

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>09/03/2017</b>
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	17/02/2017
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Raymond Yeung			2017/0164/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
12 St Mark's Crescent London NW1 7TS			Please 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>				
Erection of a single storey rear extension at garden level with terrace above, and replacement glazing to front lightwell.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant conditional planning permission		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application		

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>0</b>	No. of responses	<b>07</b>	No. of objections	<b>04</b>
			No. Electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>The application was also advertised in the local press on 19/01/2017 (expiring 09/02/2017) and a site notice was displayed between 24/01/2016 to 14/02/2017.</p> <p>4,10 and 11 St. Mark's Crescent and 61 Gloucester Avenue objects for the following issues;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set a precedent for future expansions on the Crescent, which compromise the unique character, furthermore, it is not consistent with the 'style' of these homes nestled on the Regent's Canal</li> <li>• Large increase in the size of the proposed rear extension and results in a reduction of garden size</li> <li>• Creation of loss of light and overlooking from the rear extension</li> <li>• No improvement to the front lightwell</li> </ul> <p>9 and 24 St. Mark's Crescent comments for the following issues;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments on behalf of No.11 St. Mark's Crescent with regards to limit to the depth of basement extensions on the canal side of the Crescent seems reasonable to me, and I appreciate their desire not to be overlooked, also notes advice from the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee</li> <li>• The proposal has taken into account the amenity of the neighbours</li> <li>• The rear extension and front glazing would enhance the appearance of the property</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer response;</b></p> <p>Revisions of both extension and lightwell have since been submitted to make the proposal less prominent in terms of mass and size. The proposal is not for a basement extension, with regards to the other points, please see below:  Paragraphs 3.5-3.16 (Inclusive) with regards to the first and second bullet points.  Paragraphs 4.2-4.4 with regards to amenity.</p> <p>1 letter of support from an architect and neighbour on St.Mark's Crescent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 75% of houses have rear extensions on St.Mark's Crescent</li> <li>• Latest design for no. 12 now has a pleasing architectural integrity</li> <li>• No significant overlooking</li> <li>• New extension obscures the original bay window feature at garden level is irrelevant as the existing extension, which has been there for many years, already does</li> </ul>					

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New proposal will definitely improve to front lightwell glazing</li> </ul>
<p><b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify</p>	<p>The <b>Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC)</b> objected on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed rear extension and glazing to the front basement lightwell would be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area and fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area</li> <li>• Cumulative, loss of garden space</li> <li>• Loss of sunlight and overlooking to habitable rooms at lower-ground floor level would be worsened.</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer response;</b></p> <p>Please paragraphs below: Paragraphs 3.5-3.16 (Inclusive) with regards to the first and second bullet points. Paragraphs 4.2-4.4 with regards to the first bullet point, paragraphs.</p>

## Site Description

The site is a three storey plus basement semi-detached property on the western side of St Mark's Crescent. It is a mid 18<sup>th</sup> century Italianate villa with a painted stucco frontage which backs onto Regent's Canal. The property is in use as a single family dwellinghouse.

The application building is not listed nor in an Article 4 direction area, but is located within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area and has been described in the conservation area statement as making a positive contribution to the conservation area.

## Relevant History

**No relevant history for application site, below are relevant permissions nearby;**

### **No. 5**

2009/4337/P – Erection of single storey rear extension with green roof and associated alterations including replacement of staircase to garden level, to dwelling house (Class C3). Granted 23/11/2009

### **No.6**

2015/4686/P - Replacement and enlargement of existing rear conservatory and balcony. Granted 29/09/2015

### **No.9**

PEX0201017 - Demolition of existing rear balcony, construction of single storey, glazed extension at rear basement level with roof terrace to replace existing. Granted 19/03/2003.

9003268 - Provision of glazed roof over existing light-well creating a conservatory extension to existing kitchen at front basement level. Granted 12/09/1990.

### **No.10**

2012/3514/P - Erection of a single-storey larder extension in front lightwell of residential dwelling (Class C3). Granted 05/09/2012.

2009/2070/P - Erection of a single storey rear extension at basement level below the existing ground floor balcony to dwelling house (Class C3). 13/07/2009.

2008/5214/P - Additions and alterations in connection with the erection of a balcony at upper ground floor level, elevational changes to front and rear, and partial demolition of front vaults at basement level to existing single family dwelling house (Class C3). Granted 06/04/2009.

### **No.13**

CLDP - 2010/5266/P - Erection of a single storey rear extension to an existing single dwelling (Class C3). Granted 29/11/2010.

### **No.14**

PEX0200695 - Proposed external alterations to include bay windows with balcony balustrade , enlarged timber sash window at side ground floor level, one replacement timber sash window at basement level, timber double glazed doors at the front at basement level, two new timber sash windows, proposed front wall with metal railings and gate piers. Granted 11/11/2003.

2016/1637/P - Erection of single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level with terrace above; front extension at lower ground floor level and alterations to fenestration; and erection of single storey side lean-to extension. Granted 20/7/2016

### **No.15**

2012/2515/P - Erection of a single storey rear extension with roof terrace over enclosed by metal railings and replacement of existing lower ground floor level front window with french doors and alterations to window at rear ground floor level all in connection with existing flat (Class 3). Granted 09/07/2012

2010/5629/P - Alterations and extensions including new basement extension with rear lightwell, erection of rear extension at lower ground floor level, and extension into front lightwell all in connection with existing garden flat

(Class C3). Granted 18/02/2013.

