

<b>Delegated Report</b> (Members' briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	02/04/2014
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	13/03/2014
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Jenna Litherland			(i) 2014/0954/P (ii) 2014/1019/L		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
20 Prince Albert Road London NW1 7ST			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>					
(i) Erection of single-storey rear extension at basement level (following demolition of existing conservatory) and replacement of door on rear elevation at lower ground floor level in connection with change of use of basement and ground floor from 2 x 2-bedroom flats to a 1x 3-bedroom maisonette (Class C3).  (ii) Erection of single-storey rear extension at basement level (following demolition of existing conservatory), replacement of door on rear elevation at lower ground floor level and internal alterations in connection with change of use of basement and ground floor from 2 x 2-bedroom flats to a 1x 3-bedroom maisonette (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		(i) Grant conditional planning permission. (ii) Refuse listed building consent.			
<b>Application Type:</b>		(i) Full planning permission. (ii) Listed building consent.			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	12	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 19/02/2014 until 12/03/2014. A press notice was placed in the Ham and High on 20/02/2014 (expired 13/03/2014). Letters were sent to 12 adjoining occupiers.</p> <p>One letter of objection has been received from Flat 1, No. 19 Prince Albert Road.</p> <p>Objections are on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No extensions have been added to the rear of any of the houses on Prince Albert Road in the block between Primrose Hill Park and St Mark's Church. All these properties have a particularly attractive rear façade, each with a central semi-circular glazed staircase tower rising three storeys. Each house has original wrought iron balustrade balcony. The OS plan shows extensions to the rear of No. 19 which do not exist. <b>(See paragraph 6.5 for the case officer's response)</b></li><li>The works will require access to the garden of No. 19 and will result in disturbance, noise and loss of privacy. <b>(See paragraphs 7.1-7.6 for the case officer's response)</b></li><li>The boundary wall with No. 19 will increase in height from 1.7 metres to 2.7 metres resulting in loss of light to the bedroom windows to the rear of No. 19. <b>(See paragraphs 7.1-7.6 for the case officer's response)</b></li><li>Noise from the proposed kitchen, particularly slamming of kitchen cabinets, will disrupt the occupiers of No. 19. <b>(See paragraphs 7.1-7.6 for the case officer's response)</b></li></ul>					
Primrose Hill CAAC comments:	<p>Objection:</p> <p>1. We object to the loss of the framing to the lower ground floor external door caused by the configuration of the abutment of the new extension to the original rear wall. This is wholly avoidable, and should be redesigned.</p> <p>2. The replacement extension should be linked to the existing rear wall with a glazed section, to protect the visual integrity of the rear wall itself, which is an important element in the Listed Building.</p> <p><b>(See paragraph 6.6 for the case officer's response to points 1 and 2)</b></p> <p>3. The abutment of the proposed roof to the soffit of the ground floor balcony also harms the visual value of the balcony: the roof section set at the lower level (gutter?) could be extended to achieve visual separation and still allow adequate flashing to the rear wall.</p>					

	<i>(See paragraph 6.3 for the case officer's response to point 3)</i>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------

## Site Description

No. 20 Prince Albert Road is a Grade II listed building, one of 3 semi-detached pairs of villas, linked by side porticoes. The buildings date from the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century and are located within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. The property in question was converted into four self-contained flats following planning permission which was granted in 1957. This proposal affects the upper and lower ground floor flats. There is a uPVC/aluminium conservatory attached to the rear of the lower ground floor flat which was granted planning permission and listed building consent in 2002.

## Relevant History

**2013/0508/P & 2013/0545/L:** Erection of single-storey rear extension at basement level (following demolition of existing conservatory) and internal alterations in connection with change of use of basement and ground floor from 2 x 2-bedroom flats to a 1x 3-bedroom maisonette (Class C3).

**Withdrawn following advice from the case officer that the proposal would not be acceptable owing to the location of the internal staircase.**

**PEX0101023 - LEX0101024:** Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a new single storey conservatory extension. **Granted planning permission and listed building consent 18/06/2002.**

No. 18 Prince Albert Road

**2004/1159/P - 2004/1162/L:** Change of use and works of conversion from basement flat (flat 1) and raised ground floor flat (flat 2) to a single family dwelling. **Grant conditional permission 12/05/2004.**

