

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		14/03/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		31/03/2016	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Tania Skelli-Yaoz				2016/0276/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
38 Regent's Park Road London NW1 7SX				See decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Demolition of side extension and erection of side and front extension at first and second floor, rear extension at second floor and creation of third floor roof terrace and external alterations (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning 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	01	No. of objections	01
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>The application was published in the press on 10/03/2016.</p> <p>A Site Notice was also displayed at the site for a period of 21 days between 09/03/2016 and 30/03/2016.</p> <p>No's 36A Regents Park Road have objected to the application on the following grounds:</p> <p>Roof extension too high and out of keeping with rhythm of street. Concerns over harm to CA and local amenity.</p>					
CAAC comments:		<p>Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee:</p> <p>This house has been very badly damaged over the years, the initial harm taking place before designation of the conservation area (1972), and demonstrating the sort of architectural loss which designation was designed to stop. This damage does not justify further harm to either the building or the CA.</p> <p>The proposed extra bulk of the addition at the rear would further distort the surviving elements of the original built configuration at the rear. We object to the proposed rear addition as further harming the original configuration by adding excessive bulk at a high level which has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>While the masonry facing proposed at the front is to an infill which is, in principle, harmful and unacceptable, the facing would mitigate that harm, even at the expense of indicating a wholly false form, misleading as to the original configuration of the building in its group. We do not object to this alteration.</p>					
Site Description							
<p>The host property is a large four storey terrace house with double roof dormers. The site falls within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area and also has Article 4 status. The property shares a boundary with no.36 Regents Park Road which is grade II listed. The property at no.38 has been identified as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area under the local conservation area appraisal.</p> <p>The site currently comprises four flats with permission to convert the lower ground flats into one unit (2013/1041/P). An additional flat (known as Flat C) has its main access from within no. 36 but does not form part of no. 38. The application relates to flats D & E in the upper floors. The area is predominantly characterised as residential in use. The site fronts Regent's Park (Primrose Hill) and the rear backs onto Princess Park Road and Auden Place.</p>							
Relevant History							
<p>2016/0279/P Erection of front, side and rear extensions with rear 1st floor roof terrace, including basement excavation and various external alterations, and conversion of two flats at lower ground, ground and first floor levels to one maisonette (Class C3); and excavation to create sunken garden room at basement level with roof terrace above at north end of rear garden to provide ancillary accommodation to existing residential dwelling (Class C3). Under consideration.</p>							

2014/7971/P Conversion of 2 flats into 1 (Class C3) involving demolition of side and roof extension and erection of side extension at first and second floor, rear extension at second floor, third floor terrace and roof extension was refused on 30/07/2015.

2013/1624/P Excavation to create sunken garden room at basement level with roof terrace above at north end of rear garden to provide ancillary accommodation to existing residential dwelling (Class C3) was granted on 10/10/2013.

2013/1041/P Erection of front, side and rear extensions with rear 1st floor roof terrace, including basement excavation and various external alterations, and conversion of two flats at lower ground, ground and first floor levels to one maisonette (Class C3) was granted on 10/10/2013.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan 2016

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

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

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (2015) Chapter 2, 3 and 5

CPG6 Amenity (2011) Chapter 6 and 7

Primrose Hill Conservation Area (2000)

Assessment

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for a side infill extension at second and third floor with terrace and metal railings above, rear second floor extension and extended balcony at rear and side third floor.

Revisions

Originally, the proposal sought permission for the conversion from two flats into one at second and third floor levels. This would be contrary to policy DP2 due to the recent planning permission granted for the amalgamation of the lower floor flats (A & B) under ref. 2013/1041/P. Subsequently, this element was omitted from the description of development.

The main issues for discussion are:

- ☐ Land use
- ☐ Design & conservation
- ☐ Amenity
- ☐ Highways

Land use

Core Strategy policy CS6 states that the Council seeks to maximise the supply of homes and minimise their loss, as housing is considered to be a priority land use of the Camden Local

Development Framework. This is further supported by Development Policy DP2. This looks to protect the borough's housing stock by resisting developments that would lead to a net loss of more than two units and also with the loss of any significant amount of housing floor space. The Council does not seek to resist schemes that would lead to the loss of only one unit.

As the proposal would have led to the loss of an additional unit at this site; it would have formed into a reason for refusal. The proposal was therefore revised to omit this element.

Design

Camden policies CS14 of the Core Strategy and DP24 of the Development Policies states that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest design standards in terms of the character, siting, context, form and scale to the existing building and the general area. Policies CS14 (Core Strategy) and DP25 (Development Policies) states that the Council will only give permission to developments in Conservation Areas if they preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area. In this particular case it is also important to consider whether the development would adversely affect the appearance of the architectural or historic interest in relation to the neighbouring listed building and historic mews in compliance with CS14, DP24 and DP25.

