

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	21/04/2016
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	31/03/2016
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Laura Hazelton			(i) 2016/1065/P (ii) 2016/1221/L	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
8 Prince Albert Road London NW1 7SR			Please refer to decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
(i) Erection of 3 storey side extension; replacement of 2 x existing windows with new doors at rear lower ground and ground floor level; and installation of new staircase from ground floor to garden level.				
(ii) Erection of 3 storey side extension; new internal openings between the proposed extension and original dwelling at lower ground, ground and first floor level; replacement of 2 x existing windows with new doors at rear lower ground and ground floor level; installation of new staircase from ground floor to garden level; and creation of new steps to the side and rear garden.				
Recommendation(s):		(i) Refuse Planning Permission (ii) Refuse Listed Building Consent		
Application Type:		(i) Householder Application (ii) Listed Building Consent		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	04	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	03
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The application was also advertised in the local press on 10/03/2016 (expiring 31/03/2016), and a site notice was displayed at the site between 09/03/2016 and 30/03/2016.</p> <p>Two objections were received from neighbouring occupants at nos. 3 and 7 Prince Albert Road on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of light and overshadowing; • Loss of privacy/overlooking; • The negative effect on the listed building as a result of the size and extent of the extension; • Negative impact on the conservation area; • Loss of garden views; • Significant massing of no.8 close to the boundary with no.7 would be overbearing; • Concerns regarding the impact of development on the large sycamore tree abutting the property wall shared with no.8; • Disagree that the current view of nos. 8 and 9 is spoilt because of the lack of symmetry; • The addition would have a negative impact on other neighbouring properties, notably Grade II Listed Cecil Sharp House; • The development would result in substantial harm and a total loss of the significance of a designated heritage asset as it would completely eradicate evidence of the original design of the building. 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>The Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) did not object to the proposed extension but objected to the overall proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of side garden space. The sense of openness and space of these villas reflected the aspirations of buildings set in landscape; • Object to the addition of the rear stair at the location proposed – the stair is particularly obtrusive and diminishes the sense of the building in its garden space. 					

Site Description

The application building is a mid C19 semi-detached house which was Grade II listed in 1974. It is, in addition, listed for its group value with the detached and semi-detached villas 1 to 15 (consecutive) Prince Albert Road. The application building is attached to the semi-detached villa at no.9 Prince Albert Road, which is also Grade II Listed. No.9 was rebuilt towards the end of the 1980s following extensive war damage and features a substantial 3 storey side extension.

The application site is within Sub Area One of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area, which is east of Primrose Hill and north of Regents Park. The area is dominated by large villas set back from the highway and surrounded by substantial gardens. The original wide gaps between the pairs reinforce their spacious parkland-style siting.

The application building is 3 storeys tall with lower ground floor and attic storey and is in use as a single dwellinghouse.

Relevant History

Application site

8600542 & 8670105 - External alterations including the installation of two dormer windows and velux roof light on the rear elevation; alterations to the front boundary wall including a new gateway; and the construction of a new means of access. Granted 31/07/1986.

Adjoining Neighbour No.9

8501885 - The erection of a 4-storey building with basement for use as a self-contained 1-bedroom flat and swimming pool in the basement and a self-contained 4-bedroom maisonette on the upper floors. Granted 05/03/1986.

Neighbouring properties

No.7

No planning history relating to existing three storey side extension.

Nos. 10 & 11 (paired)

No. 10

No side extension.

No.11

2010/5636/P & 2010/5644/L - Erection of a three storey side extension at lower ground, ground and first floor levels of single dwelling (class C3). Refused 21/12/2010, dismissed at appeal 07/07/2011.

The inspector noted:

"Its siting, its substantial scale and its considerable bulk would also harmfully erode the important spaciousness in the side garden to the detriment of the setting of the listed building. Thus, it would cause a substantial loss of significance to this heritage asset."

"Furthermore, at about two thirds of the width of the existing dwelling, almost the same depth, and 3-storeys tall... the scale of the extension would not be subordinate to the existing dwelling at 11 Prince Albert Road. It would also fail to respect local distinctiveness, where the gaps between buildings contribute in an important way to the character and appearance of the area....it would harm the character and the appearance of the Conservation Area."

2014/1054/P & 2014/1066/L- Erection of a 2 storey side extension at lower and ground floor level to dwelling

house with associated side entrance and external stair. Refused 19/08/2014 dismissed at appeal 13/02/2015.

