

Douglas and King Architects

148-150 Curtain Road London EC3A 3AR
 t + 44 (0)20 7613 1395
 info@douglasandking.com
 www.douglasandking.com

revision	date	notes
A	30/09/14	Updated planning drawings
B	24/09/14	Elevation updated

project
 11 Prince Albert Road, NW1 7SR
 client
 Harrison Varma

drawing title
 Proposed:
 Street Elevation

scale
 1:200@ A2
 date
 JUL 2014
 drawing no
 PARd ga 303 B


PLANNING

Appendix 12

PRIMROSE HILL CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
12A MANLEY STREET, LONDON NW1 8LT.

29 July 2014

Chair and Members of the Development Control Committee
London Borough of Camden.



Dear Councillor,

**Development Control Committee 31 July 2014: Agenda items 7 (4) and 7 (5):
11 Prince Albert Road, London NW1 7SR, app. refs 2014/1054/P and 2014/1066/L**

Following deferral of consideration of this application from 15 July 2014, the PHCAAC discussed the matter at its meeting on 16 July 2014, and unanimously agreed that it wished to make a new request to the Development Control Committee to agree to hear a deputation on behalf of the CAAC, asking you to refuse the applications.

We are most grateful to Councillors on Members' Briefing for asking for these applications to be decided by the Committee.

On behalf of the CAAC, we would address the following:

- We would supplement the officer's report by analysing the special architectural or historic interest of the Listed Building and its setting, and its contribution to the character and appearance of the Primrose Hill conservation area.
- We would refer to the 8 appeals on houses in the group of houses which include 11 Prince Albert Road. These appeals date from 2011 to 2013, and all address the issue of side extensions to these houses. In all of these appeals the Council was supported by the CAAC on behalf of the local community, and in all cases the appeals were dismissed.
- We would outline the harmful impact the proposals would have on both the Listed Building and its setting, and the character and appearance of the conservation area, also commenting on the visibility issues raised in the report. We attach images supporting these arguments.

Yours sincerely,



Chair.

1 page text + 2 pp attached images and notes

PRIMROSE HILL CAAC JULY 2014

PHOTO 1

10 and 11 Prince Albert Road as existing photographed from public road



**No 11 Prince Albert Road
As existing**

No 10 Prince Albert Road

PRIMROSE HILL CAAC JULY 2014

PHOTO 2

10 and 11 Prince Albert Road, as photographed from the public road, but with estimated massing of proposed addition to no. 11 included



Notes:

The PHCAAC's photo-montage has been based on the applicant's drawings showing both existing and proposed upper ground floor plans and existing and proposed front elevations.

The height of the proposed addition is shown on the applicant's drawings as at a level above the triangular pediment of the ground floor window, and a little below the first floor window cill.

The applicant's plans show that the proposed side addition is more than half the width of the garden to the side of the existing house.

Hutter, Hannah

From: Marc Timlin [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2014 10:11
To: RSCDevelopmentControl
Subject: 11 Prince Albert Road - 2014/1054/P & 2014/1066/L

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Dear Sir or Madam,

Turley Heritage are instructed by the applicant as their heritage advisor for these applications.

I understand that these applications are scheduled to be considered at the Development Control Committee this Thursday (31st July) following their deferral from the previous committee on the (15th July).

I note that a representative of the local CAAC was registered to object to the applications at the previous Committee.

In the event that there are deputations or requests by objectors to address Committee I would like to reserve the right to respond on my client, the applicants, behalf.

Please do contact me directly if you would like to discuss.

Kind regards,

Marc

Marc Timlin
Senior Planner, Heritage



turley.co.uk



Think of the environment, please do not print unnecessarily
This e-mail is intended for the above named only, is strictly confidential and may also be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please do not read, print, re-transmit, store or act in reliance on it or any attachments. Instead, please notify the sender and then immediately and permanently delete it.
Turley is a trading name of Turley Associates Ltd, registered in England and Wales Registered No 2235387 Registered Office 1 New York Street, Manchester, M1 4HD.

