

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 10th August 2009. For further information see

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

Delegated Report (Members' Briefing)		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	10/08/2009
			Consultation Expiry Date:	07/08/2009
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Jenny Fisher			2009/2852/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
9 Chalcot Road London NW1 8LH			Refer to decision letter	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
		Design Surgery 04/08/2009		
Proposal(s)				
Replacement of a casement window at front basement level with a timber sash window, infill of an area adjacent to the rear basement extension and installation of sliding glazed doors opening onto the garden.				
Recommendation(s):		Grant planning permission with conditions		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	21	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:						
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>Primrose Hill CAAC Object to proposal to rear; no objection to proposal to front elevation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We object strongly to the proposed changes to the rear. These are against policy guidance which seeks to protect the original pattern of back additions, which in this case means the balance of solid to void: see PH25 and PH27. There is no justification for not applying this policy guidance in this case. The simple relationship of solid over solid and void over void is a key element in the CA, and would be significantly harmed by the proposal, which would, consequently, neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. We note that the beneficial use sought by the change would not be materially affected by maintaining this balance in a modest design. 2. We have no objection to the change to the front window, so long as the details are as shown. <p>Officer comment <i>PH25 (Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement) states that some rear extensions, although not widely visible, so adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached that the character of the C.A. is prejudiced. The assessment of the report below explains why it is considered that the proposed infill extension would not adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building.</i></p> <p><i>PH27 (C.A.Statement) refers to harmony with the original form and character of the building. In this case the extension proposed would infill a space to the side of an existing two storey extension and underneath an existing non original ground floor terrace with metal steps leading to the garden. This perhaps wasn't clear from drawings submitted but there is no void over the open space at basement level.</i></p> <p><i>Assessment of the report includes reference to planning guidance. It also refers to the Council's Development Plan and concludes that works proposed are in compliance with relevant UDP policies and as a consequence there is no material reason to recommend refusal.</i></p>					

Site Description

The terraced property is located on the north-east side of Chalcot Street between junctions with Egbert Street and Edis Street and one property removed from access to Utopia Village to the rear of the residential terrace. No. 9 is a mid-terrace property comprising lower ground, upper ground, first, second floor and mansard roof addition. The building has a half width basement/ground floor rear extension. The building is currently in use as a single-family dwelling house (Class C3). It is located within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. The area is subject to an article 4 direction. Nos. 1 – 66 consecutive are unlisted buildings which have been designated as positive contributors to the special character and appearance of the area.

Relevant History

Application premises

10/12/2004 (2004/4665/P) Planning permission for the erection of a single storey infill rear extension at basement level under the existing ground floor terrace.

8 Chalcot Road (adjacent to application premises)

07/05/2002 (PEX0100500) Planning permission for addition of a single storey infill extension at rear basement level, alterations to the rear of the property and the addition of a lantern light on the existing rear elevations in connection with the conversion of the property from a self contained basement flat and four storey maisonette on the upper floors to a single family dwelling house.

Condition 2: The frame of the proposed infill extension and new sliding patio doors on the existing rear extension shall be aluminium.

4 Chalcot Road

2007/6426/P Planning permission was **granted on 22/10/08 on appeal** for the erection of a rear second floor level glazed extension in connection with existing single-family dwelling house (Class C3).

Appeal decision

The Council refused planning permission in 2007 on the grounds that the additional extension, whilst being modest in size, would in conjunction with the extensions already carried out at the site over dominate and harm the appearance of the rear façade of the building. The Inspector did not concur with the Council's opinion and stated that high density development is characteristic of the area and noted that on a number of the properties the original brick projecting wings had been extended vertically and that in some cases they had been infilled.

The Inspector acknowledged that excessive volumes of development can undermine the articulation of the built form in horizontal and vertical terms. He felt, however, that the second floor extension fell short of this for a number of reasons and therefore complied with Policy B1 and B3 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006):

- Material: The extension is self-evidently distinguishable from the brick extensions;
- The extension is set back from the plane of the adjoining walls of the brick extension and the roof is lower;
- The rear elevation is still readily apparent including both the top floor window and the roof itself.

Whilst he acknowledged proposed works could not be considered an enhancement of the conservation area he was of the opinion that they would preserve, and therefore would meet the requirements of Policy B7 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

Relevant policies

London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan (2006)

SD6 - Amenity for occupiers and neighbours; B1 - General design principles; B3 - Alterations and extensions
B7 - Conservation areas.

Camden Planning Guidance (2006) conservation areas; daylight; design; extensions; materials; overlooking

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

Proposed

Front:

An existing modern casement basement window would be removed and replaced with a new sash window with a timber frame. The window would match those of the neighbouring properties. This would be a sympathetic alteration to the front of the property. The design and materials proposed are considered appropriate for the architectural quality of the existing building. The replacement window would enhance the appearance of building and compliment its neighbours in line with UDP policy B3.

Rear:

The rear extension proposed would allow space for a larger second bedroom in the basement. Full width extensions are not normally approved where they are visible from the street and if they dominate the original building or obscure original features. The infill extension proposed would be lightweight in appearance and at basement level only, under an existing ground floor terrace. It would not be visible from the street and would not dominate the original building or obscure original architectural features. As a consequence it would not have an adverse impact on appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved. Works proposed are in line with policies B1 respecting site and setting, B3 they would not harm the architectural quality of the building and B7 the character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved.

Materials proposed are considered acceptable. Timber frame windows to the front and aluminium to the rear.

Amenity

It is noted that works proposed are similar to the recent approval for No.8 (adjacent) and that an infill extension (under the existing ground floor terrace) was approved for the application premises in 2004.

The extension would infill an existing open area 8m². It would be under a ground floor terrace. It would not restrict light to or allow views into neighbouring properties. Amenities of adjoining occupiers would not be affected and the application complies with Policy SD6.

Recommendation: Grant conditional permission.