

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		17/11/2014	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		23/10/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Alex McDougall				2014/5768/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
7A Egbert Street London NW1 8LJ				Refer to draft decision notice.			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature		C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature			
Proposal(s)							
Erection of two storey lower ground floor rear infill extension, increase in height of rear outrigger, infill of window on rear elevation, and enclosure of area under front stairs.							
Recommendation(s):		Grant planning permission					
Application Type:		Full planning permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	6	No. of responses No. electronic	00 00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:		Site Notice 26/09/14 – 17/10/14. Press Notice: 02/10/14 – 23/10/14. No responses received.					
Primrose Hill CAAC comments:		Primrose Hill CAAC have objected on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Design</i> – The visual integrity of the original rear outriggers should be maintained by setting the infill back slightly from the rear elevation and maintaining the side parapet of the outrigger (Officer Comment: The applicant submitted revised drawings which responded to these concerns. Please see Section 3.1 for more information.) <i>Design</i> – The drawings do not provide details of the method for enclosing the section of lightwell under the front steps (Officer Comment: See Sections 1.1d and 3.4 below for more information.) 					
Site Description							

The site is occupied by a 3 storey plus basement mid-terrace Victorian building on the south-eastern side of Egbert Street. The building is in use as three residential units, consisting of a maisonette at basement/ground level (subject of this application) and flats at first and second floor. The area is characterised by residential properties. The dwelling is identified as making a positive contribution to the character of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. The site is identified as being potentially contaminated due to industrial history.

Relevant History

7 Egbert Street (application site)

TP83050 - Conversion of No. 7 Egbert Street, St.Pancras, into three self-contained dwelling units. Granted 03/04/1959.

2013/6524/P - Erection of a mansard roof with front and rear dormers, and associated creation of a roof terrace to flat (Class C3). Granted 21/01/2014.

5 Egbert Street (attached property)

2009/3238/P - Erection of a two storey rear infill extension and associated works to a dwelling house (Class C3). Granted 01/09/2009.

2014/4673/P - Installation of cast iron spiral stairs in front lightwell area and rear garden, including replacement of doors to front vaults, and replacement of front window and replacement of french doors. Granted 13/10/2014.

9 Egbert Street (attached property)

J10/3/2/5378 - Conversion of No. 9, Egbert Street, Camden to 2 self-contained flats and erection of an extension at rear. Granted 04/07/1968.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

National Planning Practice Guidance

London Plan 2011

London Housing SPG

Camden LDF Core Strategy 2010

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS13 Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS18 Dealing with our waste and encouraging recycling

Camden Development Policies 2010

DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction

DP23 Water

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

DP28 Noise and vibration

DP29 Improving access

Camden Planning Guidance (updated 2013)

CPG1 Design

CPG2 Housing
CPG3 Sustainability
CPG6 Amenity

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement 2001

Assessment

1. Detailed Description of Proposed Development

1.1. The proposed works are detailed as follows:

- a) *Rear extension* - Erection of two storey lower ground floor rear infill extension. The rear extension would have a flat roof and the rear elevation would be comprised of floor to ceiling full-width glazing. The extension would have dimensions 2.7m (W) x 3.5m (D) x 5.6m (H). The depth of the extension is 100mm short of the existing original outrigger. The rear garden would be reduced from 37.7sqm to 27.9sqm, a reduction of 26%.
- b) *Alterations to rear outrigger* - Increase in the height of the original rear outrigger by 0.9m. The additional height would be constructed in matching brick.
- c) *Alterations to fenestration* - Infill of the existing lower ground floor rear window. The window and opening have been previously altered. The infill would be in matching brick.
- d) *Alterations to front lightwell* - Infill of area under front steps. The open southern side would be enclosed in a single piece of glazing cut to fit. This area is to be enclosed to enable the use of the existing vaults as an en-suite bathroom.

1.2. During the course of assessment the applicant submitted revised drawings increasing the amount of glazing in the rear extension, setting it in slightly, and reducing its height in response to concerns from Council Officers and the Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

2. Principle of Development

2.1. *Alterations and Additions*

Alterations and additions are considered to be acceptable in principle subject to a detailed assessment on the following grounds; conservation and design; residential amenity; standard of accommodation; landscaping; contamination and sustainability.

3. Conservation and Design

3.1. *Rear extension*

The proposed rear extension is considered to be of an acceptable design and have an acceptable impact on the character of the conservation area for the following reasons:

- a) The proposal extends slightly less than the depth of the existing outrigger and is slightly lower in height, helping to maintain the visual integrity of the original outrigger.
- b) The height of the extension is considered to be in keeping with the scale of the original building and would not make the proposal overly prominent when viewed from the public realm or any adjoining or nearby properties.
- c) The proposal maintains 74% of the original rear garden.
- d) While the proposed fenestration is not in keeping with the style of the building, it is considered to be acceptable as it is below first floor level, on the rear elevation, and thus not readily visible from any public space or adjoining/nearby properties. Furthermore, the lightweight appearance of the glazing would help to maintain the visual integrity of the original outrigger.
- e) Similar extensions exist, and have been approved, at several nearby properties, including the two immediately adjoining properties (see history section above). The presence of the two adjoining extensions restricts views of the proposal.

