

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		15/07/2008	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		17/07/2008	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Erin Murphy				2008/1552/P & 2008/1386/L			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
94 Albert Street London NW1 7NE				Refer to Draft Decision Notice.			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
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.							
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 internal alterations at basement, ground and first floor level in connection with conversion of single-family dwellinghouse to two self-contained flats.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Permission and Listed Building Consent					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission & Listed Building Consent					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	08	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	03
				No. electronic	01		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>A site notice was displayed from 26/06/08 to 17/07/08.</p> <p>Adjoining owners/occupiers The occupiers of 94, 96 and 106 Albert Street have raised objection to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of daylight and sunlight; • Loss of outlook; • Loss of privacy; and • A hideous eyesore and out of character. 					

CAAC/Local groups comments:

Camden Town CAAC

- Loss of the long window at first floor level would be undesirable
- Side windows on the side elevation seem overlarge for the scale of the extension
- The arch on the new window should be canted to match existing windows, with a shallow curve;
- New brick work must be Flemish bond; and
- The parapet must have traditional 19th Century details.

Site Description

The application site is 94 Albert Street which forms part of a mid eighteenth century grade II listed terrace. The building comprises lower ground, ground and two upper floors. The building has a small two-storey half-width extension at the rear which possibly dates from the 1970s (see planning history). The building is located within the Camden Town Conservation area.

Relevant History

CTP/J11/17/D/13597

Planning permission was granted on 03/08/72 for conversion to provide 4 self contained dwellings and the erection of roof extensions and rear extensions at each of 92, 94, 96 Albert Street.

8670082

Listed building consent was granted on 07/05/86 for demolition of an out-house at the rear and alterations to the rear elevation to provide a new glazed door to replace existing window at basement level.

8670304

Listed building consent was granted on 18/08/86 for internal alterations to provide a bathroom on the first- floor.

Relevant policies

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against. However, it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan Adopted June 2006

S1/S2 Sustainable development

SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 General Design Principles

B3 Alterations and Extensions

B6 Listed Buildings

B7 Conservation areas

H1 New Housing

H7 Lifetime homes

H8 Mix of units

T3 Pedestrians and cycling

T8 Car free housing and car capped housing

T9 Impact on parking

Camden Planning Guidance December 2006

Camden Town Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

Proposal

The proposal is convert the existing single-family dwellinghouse to two residential units, one in the basement and a second over the ground and upper floors. A new external stair would be installed in the front basement lightwell to provide access to the new basement flat. The existing rear extension is to be demolished and

replaced with a three-storey rear extension. To facilitate the conversion some internal works are proposed these include removal of the internal basement to ground floor staircase, modifications to partitioning at basement and first floor level and removal of a chimney breast at basement level.

It is noted that although the building currently operates as a single unit, it is shown on the drawings as having two kitchens and two living rooms. A second floor plan has not been provided. Given the unusual layout it is necessary to consider if the lawful use of the property is as a single-family dwellinghouse. The planning history indicates that planning permission was granted in the 1970s for conversion of the building to 4 flats. It is not clear if this permission was ever implemented, the rear extension appears to relate to this permission, but the roof extension which was also approved has not been constructed. It is possible that the permission was only part implemented or that the rear extension in fact predates this permission. Council tax records indicate that it has only been used as a single unit of accommodation since at least 1993 and in its current form there is no separate access to the basement. There is no record of any enforcement investigation in relation to this property. Although the layout of the accommodation is slightly unusual, there is no evidence to suggest that the building has lawful use either as a number of self-contained flats or as an HMO. On the balance of probability it is considered that the lawful use is as a single-family dwellinghouse and the application should be assessed on this basis.

Land Use

Policy H1 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) states that the Council will grant planning permission for development that provides additional residential accommodation, subject to that accommodation reaching acceptable standards. The proposed conversion of the building from one unit to two residential units is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle.

Mix of Units

The building is currently in use as single-family dwellinghouse. The proposed conversion would provide a 1-bedroom unit in the basement and retain a family sized unit on the ground and upper floors. The retention of a family sized unit is welcomed and the overall mix which incorporates a large and small unit is considered to be acceptable.

Design

The proposed demolition of the existing non-original extension is not considered to harm the special architectural or historic interest of the building. The proposed rear extension is half-width and projects to the same depth as the conservatory at No. 96. The width and depth of the extension is therefore considered to be acceptable. The proposed extension is a storey higher than the existing structure terminating just below the window at first/second floor half-landing level. The proposed height of the extension is not considered to be acceptable. The terrace has a fairly consistent rhythm it largely consists of flat back rear facades with single storey part width closet extensions. There are three notable exceptions those at Nos. 90, 102 and 110 Albert Street. These both appear as incongruous over dominate extensions which harm the appearance of the buildings, the terrace and the conservation area. The extension at No. 90 which extends to first floor level dates from the 1960s. The extension at No. 102 which is 4-storeys in height was also granted in the 1960s. The extension at No. 110 extends to first floor level was granted permission in the 1980s. It is not considered that these extensions two of which predate the listing (90-118 Albert Terrace 1974) and all of which predate current planning policies should justify further inappropriate development along this terrace. The height of the proposed rear extension is considered to dominate the rear elevation of this listed building and would cause further harm to the appearance of the terrace and the conservation area

The proposed rear extension would also result in the loss of the original ground/first floor half landing level window and a section of the masonry below the window. This is considered to harm the original rear façade fenestration pattern, will result in the loss of original historic fabric and a feature of interest as well as harm the character of the stair compartment, particularly between the principal floors. The loss of the window is unacceptable in historic building terms.