2015/4670/P & 2015/4843/L - Erection of a side extension at lower ground level. Granted 09/10/2015.

Nos. 12 & 13 (paired)

No.12

2008/4473/P & 2008/4560/L - Alterations and extensions including erection of a two storey side extension (ground floor and basement floor), excavation to extend the existing basement level to create additional accommodation and swimming pool and installation of new condensing unit in the rear garden to single family dwellinghouse. Granted 03/11/2009. *N.B Permission not implemented and now expired.*

No.13

2011/0042/P & 2011/0047/L - Erection of a 3 storey side extension at 1st, 2nd and roof level with dormers to front and rear roof slope to dwelling (Class C3). Refused 23/03/2011.

2012/2388/P & 2012/2445/L - Erection of extension at first floor level on the side elevation in connection with existing residential unit (Class C3).Refused 05/07/2012. Dismissed at appeal 28/01/2013.

2013/2542/P & 2013/2617/L- Erection of a first floor side extension with rooflight, minor external alterations to raise parapet and install access door at second floor level, and minor internal alterations to dwelling house (Class C3). Refused 25/06/2013. Dismissed at appeal 10/12/2013.

The inspector noted that:

“The fact of uneven (and larger) side extensions to nearby properties does not warrant allowing the appeals in the face of the adverse impacts described above. Text in the Council’s Development Policies similarly makes it clear that past extensions should not necessarily be regarded as precedents for subsequent extensions.”

Nos. 14 & 15 (paired)

No.14

Single storey side extension but no planning history

No.15

2012/4437/P & 2012/4438/L- Erection of single-storey side extension at lower ground floor level and excavation of part of garden to create garden room at lower ground floor level (following demolition of existing pool house), alterations to windows/doors on west elevation and associated landscaping, all in connection with the existing dwellinghouse. Granted 05/11/2012.

2012/1401/P & 2012/1403/L- Erection of a part single-storey, part two-storey side extension at ground and lower ground floor levels involving additional excavation, following demolition of existing garden room, and alterations to windows/doors on west elevation and associated landscaping, all in connection with the existing dwellinghouse. Refused 09/05/2012 and dismissed at appeal 06/12/2012.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan 2015, consolidated with amendments 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 High quality design
DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage
DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2013/2015

CPG1 (Design)
CPG6 (Amenity)

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement 2001

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission and Listed Building Consent are sought for the following development:

- Erection of a three storey side extension (lower ground to first floor);
- Alterations to rear fenestration including the replacement of existing rear window with a single door at ground floor level, installation of a new cast iron staircase to garden level and replacement of an existing window at rear lower ground floor level with new double doors;
- Creation of new internal doors at lower ground, ground and first floor levels.

1.2 Revisions

1.3 The original proposal was amended by the applicant to incorporate the following changes:

- Proposed side extension set back from the front and rear building line by an additional 600mm;
- Removal of existing marble overly to front steps and replacement with limestone treads; and
- Alteration of fanlight over front entrance door.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main planning considerations in the assessment of these applications are:

- Design (the impact of the proposal on the special architectural and historic character of the host Listed Building, and on the character and appearance of the wider Primrose Hill Conservation Area);
- Internal alterations (the impact of the internal alterations on the historic fabric of the listed building);
- Amenity (the impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers); and
- Impact on trees.

3.0 Design

3.1 Policy Background

3.2 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions to existing buildings are proposed. 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;
- development should consider the character and proportions of the existing building, where extensions and alterations are proposed; and
- development should consider the quality of materials to be used.
-

3.3 Policy DP25 'Conserving Camden's Heritage' states that within Conservation Areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the

Conservation Area. Policy DP25 also states that the Council will only grant permission for alterations to a listed building where it considers this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building.

3.4 The Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (2000) provides specific guidance regarding the erection of new extensions within the conservation area and advises that “extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace or group of buildings. The acceptability of larger extensions depends on the particular site and circumstances” (Policy PH27). Side extensions in particular “will not be acceptable where they are unduly prominent, unbalance the composition of a building group, or where they compromise gaps between buildings through which views are afforded of other properties, rear gardens, mature trees, or the Regent’s Canal.”

3.5 Site and surroundings

3.6 The application site is a Grade II listed building forming part of a series of 15 related detached and semi-detached stucco-faced Italianate villas dating from the mid-19th century. The property forms a semi-detached pair with No.9, both of which are five storeys (with lower ground and attic storeys). It is noted in the Historic England list description that no.9 was ‘rebuilt in facsimile following war damage and included for group value.’ No.9 has a three storey (lower ground, ground and first floor) extension, the exact date of which is not known.