3.2. Alterations to rear outrigger

The proposed alterations to the rear outrigger are considered to be of an acceptable design and have an acceptable impact on the character of the conservation area for the following reasons:

- a) The proposed height is less than that of the immediately adjoining extension to the north and significantly less than that of the extended outrigger to the south. As such the proposal would not appear overly dominant or out of character.
- b) The parapet would be built up and maintained to the side of the outrigger so as to help maintain the visual integrity of the original outrigger.
- c) The outrigger would be built up in matching materials. The proposal can make use of the bricks recovered from the demolition of the side walls of the outrigger. Notwithstanding, a condition is recommended requiring that matching materials be used.

3.3. Alterations to fenestration

The proposed alterations to fenestration are considered to be of an acceptable design and have an acceptable impact on the character of the conservation area for the following reasons:

- a) The proposal would infill an existing unsympathetic and non-original window considered to be of little value.
- b) A replacement window in this location is unlikely to be properly detailed.
- c) The rear lower ground floor is not readily visible from any public places or adjoining properties.
- d) The window would be in-filled with matching materials. The proposal can make use of the bricks recovered from the demolition of the side walls of the outrigger. Notwithstanding, a condition is recommended requiring that matching materials be used.

3.4. Alterations to front lightwell

Egbert Street is characterised by stair 'bridges' between the street and the front door of each dwelling. The proposal is to be finished in a single pane of glazing cut to match the opening. The lightweight appearance of the glazing is considered to maintain the visual integrity of the stairs and maintain a setting that is in keeping with the other stairs in the street. One set of stairs in the street was in-filled with a solid wall and it interrupts the rhythm of lightwells in the street. As such the proposed alterations to the front lightwell are considered to be of an acceptable design and have an acceptable impact on the character of the conservation area.

For the reasons listed above the proposed development is considered to be consistent with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of the London Borough of Camden's Local Development Framework as well as Camden Planning Guidance on Design.

4. Residential Amenity

4.1. Rear extension

The proposed rear extension is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining and nearby properties for the following reasons:

- a) Due to the height and nature of the existing extension and adjoining extension to the south the proposal would add minimal additional bulk, no additional sense of enclosure or loss of outlook, and result in no loss of light to adjoining properties.

- b) The construction of such an extension is not likely to be particularly difficult or lengthy. As such a construction management plan is not considered to be necessary. Any excessive noise or disturbance can be referred to Council's Environmental Health team. An informative will detail the standard hours of construction.
- c) The openings in the rear extension are not considered likely to have an unacceptable light spill into adjoining and nearby properties as they face away from adjoining and nearby windows.
- d) The proposal results in a flat roof that would be easily accessible from an existing rear window. Use of this space as a terrace would unacceptably impact the amenity of adjoining and nearby properties. As such a condition is recommended requiring that this space not be used as a terrace.

4.2. Alterations to rear outrigger

The outrigger would remain lower than the extensions/outriggers on the immediately adjoining properties. As such the outlook, sense of enclosure, and light of adjoining and nearby properties would not be materially affected.

4.3. Alterations to front lightwell

The proposed front infill extension is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining and nearby properties as it is below ground level and as such would not impact on the solar access, sense of enclosure, outlook or privacy of any adjoining or nearby properties.

For the reasons listed above the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Development Policy DP26 of the London Borough of Camden's Local Development Framework.

5. Standard of Accommodation

The proposal is considered to provide an adequate standard of accommodation for the following reasons:

- a) The floor to ceiling height of the proposed extension are in keeping with the existing height at lower ground level and exceed the CPG2 standard at upper ground floor level.
- b) The proposal would receive adequate light from large areas of south facing rear glazing.
- c) The proposal would maintain a private open space area commensurate with the size of the dwelling.

6. Landscaping

The proposal is considered to be acceptable with regard to landscaping as the extension is not within the vicinity of any large trees and maintains an adequately sized rear garden.

7. Contamination

The site is identified as being potentially contaminated. It is noted that the building to the rear of the site is industrial in nature. The proposed extension does not require any excavation other than for footings. Due to the small scale of excavation the proposal is considered unlikely to disturb contaminated soils to an extent likely to endanger human health. As such no further testing is considered to be necessary.

8. Sustainability

LDF Policy DP22 requires developments to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures. The proposed rear extension would be built to modern insulation and energy use requirements. Given the small scale of the proposal this is considered to be satisfactory.

9. Recommendation

9.1. Grant Planning Permission.