The proposed division of the basement would result in the loss of the existing internal staircase to ground floor level. The stair does not appear to be of historic interest, however, a stair in this location is historically accurate and helps shape the plan form and character associated with Georgian properties. Properties such as this were designed as single family dwellings. PPG 15 states that the best use for listed buildings will very often be the use for which the building was originally designed, and the continuation or reinstatement of that use should certainly be the first option when the future of a building is considered. It is not considered to be unviable or in danger of inactive use as a single family dwelling (many of the town houses in this area are occupied as single family dwellings) and as it is considered that the subdivision of the basement which would be harmful to the special architectural and historic interest of the grade II listed building. The proposed removal of chimneybreast at basement level is also considered to be unacceptable in historic building terms. The other

minor internal works to the partitioning are considered to be acceptable.

The proposed installation of a staircase in the front basement lightwell or the formation of a gate in the railings would not unduly impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area or special interest of the listed building, subject to it being suitably designed, which could be dealt with by condition (were permission to be granted).

Amenity

The internal alterations and the works to the front basement lightwell and boundary treatment do not raise any amenity issues. The proposed rear extension stands a storey higher than the existing extension and could potentially impact on the amenity of neighbours. The proposed extension is half-width and is set against the boundary with No. 96. It is considered that it is sufficiently distance from No. 94 not to impact on light or outlook to this property. The increased height adjacent to the boundary of No. 96 will have an impact on this property. No. 96 has a conservatory extension at ground floor level which spans the width of the elevation. There will be some loss of daylight (it does not face within 90 degrees of due south so there will no loss of sunlight) to the conservatory, but given the extent of glazing it is considered that this room will still receive adequate light and a reason for refusal could not be sustained on this basis.

There are no openings proposed in the side elevation facing towards No, 96 so there would be no impact on their privacy. A sash window is proposed on the side elevation which facing towards No. 94, but this faces onto the flank elevation of their own projecting wing and is to be obscure glazed as it serves a bathroom therefore it will not result in any increase in overlooking.

Standard of Accommodation

The basement would provide a one bedroom flat. The layout of the one bedroom flat is considered to be acceptable; with an overall floor space of approximately 36sqm it would be suitable for single-person occupancy. The bedroom would fall slightly short of the 11sqm recommended in Camden Planning Guidance, but at 10.5sqm it is not considered to so undersized that it is substandard.

Light would be provided to the combined kitchen/lounge room by the existing front basement lightwell and the bedroom to the rear would receive light from an existing rear door. The amount of unobstructed glazing to the kitchen/lounge is approximately 0.85sqm, with a floor area of around 20sqm this is well below the 10% requirement. Unobstructed glazing to the bedroom at 0.45sqm (the applicant has not indicated that the existing basement level door is to be replaced, therefore it is assumed that the half timber/half glazed door will continue to be the sole source of light to this room) again falls well below the 10% requirement with a floor space of 10.5sqm. The lack of natural light to the basement flat will make it extremely gloomy and dark, increasing the dependence on electric light and potentially harming the health and well-being of future occupants.

Car and Cycle parking

The proposed development would result in the net increase of one residential unit on site. Policy T8 states that the Council will grant planning permission for car-free housing in areas of on-street parking control and will particularly seek car free housing in areas within CPZs that are easily accessible by public transport. In this case the site is located within a CPZ and a ratio of 1.16 permits had been issued to 1 parking space. The area suffers from parking stress and therefore it is considered appropriate that the additional unit created by designated car-free. In the event that planning permission is refused the lack of a legal agreement to secure the unit as car free should form a reason for refusal.

The proposal includes the creation of an additional flat within the building. No provision has been made for cycle parking. Policy T3 normally requires that one cycle parking space be provided per residential unit. In this case the ground floor unit could easily store a bike within their entrance hall which is accessible off the street. The basement flat does not have level access and does not have access to the ground floor entrance hall so it would not be possible to create an internal store at this level which also provides for this flat. Furthermore, significant intervention in the layout at ground floor level would not be desirable because of the listed status of the building. Given the limited changes that can be made at ground floor level to provide a secure cycle store it is considered that the requirement of this policy should be waived in this instance.

Recommendation: Refuse Permission and Listed Building Consent.

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