

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		19/05/2014	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		24/04/2014	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Obote Hope				1) 2014/1504/P 2) 2014/1562/L			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
87 Leather Lane London EC1N 7TS				Refer to 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>							
1) The erection of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of existing rear addition. 2) The erection of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of existing rear addition.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Refuse Planning Permission</b> <b>Refuse Listed Building Consent</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		1) <b>Full Planning Permission</b> 2) <b>Listed Building Consent</b>					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>34</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 between 3 April and 24 April and a press notice was in place between 3 April and 24 April.  The application was re-consulted on the 7 <sup>th</sup> May 2014 – 28 May 2014 due to drawings not being displayed correctly.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>		No CAACs or residents associated with Hatton Garden Conservation Area.					

### Site Description

The application site is located to the west elevation north of Clerkenwell Road. Grade II listed building within the Hatton Garden conservation area dating from the early C18. One of a group of 4 terraced houses with later shops at ground floor level, the first, second and third floor are in residential use as a maisonette. The property is within the Hatton Garden Conservation Area.

### Relevant History

N/A

### Relevant policies

## **NPPF 2012**

### **London Plan 2011**

## **LDF Core Strategy 2010**

CS1 – Distribution of growth

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

## **Development Policies 2010**

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbour

## **Camden Planning Guidance 2013**

CPG1 – Design Ch 1, 2, 3, 4 (in particular para 4.12 -4.13, p27).

CPG6 – Amenity Ch 1, 6, 7

## **Hatton Garden Conservation Area Statement 1999**

### **Assessment**

#### **1.0 Proposal**

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a full width extension at first floor level on the existing rear terraced area.

#### **2.0 Design**

2.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all development, including where alterations and extensions to existing buildings are proposed. The following considerations contained within policy DP24 which are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; development should consider the character and proportions of the existing building, where extensions and alterations are proposed; developments should consider the quality of materials to be used.

2.2 Policy DP25 'Conserving Camden's Heritage' states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2.3 Camden Design Guidance states that rear extensions should be secondary to the building being extended in terms of form, scale, proportions dimensions and detailing. It should also respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style and also respect and preserve the historic pattern and not cause harm to amenity of adjacent properties (paragraph 4.10, P27). Furthermore, in relation to heights of extensions it should be subordinate to the original building, and should respect the existing pattern of rear extensions, and that extensions that are higher than one full storey below eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring extensions, will strongly be discouraged (para 4.12 -4.13, p27)

2.4 At present, there is a brick lean-to addition at this level, which houses a staircase and WC and which sits atop a full width, full depth ground floor addition. The existing extension measures approximately 2.8m in width x 8.1m depth x between 3.8m – 3.4m in height.

2.5 The proposed works would involve the demolition of the existing lean-to extension and the erection of a 3.5m width x 7.0m depth x 3.8m (height)

2.6 The application has been made without the benefit of an accompanying Heritage Statement and the small description that was attached to the design and access statement was not detailed enough to demonstrate that there is no impact to the listed building. Therefore, the proposal is assessed solely on the plans that were submitted. It's considered that the overall scale, form and positioned are considered to be over-dominant and therefore unsympathetic to the setting of the host building. The form and detailed design are at such that it over-elaborate and bulky and lacks consideration in context.

2.7 Furthermore, the full width extension at first floor level would not be considered would protect the architectural period and style and also respect and preserve the historic pattern of the host building

(paragraph 4.10, P27). The proposed extension was design to be of a similar size to it's neighbours. However the size, bulk and seting of the proposed extension would have a detrimental impact to the listed building due to its form and design. Notwithstanding, it's not considered that the extension would not be a subordinate addition to the houst building and the cumulative impact of the proposed extension would fail to enhance or preserve the special character of host building to the detriment of the host building.

### **3.0 Amenity**

3.1 The proposal would add an additional floor level and would not project beyond the back of the existing full neighbouring properties. The design of the proposed extension would not have a detrimental impact, as the current roof terrace has high screening and it is not anticipated that the rear first floor extension given the property's location, ensures there would not be any significant harm in terms of loss of light, privacy or sense of enclosure. Furthermore, if the application was supported the flat roof would only be used for maintenance purposing only, secured via condition to prevent it becoming a terrace and leading to amenity issues to the amenity of neighbours in terms of loss of privacy.

### **5.0 Recommendation**

5.1 Refuse planning permission and listed building consent.