					1				
Delegated R	leport		Analysis she	eet	Expiry l	Date:	02/09/2003		
Member's Briefing		; •			Cons. E	xpire:	04/08/2003		
Officer				Application Num	ber (s)				
Sarah Griffiths				2003/0875/P					
Application Address				Drawing Number	Drawing Numbers				
24 Fitzroy Road, NW5									
PO 3/4	Area Team	Signature	C&UD	Authorised Offic	er Signatu	re			
Proposal (s)									
The continued use of the property as a single-family dwellinghouse, and the erection of replacement extensions at the rear at basement, ground, first and second floors, and a mansard roof extension.									
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission with conditions							
Code:		FPC							
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: (Use Pacis codes for standard text)		See draft decision notice.							
Reasons for Conditions:									
Informatives:									
Consultations									
Adjoining Occupi	ers:	No. notified	18	No. of responses	09	No. of	objections	03	
Summary of consultation responses:		9 objections received, from 4 objectors. 2 objectors have withdrawn their objections following negotiations between them and the applicant's agent. The withdrawal of their objections is subject to the approval of following drawings: 3469-101 B, 3469-201 B, 3469-301 B, 3469-401 B, 3469-501 B and 3469-701 B. *Response: The drawing numbers outlined above are the subject of this proposal.* 1 objection/objector remains:							
		 loss of light to 25 (upper floor flat on first, second and third floors) Chalcot Road caused by the 3-storey rear extension 							

The Primrose Hill CAAC object on the following grounds:

• The loss of the butterfly profile to the rear

Response:revisions submitted retaining the butterfly roof at the rear

• The proposed rear extension; the proposal is in direct conflict with PH26 and PH27 on the importance of harmonising with "the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace or group of buildings"

Response: It is considered that the proposed 3-storey rear extension would improve the appearance of the existing rear elevation, and would have minimal impact on adjacent occupiers in terms of sense of enclosure and loss of light.

• The excessive degree of internal demolitions; any consent should be subject to a condition requiring a method statement, supported by a structural engineer's report, to ensure the stability of the building.

Response: This would be subject to building control regulations, not this planning application.

CAAC/Local groups* comments:

*Please Specify

Site Description

The application site comprises a 3-storey plus basement end of terrace property on the west side of Fitzroy Road. The property was constructed in the mid-Victorian period and has since been converted providing self-contained flats. The site is included within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.

Relevant History

1971 – p/p approved for change to flats.

8.5.98 – p/p approved for a single storey rear conservatory.

26.11.01 - p/p approved for a mansard roof extension and reconstructed rear extension at first floor level (PEX0100028R1).

06/02/03 – p/p approved for internal alterations for a change of use from 3 self-contained flats to a single dwelling. (PEX0201094).

21/07/03 - p/p refused for the erection of a mansard roof extension, involving the loss of a butterfly profile to the rear, and the erection of extensions and a staircase at the rear of the property (PEX0300177).

Relevant policies

Camden Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2000:

EN1 – General Environmental protection and improvement

EN13 - Design of new development

EN19 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

EN21 – Alterations to existing buildings

EN22 – Extensions to existing buildings

EN24 – Roof alterations and extensions

EN31 – Character and appearance of Conservation Areas

EN33 - Restoration and maintenance of buildings in Conservation Areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) July 2002:

2.7 (Alterations and extensions)

2.8 (Roofs and terraces)

Assessment

Proposal

The continued use of the property as a single-family dwellinghouse, and the erection of replacement extensions at the rear at basement, ground, first and second floors, and a mansard roof extension.

Reasoned Justification

With regard to the use of the property as 1 dwellinghouse, it is considered that the principle of this was approved in February 2003. A site visit confirmed that the property is currently vacant and internal works are underway in connection with the use of the property as 1 dwellinghouse. UDP policy HG4 seeks to ensure proposals for conversion do not lead to the loss of types of accommodation which meet existing and anticipated needs. There is an identified need in the Borough both for 1-bedroom flats and larger units of 3-bedrooms or more, with outside amenity space suitable for families. The use of the property as 1 dwellinghouse would provide a larger family unit, with an overall amount of residential floorspace unchanged. As such, there is no net loss of needed accommodation, and a larger unit is provided, which complies with policy.

With regard to the mansard extension, the planning permission refused in July 2003 was for the erection of a mansard roof extension, involving the loss of a butterfly profile to the rear, and the erection of extensions and a staircase at the rear of the property. The reason for refusal was the loss of a butterfly roof and an unacceptable loss of daylight to neighbouring properties (contrary to policy PH21and SPG). The property does however have a valid permission for a mansard roof extension, granted in November 2001 - this planning permission retains the existing butterfly profile of the roof, although the angle of it is subject to a planning condition number 4, which asks for the new mansard slope to have a slope of no more than 70 degrees (the approved drawings show 80 degrees). To date, no details pursuant to condition 4 have been submitted to the council for consideration.

The proposed mansard (as revised) would retain the butterfly profile at the rear, and is at an angle of 43 degrees. At the front and side, the design of the mansard is considered to complement the character and appearance of the application site, the streetscene and the Conservation Area, and it is considered that it would have minimal impact on adjacent occupiers in terms of loss of light. As such, it is considered that the proposed mansard complies with SPG and policy.

With regard to the changes at the rear, the planning permission refused in July 2003 included a first floor extension at the rear which would have projected 1m further than that existing, with perpendicular walls. It was considered that these combined, would have resulted in loss of light to adjacent occupiers along Chalcot Road. A balcony at first floor level was also considered to have resulted in overlooking to Chalcot Road. This proposal includes a new 3-storey rear extension, which would comprise mostly glazing on the side with number 22 Fitzroy Road. Due to the existing extensions to the rear of number 22 Fitzroy Road, light emissions when in use at night is not considered a problem. The replacement second storey extension and extension at first floor level is considered to have minimal impact on adjacent occupiers along Chalcot Road due their design, location and glazed privacy screen. (for the latter). It is considered that overall, the proposed development at the rear, would complement the character and appearance of the application site and the Conservation Area, having minimal impact on adjacent occupiers in terms of loss of light or sense of enclosure. As such, it is considered that the proposed works at the rear comply with SPG and policy.

The application property is situated at right angles to the properties along Chalcot Road, which are in multiple uses as residential flats. The distance between the flank boundary wall at number 24 and the rear elevations of the terraces properties along Chalcot Road is approximately 4m. Residents from the Chalcot Road properties objected to the previous application (ref. PEX0300177) on grounds of loss of light. Although residents objected to this proposal, their objections have since been withdrawn, following negotiation between the applicant's agent and themselves. Revised drawings were subsequently received by the Council, and it is these that are now the subject of this proposal.

Recommendation

Approval, subject to standard conditions.