Appendix 13

[REDACTED]

From: Richard Simpson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 29 March 2014 12:55
To: Carr, Seonaid
Cc: Planning
Subject: 11 Prince Albert Road 2014/1054/P + 2014/1066/L: ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Categories: Orange Category

Dear Seonaid, I very much hope that this very strong objection on this much appealed house is not too late. Best wishes, Richard

ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee

12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT

19 March 2014

11 Prince Albert Road 2014/1054/P + 2014/1066/L

Strong objection.

We note the decision of the Planning Inspector in dismissing the appeals in 2011 (APP/X5210/E/11/2149277 and APP/X5210/A/11/2149781) for a three-storey side extension at this house. The Inspector decided that:

The semi-detached Italianate villas at 10 and 11 Prince Albert Road are unique in the group at 1 to 15 Prince Albert Road for the broad symmetry in their principal façade, as neither building has been extended at the side. Their spacious side gardens contribute in an important way to the original layout of grand villas set in parkland, which can still be appreciated today.

It is clear that the single-storey extension would still erode this original exceptional status in the group as recognized by the Inspector here.

The Inspector also noted that:

the loss of symmetry would harm the unique appearance of the pair of dwellings within the group, it would also harm the special architectural interest of the 15 buildings which are identified for their group value.

This remains true with the current application.

The Inspector also noted that:

Because the proposed extension would harmfully erode the existing spaciousness in the good-sized garden at the side of the dwelling, it would harm the character and the appearance of the Conservation Area.

This also remains true with the current application.

The Inspector also noted that:

the siting of the extension to the side of the dwelling would damage the plan form of the listed building, which is one of its most important characteristics. The construction of the new doorways

needed to reach the extension would also cause an unacceptable loss of historic fabric, and they would harm the balanced composition of the principal rooms leading to them. ... This would harm the historic plan of the house and cause an unacceptable loss of significance.

This also remains true with the current application.

The Advisory Committee would expect to support the Council again at any further appeal.



Richard Simpson FSA
Chair

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/1054/P	Mr Anthony J Parsons	13 Regents Park Road	11/03/2014 14:43:45	COMMNT	<p>I haven't seen these plans, but from the description of only being upto ground-floor level I would not object. However an extension upto 1st floor level I would object to as it could lead to a reduction in sunlight into the houses on Regents Park Road (south-side).</p> <p>I believe the generous seperation of these buildings along Prince Albert Road is a strong positive aesthetically, which is something else to be cautionus about degrading.</p>

NW1 7TL

Appendix 14

Date: 26th November 2013
Our Ref: 2013/7036/PRE
Your Ref:
Contact: Elaine Quigley
Direct Line: 020 7974 5101
Email: Elaine.Quigley@camden.gov.uk

**Development Control
Planning Services**
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

Tel 020 7974 4444
Fax 020 7974 1975
env.devcon@camden.gov.uk
www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Harrison Varma
98 Great North Road
London
N2 0NL

Dear Harrison

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
RESPONSE TO ENQUIRY, REFERENCE 2013/7036/PRE

Excavation of a basement floor to the sides and rear of the existing property, erection of a lower ground side and rear extension and upper ground floor side extension and associated internal alterations associated with the existing single family residential dwelling.

Thank you for your recent enquiry regarding the above. Your email was accompanied by pre-application document that includes drawings entitled Basement – Proposed; Lower Ground Floor – Proposed; Ground Floor – Proposed; Elevation – Proposed (Front elevation); Elevation – Proposed (Side elevation); Elevation – Proposed (Rear elevation).

The response is given specifically in relation to the potential development of the site as suggested by the pre-application documentation submitted. Should your pre-application scheme be altered this advice may become redundant; and this advice may no-longer be considered relevant if adopted planning policies at national, regional or local level are changed or amended; other factors such as case-law and subsequent planning permissions may also affect this advice.