Supplementary design guidance contained within CPG 1(Design, section 4.10) provides details on how the above policies will be applied for rear extensions. This states that rear extensions should be designed to, amongst other criteria:

- be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
- respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;
- respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies or chimney stacks;

Further guidance with regards to the height of rear extensions states that new extension should be subordinate to the original building and respect the existing pattern of rear extensions. It states that the height of acceptable extensions will be determined in the context of the above guidance and that in most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring extensions, will be strongly discouraged. The width of extensions of rear extensions should not be visible from the rear and that harmonious architectural compositions should be maintained.

In relation to infill and rear extensions CPG 1 states that Infill extensions will not be considered acceptable where:

- the established front building line is compromised;
- the architectural symmetry or integrity of a composition is impaired;

The local conservation area statement notes that “the general presumption should therefore be in favour of retaining such (positive contributors) buildings” (p.24) New development should be seen as an opportunity to enhance the Conservation Area. All development should respect existing features such as building lines, roof lines, elevational design, and where appropriate, architectural characteristics, detailing, profile, and materials of adjoining buildings. However the proposed extension at rear 2nd floor level together with the new rear and side balcony at rear both fail to adhere to the above stated principles.

The property, like many others on the road, currently benefits from an infill at its side elevation. This current side extension is higher than the neighbour's at no.36. This was given permission before the

area was designated as a conservation area. As such the proposal to replicate the infill at no.36 and at other properties nearby, in terms of height, materials and design is welcomed as it would result in a symmetrical and balanced front elevation (without the additional terrace and rear development). Furthermore, the windows at no.36 would be replicated. The infill side extension, in isolation, is supported because this element has been influenced by the architectural importance of the composition buildings. Therefore it would enhance the architectural relationship between the building and no.36. Whilst the replacement of the top part of the existing glazed stair enclosure with the proposed front balcony with metal railings is not a historic characteristic of the area and terrace and therefore not supported by design guidance, it is acknowledged that this replacement will enhance the front elevation and therefore should not form as a refusal for refusal.

However, the proposal to extend at second and third floor level would represent a complete departure from what can currently be seen in the conservation area by way of development, materials and design. The proposed terrace would be visible at street level (from rear) and thus would have the impact of immediately altering the character of the conservation area by creating an incongruous element at high level. This would be particularly exacerbated by the existing uncharacteristic extensions at roof level. It is also noted that a stair tower is normally narrow and vertical, distinguished from the main building and acts as a separator to villas. At this site, the stair tower is already wide and will become taller and wider which will result in a bulky, cluttered and uncharacteristic extension to this building at high level. The continuation of the 0.5m projection at third floor level as well as the proposed balcony with glazed balustrade at second floor level is uncharacteristic to this terrace and harmful to the conservation area and the adjoining listed building at no. 36. This harm does not outweigh the benefit from the removal of the uncharacteristic high level picket fence at this rear elevation.

It should be noted that there is currently an extension at roof level. This employs more traditional materials and is smaller in scale than what is being proposed here. However it is also important to note that this extension has taken away from the properties historic value and harmed the character of the conservation area. Therefore it is argued that it does not represent a precedent in the conservation area. Simply because a negative development already exists in the conservation area it would be irresponsible to encourage more of the same. Under the current framework the existing roof terrace would not be approved. The current extension was given permission before the area was designation as a conservation area in 1971. Its status was revised to help protect the area and control development that may cause further harm.

The scale and design of the proposed rear extensions and terrace are not only too large for the host building as they would detract from its special architectural character, they would also have the result of adversely impacting the setting of the listed building at no. 36 Regents Park Road by detracting from views to the property. The rear extension at third floor would be higher than the neighbouring property at no. 36 Regents Park Road where as currently it is at a lower level. This would compete with the neighbouring building rather than complement it.

As a result of the above, the proposal at rear and side, second and third floor levels are considered unsympathetic to the context and the character of the property; would have a significantly harmful impact on the architectural composition of the host building and the listed building; would harm the symmetry of the terrace; and would detract from the character and appearance of the Primrose Hill conservation area. The development therefore fails to comply with design guidance and policies and has not overcome previous reason for refusal associated with planning reference 2014/7971/P.

Amenity

Under planning guidance CPG6, all developments are required to have some regard for the amenity of existing and future occupants. Policies CS5 (Core Strategy) and DP26 (Development Policies) state that the Council will protect the quality of life of existing and future occupiers and neighbours by

only granting permission for those developments that would not have a harmful effect on amenity. Such issues include visual overlooking, overshadowing, outlook, sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels.

No windows or structures would be built in such a way as to impact on their privacy or enclosure. The proposed rear extension at second floor would project very minimally from the existing rear extension at no.36. However this projection would be 0.5 metres. This amount is too small to have any real perceived impact on sunlight or overshadowing to the property. Therefore the development is acceptable on amenity grounds.

Highways

Due to the scale of works proposed a Construction Management Plan is not considered necessary for this proposal.

Recommendation

Refuse planning permission