

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	17/08/2016
			Consultation Expiry Date:	21/07/2016
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Helaina Farthing			2016/3171/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
77 Clarence Way London NW1 8DG			EX Location Plan; EX Site Plan; EX3D View1 (Front); EX3D View2 (Front); EX3D View3 (Rear); EX3D View4 (Rear); EX Ground Floor Plan; EX First Floor Plan; EX Roof Plan; EX Front and Rear Elevation; EX Side (left); EX Side (right); Ex Section-1; PR3D View 1 (Front); PR3D View2 (Front); PR3D View3 (Rear); PR3D View4 (Rear); PR Ground Floor Plan; PR First Floor Plan; PR Roof Plan; PR Side (Left); PR Side (Right); PR Section-1.	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of a two-storey side infill extension to replace the existing in connection with dwelling house (Class C3).				
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning permission		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	7	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>A site notice was displayed from 29/06/2016 and a public notice was published in the Ham & High from the 30/06/2016.</p> <p>No objections were received.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		No responses received from the CAAC or local groups.					

Site Description

The application site is situated within the Harmood Street Conservation Area, on Clarence Way. The property is not a listed building but is considered to make a positive contribution to the Harmood Street Conservation Area.

According to the Harmood Street Conservation Area statement, 'Clarence Way connects Harmood Street to Harland Road. The street bends sharply beneath the railway line, which forms the boundary to the conservation area. Views along the street therefore lead to the raised bridge of the railway line with the tower of Holy Trinity Church beyond. The two blocks of terraced houses on either date to before 1849 and are built from yellow stock brick with no ornamentation apart from the stepped parapet which conceals the party walls'.

The application site is a two-storey early Victorian terraced house; there is an existing half width two-storey rear extension as well as a lean-to glazed extension.

Relevant History

70 Clarence Way (2015/6763/P)

- Planning permission refused for the erection of a first floor rear infill extension.

77 Clarence Way (2015/2986/P)

- Planning permission granted for the erection of a single storey infill extension to replace existing lean to.

Relevant policies

National and Regional Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan (2016) (Sections 7.4 Local Character and 7.6 Architecture).

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

CPG1 Design (2015; Section 2, 3, 4 and 5)

CPG2 Housing (2015; Section 4)

CPG6 Amenity (2011; Section 2,3,4,5,6 and 9)

Harmood Street Conservation Area Statement (2005)

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for an in-fill two storey rear extension to replace the existing lean to;

- The proposed extension would have a height of 4.9m and a width of 2.2m;
- The proposed extension would not extend beyond the rear elevation of the existing rear return;
- The materials and surface treatments proposed would be grey metal cladding above new glazed sliding doors.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main planning considerations relate to:

- Design (principle of development and detailed design);
- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

3.0 Design

3.1 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.

3.2 The current proposal seeks to replace the existing lean to with a two storey rear infill extension, thus having the effect of increasing the mass, bulk and scale of the first floor rear extension across the whole rear elevation of this mid-terrace property. The proposal is therefore considered unacceptable in principle as it would result in the whole of the original rear elevation at first floor level being obscured and would appear as a dominant addition to the rear elevation, contrary to DP24.

3.3 CPG1 sets a list of general principles in regard to the rear extension within paragraph 4.10, including being secondary to the building, respecting its original design and proportions, including its architectural style and detailing, respecting architectural features such as chimney stacks and respecting the historic pattern of the surrounding area. The proposed development would not accord with any of these design principles which are set out with the aim of achieving a subordinate extension in line with the aim of DP24. The proposed extension bears no regard to the character of the parent building. As noted in paragraph 3.2 its scale would dominate the rear elevation, by virtue of its two storey nature. The extension would obscure the chimney stack, visible at first floor level and the detailed design of the extension takes no regard to the fenestration of the parent building. Resulting in a wholly inappropriate and unacceptable addition to the rear elevation.

3.4. It is also important to note that paragraph 4.13 of CPG1 notes that extensions of higher than a single storey shall be one full storey below the eaves/parapet level will be strongly discouraged. The proposed extension would not be set a storey below the eaves and would therefore be contrary to the guidelines set out in CPG1. The purpose of setting an extension one storey below the eaves, is to ensure it respects the proportions and character of the parent building as required by DP24. It is considered the proposal would fail to respect the proportions of the parent building and would therefore not accord with DP24.

3.3 It is acknowledged that the proposed extension would sit within the flank walls of no. 77 and the adjoining property at no. 75; however the additional bulk and mass created at first floor level would adversely impact on the existing terraces rhythm and form. Taken in conjunction with next door's extension, it would result in a three bay slab of development at the rear, which would add to the bulk of the buildings as seen from the adjacent gardens. The established character of this row of houses is

that largely of two-storey half-width closet wings, the proposal would be contrary to this pattern. Therefore, the proposal would interrupt the rhythm of the rear of these properties and would not therefore be a sympathetic or complementary addition to the property and would not harmonise with the property, as a result it is viewed to be harmful to the host building, the terrace which the property forms a part and the wider conservation area due to its design, bulk, scale and siting. Moreover the proposal could set an unwelcome precedent for similar extensions along the terrace which would cause additional harm to the Conservation Area.

3.4 Section 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013 requires for buildings in conservation areas that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. It is considered that this proposal would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and this heritage asset.

4.0 Detailed Design

4.1 Policy CS14 aims to ensure the highest design standards for developments. Policy DP24 states that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and respect the character, setting, form and scale of neighbouring properties and the character and proportions of the existing building.

4.2 In addition to the principle of the scheme being unacceptable, the detailed design and form of the proposed extension is also considered inappropriate. The extent of glazing and use of cladding would appear obvious and an unsympathetic addition, resulting in additional harm to the significance of the conservation.

5.0 Amenity

5.1 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG6 seeks for developments to be "designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree" and that the Council will "aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight caused by a development on the amenity of existing occupiers."

5.2 Given the positioning of the extension within the flank walls of 77 and 75 (i.e. not extending beyond the existing building line), the proposal is not considered to harm the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of access to sunlight, daylight, visual bulk, sense of enclosure or privacy.

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 The proposal is considered to detract from the appearance of the host building. It would be out of keeping with the terrace buildings within this group of properties and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Harmond Street Conservation Area and is subsequently harmful to the Conservation Area and therefore contrary to CS15, DP24 and DP25.

7.0 Recommendation

7.1 Refuse planning permission