I have now had the opportunity to review the proposal and have received comments for the relevant officers including the conversation officer and tree officer. The following advice is based on the drawings that you have submitted. The letter has been broken into sections for the ease of dealing with each of the planning considerations. The sections do overlap and need to be read collectively in order to provide a comprehensive response.

Planning policy

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that developments must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The document which makes up the development plan is Camden's Local Development Framework (LDF). There are a number of documents making up the LDF, but those primarily of concern in this instance are the Core Strategy (2011), and the Development Policies (2011). Other documents which are of relevance include the Camden Planning Guidance (CPG).

Finally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published in 2012, is an important consideration as well as the London Plan (2011).

Site context

The site is one of a row of 15 detached and semi detached villas which lies on the northern side of Prince Albert Road. The site comprises a three storey plus attic and basement accommodation (Class C3 use) semi-detached single family dwelling house that is finished in stucco and was constructed in the mid-19th century. The building is Grade II listed (1974) and lies within sub area 1 of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. The area is characterised by well laid out mainly residential 19th century development. The spacious side gardens of nos. 10 and 11 Prince Albert Road are unique to the group at nos. 1 to 15 and contribute in an important way to the original lay out of grand villas set in parkland, which can still be appreciated.

Relevant history

Planning permission and listed building consent were refused on 21/12/2010 (ref: 2010/5636/P and 2010/5644/L) for the erection of a three storey side extension at lower ground, ground and first floor levels of single dwelling (class C3). The applicant appealed against the decision and the appeal was dismissed on 07/07/2011.

Impact on historic building and conservation area

This scheme includes excavation of a new basement level to provide health suite facilities for the existing dwelling. The creation of an additional level below an original basement level or lower ground floor level is generally unacceptable in listed buildings as a result of the harmful impact on the planned hierarchy within the building. This is considered to be the case here and excavation of an additional floor level below the original lower ground floor level would not be supported by the Council.

A scheme to create a new basement level at no. 13 was approved in 26/04/2012 (2011/6227/P and 2011/6460/L). However the creation of an additional floor below the original basement level of this building that had been significantly altered internally was seen as an exceptional circumstance and would not set a precedent for similar development on other buildings within this part of Prince Albert Road.

You mentioned a further example of similar development at no. 12 Prince Albert Road. However having checked the planning history of this property permission was granted on 03/11/2009 for a two storey side extension and excavation to extend the existing basement level not create a new floor underneath the original basement level.

This scheme maintains a very substantial lower ground floor extension which seems disproportionate to the size and scale of the listed building. Although the existing basement is already unsympathetically subdivided, the internal alterations also raise issues. The creation of a single large dining room that straddles the spine wall is

rather uncomfortable and this would be exacerbated by the proposed localised reduction in the floor level. This does not preserve the special interest of the listed building, and certainly does not enhance its significance.

The principle of adding a modest single storey side extension at ground floor level is likely to be acceptable. There are several examples of side extensions amongst the group of listed buildings at 1-15 Prince Albert Road, including two storey examples at nos. 7 and 9, single storey extensions at 13 and 14, and a similar addition permitted but not yet implemented at no.12. Although the Council resisted a single storey side extension at no.15 this was due to its particular topographical and visual relationship with the surrounding buildings and canal.

It is considered that a traditional approach would be the most successful in this very sensitive location. Whilst contemporary highly glazed facades to new additions are sometimes acceptable on listed buildings, in this case a more modest and reticent addition is considered appropriate given the tightly developed surrounding context and visibility of the rear elevations of the group from the adjacent Regent's Park Road properties. Further comment could be offered if detailed elevations are submitted.

From the front elevation drawing submitted it seems that the height of the proposed extension could be slightly reduced. Furthermore, the proposal projects beyond the original rear building line of the building at lower ground floor level and would not be visually subordinate. We would normally expect a side extension to be set in from both the front and rear building lines so as to provide a clear visual distinction.

