

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		29/07/2015	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		06/08/2015	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Patrick Marfleet				2015/3137/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Flat 2, 2 Albert Terrace London NW1 7SU				See draft decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a single storey side infill extension and alterations to rear fenestration at rear lower ground floor.							
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	16	No. of responses No. electronic	09 09	No. of objections	08
Summary of consultation responses:		Site notice: 15/07/2015 - 05/08/2015 Press notice: 16/07/2015 - 06/08/2015 Objections have been received from 8 adjoining properties (2 & 3 Albert Terrace, 1,2 & 3 Albert Terrace Mews, 16 Princess Rd): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed timber cladding is completely out of character and would have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding conservation area. 2. The side extension would lead to the unacceptable erosion of rear garden space at the site, contrary to the Councils design guidance. 3. The proposed windows to the rear of the property would cause an undue loss of privacy to the neighbouring dwellings at Albert Terrace Mews. 4. The information submitted by the applicant is misleading as it refers to restoring the proportions of the building. Whilst it might make the building more symmetrical, nothing is being restored. 5. The size, scale and bulk of the extension is excessive and would lead 					

	<p>to the overdevelopment of the site and loss of neighbouring amenity.</p> <p><i>Officer response:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The timber cladding has been removed from the proposed plans and replaced with a traditional rendered finish to match the existing property.</i> 2. <i>See paragraph 2.3.4</i> 3. <i>See paragraph 2.3.3</i> 4. <i>Whilst the applicant has made various references to restoration in their supporting information, it is clear that the extension is a completely new development and not a restoration of the property's original features or built form.</i> 5. <i>The proposed extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of its size and design and would appear as a subordinate addition when set against the rear elevation of the host dwelling, the original form of which has already been lost due to the existing 3 storey rear extension at the site. See section 2.2</i>
<p>CAAC/Local groups comments:</p>	<p><u>Primrose Hill CAAC: Objection.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unacceptable loss of rear garden space contrary to CPG1. 2. The alignment of the proposed extension is not characteristic of the pattern of rear additions in the conservation area. 3. The proposed extension would be harmful to the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings causing an increased sense of enclosure. <p><i>Officer response:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>See paragraph 2.3.4</i> 2. <i>See section 2.2 and paragraph 2.2.5</i> 3. <i>The proposed extension would be set in from the shared boundary line with No.3 Albert Terrace by 1m and with a maximum flat roof height of 3m, is considered not to have a significant impact to the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.</i> <p><u>Cllr Callaghan:</u></p> <p>In my opinion the new windows will be intrusive, but it is for the members to decide on the outcome of this application.</p> <p><i>Officer response:</i></p> <p><i>The new window openings would be located at ground floor level and would share the same view over the private garden area as the existing rear windows at the property, and are considered not to significantly increase the current level of overlooking at the site. There is also an existing boundary wall/fence measuring between 1.8m-2.8m in height, which would prevent overlooking between the proposed extension and the neighbouring property at Albert Terrace Mews.</i></p>

Site Description

The application site is located on the eastern side of Albert Terrace and relates to the lower ground floor flat of a large semi-detached dwelling which has been divided into a series of flats. A number of alterations have previously been made to the host property, most notably the erection of a 3 storey rear extension. To the rear of the site is a modest garden area which can be accessed via the existing pathway to the side of the property.

The property is located within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. It is not a listed building but is identified as making a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area.

Relevant History

None relevant to this application.

Relevant policies

NPPF 2012

The London Plan March 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's Heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

DP28 Noise and vibration

Camden Planning Guidance (2015)

CPG1 Design

CPG6 Amenity

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (2003)

Assessment

1.0 PROPOSAL

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey side infill extension at lower ground floor level. The proposed extension would have a flat roof height of 3m, a depth of 7m, a width of 2.4m and would occupy a recessed area between the rear elevation of the original property and the side elevation of the existing 3 storey rear extension. Permission is also sought for the installation of a new window opening on the rear elevation of the existing 3 storey extension at the site and for new fenestration pattern to the existing patio doors to the left of this. Both will use new metal Crittal windows.

Revisions

- 1.2 The plans initially submitted showed the proposed extension being covered in timber cladding which was considered to have an unacceptable impact to the character of the original property. The plans have since been amended and the timber cladding replaced with a rendered finish to match the appearance of the host dwelling.

2.0 ASSESSMENT

- 2.1 The material considerations for this application are summarised as follows:

- Design and Conservation; and
- Amenity of neighbouring residential occupants;

2.2 Design and Conservation

- 2.2.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within policy DP24 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the quality of materials to be used. Policy DP25 'Conserving Camden's Heritage' states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.
- 2.2.2 CPG1 design guidance recommends that alterations take into account the character and design of the property and surroundings; windows, doors and materials should complement the existing building, and side/rear extensions should be secondary to the main building.
- 2.2.3 The size, scale and design of the proposed single storey rear extension would represent a subordinate addition that would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the 4 storey host building and would respect the character and setting of the surrounding conservation area. The modest lower ground floor development would occupy a recessed area between the rear elevation of the original property and the side elevation of the existing rear extension, and is

considered to be proportionate in its appearance. It is also important to note that the extension would not project beyond the main side elevation of the property, thereby respecting the proportions of the parent building. The replacement of the proposed timber cladding with a rendered finish is welcome and now acceptable as an appropriate use of matching materials on this rendered property.

- 2.2.4 The installation of Crittal windows is considered to be acceptable in this instance, given the varied nature of window materials and patterns used to the rear of the property particularly at ground floor. The new window is appropriate in size and location.
- 2.2.5 Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013. The scheme is considered acceptable in bulk and design and that it does not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area. There is no typical pattern of development in this part of the conservation area for the side extension to conform to, and it is not comparable to other rear extensions nearby.

2.3 Amenity of neighbouring residential occupants

Daylight / Sunlight / Outlook / Privacy

- 2.3.1 Policy DP26 states that the Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity in terms of; visual privacy, overshadowing and outlook, daylight levels and noise/vibration levels.
- 2.3.2 The proposed extension would be set in from the shared boundary line with the neighbouring properties at 3 Albert Terrace by 1m with the total distance between the side elevations measuring at approximately 2 metres. This distance from the boundary is considered sufficient to negate any significant impact to the amenity of neighbouring dwellings. Furthermore, due to the height and depth of the extension and separation of both properties by a 2m high fence with trellis, it is considered that there would be no significant loss of residential amenity to the adjacent neighbour in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy. A condition preventing the use of the flat roof as a balcony will be applied to prevent overlooking of private amenity space.
- 2.3.3 A number of the objections received raised concern over the potential loss of privacy that would occur to the adjoining properties at Albert Terrace Mews (behind the application site) as a result of the new habitable room windows to the rear. However, both of the new window openings would be located at ground floor level and would share the same view over the private garden area as the existing rear windows at the property and are considered not to significantly increase the current level of overlooking at the site. There is also an existing high boundary wall/fence located along the rear boundary of the site, which would further prevent any increased overlooking.
- 2.3.4 The existing rear garden space would reduce from approximately 76sqm to 50sqm following construction of the proposed extension which is considered to be a sufficient amount for the occupiers of the 2 bed dwelling. Furthermore, the loss of approximately 26sqm of rear garden space is considered not to detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

3.0 Recommendation

- 3.1 Grant Conditional Permission

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 14th September 2015. For further information, please go to www.camden.gov.uk and search for 'Members Briefing'.