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2012

### London Plan 2011

### Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Plan Policies 2010

**CS5:** Managing the impact of growth and development

**CS6:** Providing quality homes

**CS14:** Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

**DP2:** Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing

**DP5:** Homes of different sizes

**DP24:** Securing high quality design

**DP25:** Conserving Camden's heritage

**DP26:** Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

### Camden Planning Guidance 2013

**CPG1 – Design** (Chapters 3 and 4).

**CPG2 – Housing** (Chapter 5).

### Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement 2000

## Assessment

1. Planning permission and listed building consent are sought for the erection of single-storey rear extension at basement level (following demolition of existing conservatory), replacement of door on rear elevation at lower ground floor level and internal alterations in connection with change of use of basement and ground floor from 2 x 2-bedroom flats to a 1x 3-bedroom maisonette (Class C3).
2. The proposed rear extension has a footprint similar to the existing conservatory at the site. The existing conservatory has a depth of 5.4 metres, a width of 3.8 metres and is set 0.3 metres from the boundary with No. 19. The proposed extension has a depth of 5.4 metres, a width of

4.1 metres, but is set on the boundary with No. 19. The existing conservatory has an eaves height of 2.4 metres rising to 3 metres at the ridge. The proposed extension is flat roofed with a height of 2.6 metres with the boundary wall being built up to 2.7 metres adjacent to the extension. The extension would be finished in brick to match the existing house and the fenestration would be bi-folding timber framed doors.

3. The proposal is near identical to applications 2013/0508/P & 2013/0545/L which were withdrawn following advice from officers that the proposals were unacceptable. The differences between the current application and the previously withdrawn application are minor design changes to the rear doors on the rear elevation of the single storey extension and that the current proposal also includes replacement of a door on the rear elevation of the building at lower ground floor level.

4. The material planning considerations in relation to the assessment of the proposal relate to the acceptability of the conversion in land use policy terms, impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the listed building and the conservation area, impact on neighbour amenity, and impact on transport.

5. **Land Use**

- 5.1. The proposal will not result in the loss of residential floorspace; however it will result in the loss of one unit. Policy DP2 states that the Council will resist development that will result in the loss of 2 or more homes. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in land use terms. The proposal will create a 3 bedroom dwelling and provision of a family sized home is compliant with Policy DP5.

6. **Impact on Historic Building and Conservation Area**

- 6.1. The physical works comprise of erection of a single storey rear extension to replace the existing conservatory; replacement of a non-original external door on the rear elevation and a number of internal alterations allowing for the conversion of the two flats to one maisonette, to help streamline the layout on both the upper and lower ground floors, and to generally upgrade the property.

- 6.2. Rear extension - The demolition of the existing conservatory at lower ground floor (garden) level, which is just over a decade old, is considered to be acceptable as it does not involve the removal of historic fabric and the design has a somewhat out-dated appearance. The replacement extension will occupy the same footprint in depth and a slightly wider footprint in width so that it will take the line of the party wall which divides the garden with No. 19 Prince Albert Road.

- 6.3. The overall height will not exceed the ridge height of the existing conservatory although the extension will have a flat roof which will be taller at the point of the eaves. The roof will have a lead finish to match the lead cladding of the historic upper ground floor balconette, and will skirt the balconette so that it continues to read as a separate architectural component. The CAAC raised concern that the roof of the extension harms the visual value of the balcony. However, the Conservation Officer considers that junction between the roof and the balcony has been carefully designed to ensure the roof sits below the balcony and will not impact on the appearance of the balcony.

- 6.4. There will be two slightly raised horizontal rooflights projecting from the roof which will not compromise the architectural character of the building. The solid walls of the extension will be constructed from brick which should match the brick of the main rear elevation of the building.

The extension will be fenestrated by two sections of bi-folding doors constructed from timber, each occupying a stretch of the north and east walls. The central section on the east elevation has been revised since the previous application so it is centred along the line of the upper ground floor window opening onto the balconette directly above. This is welcomed. Details of the bricks would be secured by condition to ensure they are an appropriate match.