An opening is proposed into the new side extension from the rear room at ground floor level. This is currently shown as a modestly sized opening. A very large opening however is also shown through the spine wall so as to link the front and rear rooms. This creates the impression of a large open plan space which detracts from the cellular plan form and spatial quality of the listed building at this principal floor level. A reduction in the width of the opening in the spine wall to a double traditional double door would be more appropriate.

Basement works

The works would include excavation works underneath the side patio area at basement, lower and upper ground floor levels. It would be necessary to submit a basement impact assessment as part of any future planning application.

DP27 of Camden's Development Plan Policies states that the Council will only permit basement and other underground development that does not cause harm to the built and natural environment and local amenity, and does not result in flooding or ground instability. You are reminded that any BIA should rigidly follow the sequential approach (screening stage and where necessary scoping stages) that is set out in the Council's CPG4 (Basements and Lightwells) and should include information about (i) surface flow and flooding, (ii) land stability (including structural stability of neighbouring properties) and (iii) groundwater flow. You would be expected to identify how these issues impact on neighbouring properties and the natural environment.

Basements can raise a number of issues which would need to be addressed as part of any submission. This is especially important in this location given that this is a part of the borough which has been subject to flooding in the past. My advice is to refer to the Council's CPG4 (Basements and lightwells) which supplements policy DP27. This describes the potential issues involved and provides a detailed methodology for assessing the impacts, and a basement impact assessment (BIA) should strictly

follow this methodology to demonstrate that potential issues have been addressed. The CPG advises that there are several situations where basement impact assessments should be independently assessed. These include:

- Where a scheme requires applicant to proceed beyond the screening stage of the basement impact assessment (i.e. where a matter of concern has been identified which requires the preparation of a full basement impact assessment)
- Where the proposed basement development is located within an area of concern regarding slope stability, surface water or groundwater flow: or
- For any other basement applications where the Council feels that independent verification would be appropriate (e.g. where conflicting evidence is provided in response to a proposal).

If a BIA proceeds beyond the screening stage on any of the issues of concern it will be necessary for an independent review to be carried out. The costs are normally borne by the applicant, so it is appropriate to raise this at an early stage.

Residential development standards

Policies CS6, CS18, DP6, DP17, and DP28 are of relevance, as is CPG2 (Housing). Due to the objection raised to the principle of the newly created basement level the issues associated with the additional floorspace created at this level will not be discussed.

The proposal would create additional floorspace to provide a playroom/family room at lower ground floor level and dining room at upper ground floor level. Natural light into the lower ground and upper ground floor space would be provided by windows that face into the garden and into the front forecourt of the property. This would provide adequate level of natural light into these rooms and would be considered acceptable.

Amenity

Prince Albert Road is to the south of Regent's Park Road, and the site is bounded by the gardens of nos. 13, 15, and 17 Regent's Park Road and is adjacent to no. 10 and 12 Prince Albert Road.

DP26 of Camden's Development Policies states that Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The lower ground floor extension would extend up to 2.3m from the boundary with the neighbouring property at no. 12. The drawings show that no windows would be installed in the side elevation of the new side extension. There would therefore be no direct overlooking from windows into the neighbouring property at no. 12. Elevation and section drawings should be submitted as part of any future planning application to illustrate the extent of the works that will be visible above ground due to the fall in the ground level from the front to the back of the site. The proposed upper ground floor side extension would be located approximately 3m from the boundary with no. 12. There is a substantial level of soft planting between the boundary of this property and the neighbouring property at no. 12. Given the size of the extension and its separation distance from the neighbouring property it is considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of this property in terms of daylight and sunlight.

The proposal would include new window openings on the rear elevation of the single storey rear and two storey side extension. The separation distance between the windows in the rear elevation of the new side extension and the windows of the neighbouring properties along Regent's Park Road would be approximately 15m. CPG6 (Amenity) advises that there should normally be a minimum distance of 18m between the windows of habitable rooms of different units that directly face each

other. The glazing would generally follow the pattern of the window openings in the existing upper floor levels of the rear elevation of the building. Given the separation distance between the properties the number and size of the windows would not appear to result in additional harmful overlooking above the existing situation. However it would be useful to submit an existing and proposed long section through the house showing the position and height of the existing rear boundary treatment between your client's property and the neighbouring properties in order to fully understand and assess the impact of the new window openings in relation to the neighbouring properties.