3.7 It was noted in the Appeal Decision dated 13 February 2015, relating to the refusal of 2014/1054/P and 2014/1066/L (proposed two storey side extension at 11 Prince Albert Road) that: ‘The group of villas provides a backdrop to the extensive landscape of Regents Park, a Grade I registered park and garden of special historic interest. This contributes towards the group’s architectural interest, providing a somewhat theatrical setting to the edge of Regents Park which is visible for some distance. The group’s consistent pattern of development reflects the Grade I and II* listed buildings by Nash found in the locality. They broadly follow his Masterplan for the Regents Park area and this contributes to the historic interest of the appeal building and its neighbours and to the significance of the heritage assets.’

3.8 The pairs of mainly stucco fronted villas from 6 to 15 Prince Albert Road are semi-detached to emphasise their appearance of grandeur. The original wide gaps between the pairs would have reinforcement their spacious parkland-style setting.

3.9 Nos. 7, 9, 13 and Prince Albert Road benefit from side extensions; however, those at 7, 9 and 14 were constructed prior to the buildings’ listing and no. 13 was permitted prior to current Development Plan Policy. The most recent approvals were for single storey side extensions at lower ground floor level at nos. 11 (granted 09/10/2015, reference 2015/4670/P & 2015/4843/L) and 15 (granted 05/11/2012, reference 2012/4437/P & 2012/4438/L).

3.10 Side extension

3.11 Harm caused to the listed building

3.12 The key element in this scheme is the proposal to extend the property at the side from lower ground to first floor level. The extension would measure a maximum height of 11.4m when measured from lower ground floor level, 7.2m deep (set back from the front elevation by approximately 1.33m) and 5.32m wide. The front and side elevations would be rendered and painted to match the existing with matching brickwork to the rear. Windows would be double glazed, white timber framed sash windows to match the existing.

3.13 CPG1 (Design) provides detailed guidance regarding side extensions and paragraph 4.1 states that where a side extension is appropriate, it should be no taller than the porch and should be set back from the main building. Although the proposed side extension has been set back slightly front the front and rear elevations; at 3 storeys tall and nearly three fifths the width of the existing dwelling, it is considered an overly large, dominant

addition that would not be subordinate to the host dwelling.

3.14 The side extension would be constructed to the southern elevation facing neighbouring property no.7 Prince Albert Road. This property already benefits from a historic three storey side extension, constructed circa 1872. At present, there is a separation distance between the two properties of approximately 13m, which would be reduced to approximately 7m were the side extension constructed. The group of listed villas were originally laid out with generous gaps between the properties, creating a sense of openness and grandeur. Combined with the existing extension at no.7, the proposal would result in harm to this character of spaciousness, with the proposed extension being nearly three fifths of the width of the existing dwelling.

3.15 The development would therefore cause harm to the significance of the listed building due to impact on its existing spacious setting, and would harm the balance between the buildings and the spaces between them.

3.16 Harm to the character and appearance of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area

3.17 The Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement notes that the character and appearance of the sub area that includes the grouping of buildings at 1-15 Prince Albert Road is dominated by large villa-style properties surrounded by substantial garden spaces. The effect is a spacious, parkland setting in which the uniformity and grandeur of the listed villas play an important role.

3.18 Although the lower ground floor is mostly obscured from views outside of the site due to the stepped ground levels descending towards the rear, the ground and upper levels are clearly seen from certain parts of Prince Albert Road. The proposed side extension would erode the attractive sense of spaciousness created by the layout of this grouping of villas, and result in the loss of views between the building to buildings, gardens and trees behind. As a result it would fail to preserve or enhance the Primrose Hill Conservation Area's character and appearance and would therefore be unacceptable.

3.19 Symmetry

3.20 The applicant has argued that the proposed development should be permitted due to the resultant restoration of the symmetry between the two semi-detached properties. This is not considered to be sufficient justification to outweigh the harm caused to the spacious character of the listed building's setting and the conservation area outlined above.

3.21 Although historic maps show a side extension constructed of the same footprint as the current extension to no.9 circa 1840 and 1872, the existing 3 storey extension was a post-war addition following extensive bomb damage. It is therefore not possible to discern how many storeys the previous side extension was. Furthermore, the proposed development does not mirror the design of the extension at no.9, therefore there would still be a sense of imbalance within the appearance of the semi-detached pair.