- 6.5. An objection from a neighbour raised concern about the principle of adding a rear extension to this row of properties which they considered unaltered. However, this proposal is for erection of an extension to replace an existing conservatory which is of a similar size to the proposal. As such, the principle of an extension in this location has already been accepted. The design of the extension is considered to better respect the special interest of the listed building than the current conservatory.
- 6.6. The CAAC have raised concern about the loss of the framing of the lower ground floor door which currently leads to the conservatory. The doors would be removed; however, the rear wall and the original opening would remain in place. The Conservation Officer considers this is sufficient to ensure the proposal would not impact on the special interest of the listed building.
- 6.7. The proposal also includes replacement of a non-original lower ground floor garden entrance door. The door would be the same size and design therefore, as the existing is not original, its replacement is considered acceptable and will not impact on the special interest of the listed building.
- 6.8. Internal alterations - The original layout of the upper and lower ground floors is still apparent despite the alterations which took place in the late 1950s as part of the conversion of the house to four flats. The majority of the proposed internal alterations are sympathetic to the historic interest of the interior and in many cases help to reinforce the original plan form. However, there are major concerns regarding the insertion of a new staircase to directly link the upper and lower ground floors. The concerns relate to the position of the staircase, up against and perpendicular to the party wall shared with No 19, carving up the plan form approximately at its midpoint adjacent to the original spinal wall at each level, and involving the loss of a notable area of original floor structure. Although it will occupy the position at upper ground floor level of a non-original bathroom (a feature which is out of keeping with the special interest of this principal floor and which probably would not receive listed building consent in the current policy and guidance regime), it will be an alien structure as it divides up the lower ground floor which retains much of its original plan form including the immediately adjacent spinal wall between the front and rear principal rooms of the floor.
- 6.9. It should be noted that in 2004 planning permission ref 2004/1159/P and listed building consent ref 2004/1162/L were granted for the conversion of the two upper and lower ground floor flats into a maisonette at No. 18 Prince Albert Road which is a near identical property to No. 20. An alternative position was selected for the connecting staircase between the two floors, within the rear bow projection which at No. 20 currently houses a WC at upper ground floor level and part of a bedroom at lower ground floor level. The entrance to the maisonette was directly off the main stair hall of the property, directly behind this bow projection. This would be considered a more appropriate position for the stair case. A brief discussion with the Council's Building Control Officer for Primrose Hill has established that this position is likely to be acceptable both in terms of current Building Regulations as well as in listed building terms.
- 6.10. These alterations have been suggested to the applicant; however, the applicant advised that this solution would not be suitable owing to the low ceiling height under the main stair of the house which is adjacent to the rear bow where officers suggested that staircase could be located. Officers have suggested solutions to address this concern such as lowering the floor

in this location which would be considered not to impact on the special interest of the building. However, the applicant has not made any revisions to the application.

- 6.11. Although the general principles behind this proposal are acceptable, the location of the staircase is considered to harm the spatial quality of the original floor plan of the house harming the special interest of the listed building. The listed building application will therefore be refused on this basis alone.

## **7. Residential amenity**

- 7.1. A consultation response expressed concern that the proposed development would impact on daylight, privacy and noise to the occupier of No. 19.
- 7.2. The bedroom window at No. 19 at lower ground floor level is set around 1.2 metres in from the boundary with No. 19. The main difference between the existing situation and the proposed is that the boundary wall is increasing by 1 metre in height from 1.7 metres to 2.7 metres. However, it should be noted that at present there is a trellis with dense planting above this boundary wall rising to a height of around 2.4 metres. As such, any loss of daylight to the bedroom at No. 19 as a result of the proposal would be minimal. It is not considered that the proposal would harm neighbour amenity in terms of loss of daylight or indeed outlook.
- 7.3. The proposed extension is at lower ground floor level only and the garden is bound by high boundary walls; as such, the proposal would not impact on privacy of the neighboring properties. An objection raised concern over loss of privacy during the construction works as the proposed boundary wall would need to be demolished. This would be a temporary situation which would not impact on the long terms enjoyment of the neighbouring property.
- 7.4. Concern has also been raised in relation to noise from the use of the lower ground floor room closest to the party wall with No. 19. Building regulations would control insulation on the boundary.
- 7.5. The conversion of two units into one would have no detrimental impact on neighbour amenity.
- 7.6. The proposals are acceptable in terms of impact on neighbour amenity.

## **8. Transport**

- 8.1. As the proposal results in a reduction in the number of dwellings by converting two dwellings into one dwelling, demand for parking and refuse storage will be reduced.

## **9. Conclusion**

- 9.1. The principle of the conversion of the two residential units into one is considered acceptable as is the erection of the single storey rear extension. However, the proposed internal alterations namely, the creation of the staircase between the ground and lower ground floor is considered to be an alien structure which divides up the lower ground floor which retains much of its original plan form including the immediately adjacent spinal wall between the front and rear principal rooms of the floor, harming the special interest of the listed building.

10. **Recommendation:** Grant conditional planning permission and refuse listed building consent.

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 15 September 2014. For further**

information please go to [www.camden.gov.uk](http://www.camden.gov.uk) and search for 'members briefing'