An external terrace area would be created along the rear elevation of the existing building and to the rear of the new side extension at upper ground floor level. Given the depth of the rear garden and close proximity of the rear elevations of the neighbouring properties fronting onto Regent's Park Road, the proposed terrace would allow direct views into the windows of these properties. This would be considered unacceptable as it would result in direct harmful overlooking of the windows of the neighbouring properties.

Trees

Policy CS14 and DP24 are relevant in the consideration of issues relating to trees. There are some key trees on the site and adjoining sites which the Council would seek to retain and protect as part of any development. These trees provide a high level of visual amenity and contribute to the character of the conservation area. It would be necessary to submit the following information in support of any future planning application:

- Pre-development survey
- Arboricultural constraints plan
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- Tree Protection Plan and Method Statement

Construction management plan

Due to the sensitive nature of the site in terms of the historic building and in keeping with policy DP21 which seeks to protect the safety and operation of the highway network, it may be necessary to submit a draft construction management plan with any application for basement works. This should outline how construction works will be carried out and how the works would be services (delivery of materials, set down and collection of skips). I have attached a copy of the details required by a CMP. You are advised that if a CMP is required to be submitted as part of the proposal this would be secured by s106 legal agreement.

You are advised that any occupation of the highway, such as for hoarding, skips or storage of materials, would require a licence from Highways Management.

You are advised that the Council's Transport Team has not been formally consulted on the pre-application proposal and the advice given above is general advice relating to works of this scale and kind. If a planning application is submitted for these works consultation with the Transport Team will be undertaken as part of this process and further advice may require amendments to be made to the proposal.

Planning obligations

CPG8 (Planning obligations) provides full details of planning obligations which would be likely as a result of development, to mitigate its impact. My initial view is that there is likely to be a number of obligations sought including:

- Construction management plan
- Highways works contribution

CIL

Given that the proposal would result in the creation of approximately 120 sq. m new residential floorspace that exceeds 100 sq. m the development would be liable towards the Mayoral CIL. The CIL contribution is calculated at £50 per sq. m.

Planning application process and supporting information

Please ensure that you submit all the required information in accordance with the validation checklist, details of which can be obtained from the council's website:

<http://camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/making-an-application>.

In addition to the necessary forms, certificates, and drawings to fully illustrate what is proposed my view is that the following documents would be required in order for the submission to be a valid planning application:

- Heritage statement
- Basement impact assessment
- Independent arboricultural report
- Design and access statement
- Draft construction management plan

Consultation

You should consult with neighbouring properties prior to the submission of any planning application in order to discuss any concerns that they may have regarding the proposal (including those on Regent's Park Road). The Council would formally notify neighbouring properties that have contiguous boundaries with the site in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The site is within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. Therefore the Council would notify the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) about any future planning application.

Conclusion

Based on what has been provided the principle of a new basement floor level below the original basement level of the house would not be supported by the Council. A single storey side extension may be considered acceptable subject to its detailed design. A lower ground floor extension may be acceptable however its size should be reduced to ensure that it is proportionate to the size and scale of the listed building. The creation of a rear external terrace along the rear elevation of the existing and newly extended property would be considered to adversely affect the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy and should be reconsidered. I would expect most of the other issues to be dependent on the eventual design parameters.

This document represents the Council's initial view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage. Please note that if you (the applicant or their representative) have drafted any notes of the pre-application meeting(s) held with the council you cannot assume that these are agreed unless you have received written confirmation of this from the case officer.

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact **Elaine Quigley** on **020 7974 5101**

Yours sincerely,

Elaine Quigley
Senior Planner
West Area Team – Development Management