

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		07/07/2017	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		13/12/2016	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Patrick Marfleet				2016/6862/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Kings College Court 55 Primrose Hill Road London NW3 3EA				See draft decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Details pursuant to condition 4 (external finishes) of planning permission reference 2013/6388/P dated 19/06/2014 (Erection of three storey roof extension to provide 4 self-contained flats, single storey extension to east elevation for new entrance, installation of balconies to all flats together with insulated cladding to all elevations, landscaping works throughout the site, erection cycle store for 50 cycles to the south of the building and provision of two disabled car parking spaces).							
Recommendation:		Refuse and warn of enforcement action					
Application Type:		Approval of Details					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	00	No. of responses No. electronic	00 00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:		No objections received to date.					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		N/A					
Site Description							
The site is located to the western side of Primrose Hill Road between the junctions of Fellows Road and Adelaide Road. The original property consisted of a nine storey residential building containing 48 one and two bedroom units. However, work has now commenced at the site to implement the approved scheme (2013/6388/P) for the erection of a three storey roof extension and re-cladding of the entire building.							
The site is not located within a conservation area, however the Belsize Park Conservation Area is located approximately 45m to the north and the site can be seen in short and long range views within the neighbouring conservation area. The site does not contain any listed buildings.							

Relevant History

Application site

2016/0070/P - Details pursuant to conditions 4 (external finishes); 5 (details of windows, railings, balconies); 7 (tree protection) and 9 (noise report) of planning permission reference 2013/6388/P dated 19/06/2014 (Erection of three storey roof extension to provide 4 self-contained flats, single storey extension to east elevation for new entrance, installation of balconies to all flats together with insulated cladding to all elevations, landscaping works throughout the site, erection cycle store for 50 cycles to the south of the building and provision of two disabled car parking spaces). **Part granted (conditions 5, 7, 9) and part refused (condition 4) 06/10/2016.**

2013/6388/P - Erection of three storey roof extension to provide 4 self-contained flats (2x2beds and 2x3beds), single storey extension to east elevation for new entrance, installation of balconies to all flats together with insulated cladding to all elevations, landscaping works throughout the site, erection cycle store for 50 cycles to the south of the building and provision of two disabled car parking spaces. **Approved subject to s106 agreement 19/06/2014.**

This application seeks to discharge condition 4 of this permission.

2013/0074/P - Erection of a four storey roof extension to provide five self-contained flats to three floors and a service level to the 9th floor together with remodelling of the existing building including addition of insulated rainscreen cladding, new balconies to all flats, new entrance with ramp, general refurbishment work, re-landscaping and provision of two disabled car parking spaces. **Refused 12/07/2013 - due to the detrimental impact the height, scale, design and proposed materials would have on the character and appearance of the immediate area and the neighbouring conservation area.**

Relevant policies

NPPF 2012

The London Plan 2016

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS15 Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's Heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance (2015)

CPG1 Design

Assessment

1.0 PROPOSAL

- 1.1 Planning permission was granted on 19/06/2014 (ref: 2013/6388/P) for the erection of a three storey roof extension to provide 4 self-contained flats, a single storey extension to the eastern elevation to provide a new entrance, installation of balconies to all flats together with insulated cladding to all elevations, landscaping works throughout the site, erection of cycle store for 50 cycles to the south of the building and the provision of two disabled car parking spaces. This permission was granted subject to a s106 legal agreement and the subsequent discharge of relevant pre-commencement conditions.

Condition 4 - No development shall take place until samples and manufacturers details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The materials panel must include an on-site facing brickwork panel demonstrating the proposed colour, texture, face-bond and pointing. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area in accordance with the requirements of policy CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP24 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

- 1.2 It is noted that the details of the proposed external cladding material submitted as part of the current application match those that were recently refused by the Council under permission reference 2016/0070/P, after an unsuccessful period of negotiation between the applicant and the Council to change the proposed material from synthetic to clay brick slips. Therefore, given that the proposed materials remain completely unchanged from the previous submission (2016/0070/P) and no amendments are proposed in the current submission, the application is recommended for refusal for the same reasons as previously expressed.

2.0 ASSESSMENT

- 2.1 **Condition 4** - When determining the original application for this site (2013/6388/P) it was made clear in the officer report that the success of the proposed cladding would depend largely on the appropriate use of high quality materials, the details of which would be secured by condition. The details submitted to discharge this condition propose the use of a Sto External Wall Insulation System which includes the use of synthetic render brick slips as opposed to the required clay brick slip.
- 2.2 The original application was proposed, and gained conditional approval, on the basis of recladding the entire of the existing brick block with new brick (as well as render cladding). Negotiations on the acceptability of extending and recladding the building were predicated on achieving the required quality external finish given the scale and prominence of the building and its setting near to a conservation area. What is now proposed is an acrylic brick replica,

which is unacceptable to the Council and is at odds with the conditional permission and the undertakings made by the applicant at the time in supporting submissions.

- 2.3 When development is proposed in close proximity to heritage assets and conservation areas, facing materials are chosen to ensure a high level of quality and design integrity. This has been the Council's objective throughout the process hence the requirement at application stage for the use of brick, which is a material that offers the desired architectural and visual integrity that the synthetic fabric proposed, does not.
- 2.4 The proposed product has been amended during the application by the applicant. The material sample, submitted with the condition discharge application when it was originally made, was revised in July 2016 following concerns raised by Council officers. A new sample was submitted in writing on the 14th July 2016 and inspected on site on the 26th July 2016. This sought to address officers' concerns about the product. Whilst the colour of the revised sample better matches the existing brickwork on the building it is not considered to overcome the in-principle concern regarding the material choice. The same sample was reviewed at the site again by the Council's enforcement officers on 12th December 2016, but was still considered to be unacceptable.
- 2.5 The proposed product is essentially a tile, glued to the prefabricated insulated panes which are hung to the existing façade. It cannot replicate the texture, colour, patina, character and appearance of brick. It also weathers very differently to real brick and this will mean that in the short-term and over time, the appearance of this material will be at odds with the natural feel of brick and the surrounding area.
- 2.6 It is the Council's opinion that the proposed synthetic slips would reduce the quality as well as the long term durability of the building particularly as rendered slips do not weather to the same patina, have the same long term durability or offer the same character and appearance to a building as clay brick slips. The lack of quality and design integrity would not be appropriate within the setting of the conservation area and would detract and cause harm to its character and appearance. There is a clear visual connectivity between the site and the conservation area and the proposed material would not result in the quality of building that is expected within such a sensitive setting.
- 2.7 It is important to note that throughout this entire process the applicant has failed to provide any appropriate examples that demonstrate the use of synthetic brick slips on buildings of a similar size, scale and location to the application site. The three examples submitted in support of this application include Whiston Hospital in Merseyside, Roundshaw Estate in London and a development in Hamburg, Germany. However, these developments do not compare with the height and scale of the application site and are less likely to have such a significant impact on the character and appearance of a designated conservation area and cannot be used as justification for the use of synthetic slips in this instance.
- 2.8 Given the above, the proposed synthetic slips, as with the previous refusal (2016/0070/P), are not considered to be a suitable cladding material for this particular site given the size, scale and prominence of the host building within the existing street scape and the damage the use of synthetic brick slips could have on the character and appearance of the neighbouring conservation area. Therefore, it is recommended that the details submitted in accordance with condition 4 are refused.

3.0 Recommendation

- 3.1 a) Refuse details submitted in relation to condition 4 (external finishes).

b) Authorise enforcement action to be taken in the event the sto-brick cladding is installed without the required conditional approval.

