to the front and rear. The upper floors of the property are in use as 2 self-contained flats. The ground floor contains a commercial unit which is in use as a restaurant.

The building is not listed, however it is identified as making a positive contribution to the Primrose Hill Conservation Area in which it is located.

Relevant History

June 1976 Planning permission granted for the erection of a rear extension at first floor level to provide a bathroom/ toilet for the first and second floor maisonette, ref. J10/8/4/22231.

April 2000 Planning permission refused for erection of a roof extension and second floor extension to Rear, ref. PEX0000134. Reasons for refusal:

- *The proposed rear extension by reason of its size and position would be unduly prominent on the rear elevation to the detriment of the building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would be contrary to the Unitary Development Plan policies EN33, EN51, and EN52.*

and

- *The proposed roof extension would be overly dominant and would disrupt the largely unaltered rooflines in the terrace to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would accordingly be contrary to Unitary Development Plan policies EN33 and EN57.*

October 2000 Appeal against the refusal of permission for application ref. PEX0000134 dismissed.

Relevant policies

Camden Development Plan 2006

SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours
B1 General design principles
B3 Alterations and extensions
B7 Conservation Areas

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

Proposal: raising of parapet, erection of opaque glass screen and replacement of rear window with door in association with the creation of a terrace above existing ground floor rear extension for existing second floor maisonette.

The proposed terrace would occupy the entire extent of the flat roof of the existing rear extension (3.5m W x 4.1m L). The brick parapet of the rear extension would be raised by 1.4m and the terrace would be enclosed within new obscure-glazed railings. The total increase in height to the rear extension as a result of the proposal would be 3.25m.

Assessment

The proposal has been assessed principally against the Council's policies and guidance on Design, Conservation Areas and Impact on Neighbour Amenity. The application has also been assessed against the guidance contained in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement. The following advice on rear extensions is contained in the CAS:

"Rear extensions should be... no more than one storey in height but [the] general effect on neighbouring properties and the Conservation Area will be the basis of its suitability"

"Extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace... The acceptability of larger extensions depends on the particular site and circumstances".

Local context

Most of the buildings that form part of the terrace have rear extensions. These vary from 1- to 2-storey in height and generally project by less than 4m to the rear. These additions result in the rear elevation of the terrace having a varied but relatively harmonious appearance. The rear of the terrace is considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

It is noted that, at roof level, the terrace has undergone significant alteration and very few of the original butterfly roofs have been retained.

The rear elevation of the application building and the terrace as a whole is highly visible from street level on both sides – on Chalcot Road and Kingstown Street - and from the rear – on Calvert Street.

The rear extension of the application building, granted permission in 1976, has been constructed in yellow bricks which do not match the brown bricks used in the rear elevation of the terrace. These bricks have not weathered to match the original bricks and consequently the extension appears prominent in views of the rear elevation of the terrace.

It is noted that a number of properties on the terrace (nos. 15, 21, 23) have roof terraces on top of the rear extensions - these roof terraces are all constructed on top of single-storey rear extensions, none of the buildings in the terrace contains a roof terrace on top of a two-storey extension.

Proposed scheme

In the case of this application, the Council has serious concerns regarding the proposed raising of the height of the closet wing extension. A combination of the building up of the parapet and the addition of high glazed railings would result in a significant addition to the height and perceived bulk of the rear wing and would result visually prominent and obtrusive extension. It is recognised that the extension would be one storey below eave level and it could therefore be argued that it would comply with Camden Planning Guidance. However the proposed development would add an extra 3.25m of height and would project the entire extent of the existing flat-roofed area, adding further bulk to an existing extension. It is considered that this additional bulk would be substantial in scale and would relate poorly to the existing building.

While the rear elevation of the terrace does not feature a consistent height or depth of rear extensions, the proposal would result in the existing extension appearing at least one full storey higher than any neighbouring rear extensions. The additional bulk proposed would detrimentally impact on the appearance of the terrace of buildings when viewed as a whole, particularly in long views from Chalcot Road, Calvert Street and Kingstown Street. It is considered that the proposed alteration would look out of place and intrusive in its context and would harm the appearance of the terrace as a whole. It is noted that no. 11 Princess Road contains a 2-storey rear extension which is slightly taller than the other buildings on the terrace due to higher internal floor to ceiling heights within this property. A short stretch of wall (1.2m in length) projecting at 90° from the rear elevation is positioned on top of this extension. This wall does not enclose any space and appears to serve as a screen for mechanical plant. This wall does not add significantly to the bulk of this building and is not considered to serve as a precedent for any upper level additions.

Concerns are also raised about the proposal on the following grounds:

- The second floor rear window would be altered to form a door giving access to the proposed terrace. The proposed door is considered to be excessively tall for its modest width and would appear poorly proportioned;
- In terms of materials and appearance, the proposed obscure-glazed railings to the roof terrace are not traditional within the Conservation Area. On the other hand, if a traditional metal railing was proposed this would expose the proposed poorly proportioned access door to views from the surrounding streets; and
- The application drawings indicate “Parapet raised in brickwork to match existing”. As noted above, the rear extension has not been constructed in matching brick and the bricks have not weathered to match the bricks used in the rear elevation of the terrace. The extension therefore already appears prominent in views of the rear elevation of the terrace. This unfortunate effect would be further aggravated by the proposed development.

Design conclusions

In a future application, a roof terrace reduced significantly in depth may not require high screens to either side to protect neighbour privacy; however such a terrace would still require the addition of a significant amount of bulk through the building up of the parapet and the addition of obscure glazed railings to enclose the terrace. If, instead, a traditional metal railing was proposed to enclose the terrace, this would open up views from the surrounding streets to a door opening in the rear elevation. Should the existing upper level window be adapted to be used as a door, the architrave of the existing window would need to be retained in its current location to prevent harm to the rear elevation of the terrace (by disrupting the rhythm of windows). If a metal railing was proposed, such a door would appear excessively tall for its modest width and poorly proportioned in views from the surrounding streets. It is the view of officers that significant compromises to the character and appearance of the building and the terrace would be required in order to insert a roof terrace in this location: such compromises are not considered to be consistent with the Council’s Design and Conservation area Policies.

Other issues

The proposed roof terrace would be enclosed on both sides with high obscure-glazed railings therefore the proposal is not considered to result in a loss of privacy to any neighbouring properties as views into any rooms not protected by the screens would be at an oblique angle: any views would not penetrate deeply into neighbouring habitable rooms. The rear gardens of all the properties in the terrace are overlooked by the windows of the buildings that form part of the terrace and the proposed roof terrace would not add materially to overlooking of any gardens. Due to its location on the northwestern elevation of the terrace and the fact that it would be enclosed within an obscure-glazed balustrade, the roof terrace is not considered to cause a loss of sunlight or daylight to neighbouring habitable rooms. It is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the

amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Recommendation: refuse permission.

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