3.22 The fact of larger side extensions to nearby properties does not warrant approval in the face of the adverse impacts listed above, and Policy DP24 expressly states that past extensions should not necessarily be regarded as precedents for future development (paragraph 24.13), particularly as all of the built or approved two/three storey side extensions to the neighbouring villas pre-date the current Development Plan.

3.23 Alterations to the front and rear fenestration

3.24 To the rear, the proposals include the replacement of an existing timber sash window at ground floor level with new timber double doors, the replacement of a timber sash window at first floor level with a single door and the construction of a cast iron staircase down to garden level with balustrade.

3.25 The proposed enlargement of existing window openings to create doorways and the proposed new

staircase are considered to be incongruous additions to this historic building. The proposals would result in the loss of historic window openings, affecting the overall composition and proportions of this simple and restrained elevation. The staircase would protrude out from the rear closet wing and would appear particularly obtrusive, resulting in unnecessary visual clutter and diminishing the sense of the building in its garden space.

3.26 To the front elevation, the proposal includes the replacement of the existing marble steps with limestone slabs, and the alteration of the existing fanlight above the front entrance door (subject to detailed design). These changes are considered minor ones which would be sympathetic to the host building and are therefore considered acceptable.

3.27 Design Conclusion

3.28 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paras 132, 134 and 137 are particularly relevant. Para 134 is clear that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Furthermore, para 137 outlines that proposals that preserve those elements of the setting of a heritage asset that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably. Although the proposed development is considered to result in less than substantial harm, given that there are few demonstrable wider public benefits accruing from this application and that the proposal is considered to detract from the significance of the listed building as demonstrated above, the application is not considered to comply with the NPPF. Furthermore, given the harm to the external appearance of the listed building and its failure to preserve and enhance the conservation area, the scheme also fails to comply with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of the LDF.

4.0 Internal alterations

4.1 The proposals would also involve internal alterations in the creation of new openings between the existing house and the new side extension at ground and first floor level. Whilst these openings would be within hallways rather than principle rooms, there is concern that the resultant internal layout would give an unbalanced composition and false sense of hierarchy within the plan form at ground floor level, as shown by the equal prominence given to the use of double doors to access both the dining room and the newly created room within the proposed extension.

5.0 Amenity

5.1 Policy CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Policy DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting planning permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight.

5.2 CPG6 (Amenity) provides specific guidance with regards to privacy, overlooking and outlook.

5.3 Objections have been received from the occupants of nos.3 and 7 Prince Albert Road on the amenity grounds of loss of light, loss of garden views, overshadowing and a loss of privacy.

5.4 No.7 is the closest neighbouring building, and benefits from an existing three storey side extension approximately 13m to the south east from the host building. The side elevation of no.7 features 2 windows on each floor at lower ground, ground and first floor which face the side elevation of no.8.

5.5 A daylight/sunlight assessment has not been submitted with the application to investigate the full impact of the development on neighbouring properties. However, the massing of the proposed extension would be within the outline of the existing building to the north west of no.7 and is therefore unlikely to result in a significant

decrease to daylight/sunlight levels entering the neighbouring windows.

5.6 The side extension would feature two windows at lower ground floor level only. Although these would face no.7, views between the two properties would be blocked by the boundary wall and existing vegetation and it is therefore not considered to result in harmful levels of overlooking between the two properties or a loss of privacy.

5.7 For the reasons outlined above, the proposed development is not considered to cause significant harm to neighbouring amenity in terms of a loss of outlook, daylight or privacy.

6.0 Impact on trees

6.1 There are a number of established, mature trees to the front and rear garden of the application site and neighbouring property no.7. An arboricultural impact assessment report and outline method statement has been submitted in support of the application. This report concluded that the impacts of development are relatively low in terms of both quality of trees removed and root protection area (RPA) encroachments of the trees retained. The species affected are generally tolerant of root disturbance and the retained trees are generally in good health and capable of sustaining these reduced impacts. Furthermore, the trees located to the front of the site (fronting Prince Albert Road) are afforded an extra element of protection due to being positioned on a raised ground level as compared to the location to the proposed extension.

6.2 The Council's Trees and Landscaping Officer has assessed the proposals and submitted tree report and does not object to the development.

7.0 Conclusion.

7.1 Refuse planning permission and listed building consent.