

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		28/08/2015	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		20/08/2015	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Oluwaseyi Enirayetan				2015/3787/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
48 Rochester Place London NW1 9JX				Refer to 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>							
Replacement of first floor window to front elevation with metal frame glazed door at existing dwelling house.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full planning application					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>17</b>	No. of responses	<b>02</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
				No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		A site notice was displayed from 29/07/2015 to 19/08/2015 A press notice was published 30/07/2015 expired 20/08/2015  'No comment' received from Flat 3, 11 Rochester Terrace					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify		No objection from the Rochester CAAC					

## Site Description

The site comprises a two-storey residential building situated on the north-east side of Rochester Place, between the junctions with Wilmot Place and Rochester Road.

Rochester Place is characterised by low mews type buildings, originally built in the 1870s to serve the properties in Rochester Terrace. There are also a number of more modern developments of a residential and industrial nature. The application site dates from the late 19th century and it is understood that it was used as a commercial repairing garage until the early 1980s. The building has subsequently been converted into two residential properties - No's 48 and 48a which form a symmetrical pair.

The site falls within the Rochester Conservation Area, and is not listed. It is identified within the conservation area statement as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

## Relevant History

**H12/2/8/32788R** - Change of use and works of conversion, including the erection of a two-storey rear extension and a rear roof extension, to provide two residential houses, one with integral garage. **GRANTED 15/12/1981.**

**H12/2/8/33981** - Alterations to the front and rear elevations and the erection of a roof terrace at rear second floor level as an amendment to the scheme approved by letter dated 15th December 1981 (Reg. No. 32788(R)), for change of use and works of conversion including the erection of a two storey rear extension and a rear roof extension to provide two residential houses, one with integral garage. **GRANTED 24/05/1982.**

**2009/3690/P** - Alterations to ground floor south-west (front) elevation, including removal of recessed doorway and steps and infilling of part of the ground floor front façade in line with the existing front boundary of single dwellinghouse (Class C3).- **GRANTED 25/09/2009**

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2012

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

#### Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

#### Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

#### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG 1 (Design) – 2015 ( paragraphs 2.12, 24.12 and 24.13)

CPG 6 (Amenity) - 2011

**Rochester Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy– December 2001 (Pages 18, 22 and 25)**

## Assessment

### Proposal

The application seeks to replace an existing timber sash window on the front elevation at first floor level with a bi-fold metal framed door.

### Assessment

The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are

- Design
- Amenity

### Design

Of particular relevance to the proposed works are LDF Development policies 24 and 25. DP24 states that the Council will expect all developments to be of the highest standard of design and expects development to consider a) character, setting, context and form. Paragraph 24.12 states that development should respect the character and appearance of the local area and neighbouring buildings and paragraph 24.13 states that development 'should not ignore any existing uniformity in the street.'

Building on the requirements of DP24, paragraph 2.12 of Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) 1-Design states that 'materials should form an integral part of the design process and should relate to the character and appearance of the area, particularly in conservation areas'.

With respect to Conservation areas DP25 states that the Council '...will only permit development in conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area'. This is restated verbatim in Paragraph 3.7 of the CPG. Specifically with respect to window alterations paragraph 4.7 states that 'Where it is necessary to alter or replace windows that are original or in the style of the originals, they should be replaced like with like wherever possible in order to preserve the character of the property and the surrounding area'.

It is noted in the applicants design and access statement that the proposed door is part of *completing the reinstatement of the building as an industrial part of this street and also returning to the original façade of the building*. The proposed door however is not considered to be historically or architecturally appropriate at the site. The site along with the attached neighbouring building is identified at page 18 of the Rochester Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (RCAAMS) as a positive contributor. The RCAAMS at page 22 cites 'alterations to or replacement of windows, porches, doors, and other features' as contributing to the erosion of the historic character of the conservation area. No evidence has been provided from the applicant which indicates that a door at first floor level was ever an original feature of the building. The photograph contained within the design and access statement shows the building pre 1896 as a garage with no first floor door present. Furthermore the brick work on the front elevation does not appear to indicate doors having even been previously in situ in this location.

As justification for the proposed works it is submitted by the applicant that the existing sash window is rotten. In these circumstances where replacement is the only possible option, materials should be chosen to closely match the original as per the recommendations of the RCAAMS (page 25)

It is acknowledged that some properties along the mews benefit from 'loading' doors similar to that proposed at the subject site. In this case however, the subject building forms one half of a symmetrical pair with neighbouring 48a Rochester Place. This uniformity is considered to form an important and integral component of their architectural character and serves to greatly enhance the positive contribution of the buildings to the conservation area. It is considered that the proposed door would visually unbalance the pair of buildings harming the character and appearance of the host building, its attached neighbour and the conservation area.

On the basis on the above the proposal is considered to be inappropriate addition the host building, disrupting the existing symmetry and uniformity between the subject site and its attached neighbour. As such it is considered that the proposed door would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, contrary to policies DP24 and DP25 of the LDF.

**Amenity**

The proposed alterations to the front elevation are not considered to affect the amenity of neighbours in terms of outlook, sunlight/daylight, privacy and overlooking.

**Recommendation**

Refuse Planning Permission