**No. 16**

2009/3507/P - Erection of extension in existing front lightwell of dwelling house. Granted 23/11/2009.

**Relevant policies**

**National Planning Policy Framework 2012**

**London Plan March 2016**

**LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

**Core Strategies**

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

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

**Supplementary Planning Guidance**

CPG 1 (Design) 2015

CPG 6 (Amenity) 2013

**Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement 2000**

## Assessment

### 1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the following:

- Replacement single storey rear extension with associated roof terrace balcony and rear paved area following excavation and removal of existing extension
- Replacement glazed roof of front Lightwell

1.2 Revisions

1.3 Change floor plan due to error in coinciding with the elevations with regards to the measurements of the roof terrace

1.4 Reduction of rear extension's depth from 3.6 to 3.1 metres a reduction of 500mm, along with the depth associated depth of the proposed excavation, patio and stairs

1.5 Reduction in height of the front lightwell following a redesign from sloped glazing to a flat glazing system.

### 2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main planning considerations in the determination of this planning are as follows:

- Design (the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and wider Primrose Hill Conservation Area)
- Amenity (the impact of the proposal on the amenity of adjoining occupiers)
- Impact on trees

### 3.0 Design

3.1 Policy CS14 aims to ensure the highest design standards from developments. Policy DP24 also states that the Council will require all development, including alterations and extensions to be of the highest standard of design and to respect the character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties as well as the character and proportions of the existing building. Policy DP25 seeks to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas.

3.2 CPG1 (Design) provides further guidance relating to extensions, alterations and conservatories (chapter 4) and emphasises that alterations should always take into account the character and design of the property and its surroundings; windows, doors and materials should complement the existing building; and extensions should be secondary to the building being extended.

3.3 Primrose Hill CAS states in PH25 Extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. Some rear extensions, although not widely visible, so adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached that the character of the Conservation Area is prejudiced.

3.4 Extensions can alter the balance and harmony of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. The above policies and design guidance state that rear extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or character and appearance of the conservation area. The property forms part of houses which are both four storeys, in which the lower ground is not in view at the front elevation, but the storey is visible at the rear. The rear of this property can be seen from the Regent's Canal and therefore can be prominent in the public realm as well as private vantage points.

Rear extension, roof terrace and pathed area

3.5 The Existing extension is full width, 2.3 metres and 2.5 metres above ground. Following revised plans, the new extension to contain an extended dining area is between 5.5m (set in), 6m wide (adjoining main house), 3.1m deep and 2.8 metres high above new level and 2.2 metres high above original ground level, with a proposed paved area about 3.9m wide by 2.35m deep. It is proposed excavating some 600mm to accommodate for this extension to give it additional internal height, including a rear patio and new stairs into the garden which is simplistic and considered acceptable which would be obscure from viewpoints. The lowering of the floor would make the extension lower than existing and therefore making it less prominent.

3.6 The principle of such proposal is acceptable considering the planning history of St. Mark's Crescent for similar proposals at nos. 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15 and 16 have been granted approval for similar development at lower ground floor level, which as a whole, contribute to the character of the rear of this terrace. The proposed development therefore would not result in the loss of original features or historic fabric.

3.7 The rear garden is about 7.5m wide by 9m long, bounded by similar gardens to each side and to the rear by Regent's canal. The finished proposal would still have a significant amount of garden space left over; The rear garden floor area measures 85 square metres, with the current extension taking up 14 square metres. The proposed extension would have a footprint of 17.5 square metres, which would only amount to 3.5 square metres more than existing and would still have some 67.5 square metres of garden space remaining which equals around 75% of the original rear garden space remaining, furthermore this would be in addition to the space which is benefited by the occupiers to the side of the house.

3.8 The extension is set back some 800mm from the boundary which is considered to reduce the size and bulk and is considered acceptable. The proposed extension is of a modest size and comparable to existing extensions in this row of villas. The existing house is four storeys at the rear. The proposed extension (despite having a slightly larger footprint than the existing extension) is considered subservient to the main house. As with previous approved rear extensions of the same nature in St Marks Crescent, the scale is considered to not be damaging to the character of the conservation area. The most notable one is at No.14 which is the most recently approved under 2016/1637/P mentioned above which is of a similar modern design and size, although smaller in depth, this one in fact goes up all the way to the neighbours boundary with the balcony above and is also higher above the original ground level. No.5 and 6 St.Mark's Road were given permission recently and both 3.6 metres in depth which is 500mm more than the proposal in question.

3.9 Due to the change in level between the original house and the garden, the floor of the proposed extension will be lower than the existing extension, so that it will be level with the existing lower ground floor. This existing rear extension measures at 2.5 metres height however with the proposal being at a sunken level compared to the garden, this would reduce the visual impact of the extension. Therefore despite the proposed external measurements of the extension being slightly more than the existing, the finished roof level (and therefore terrace level) of the new extension will be lower above the ground level and hence less visible than the existing extension.

3.10 The finish would be in render and it would be coloured the same as the existing property. The design is considered simplistic and modern with the fenestration of the proposed extension broken up by the introduction of vertical columns, which reduce the size of the apertures to a scale more appropriate to the main building's character, which give a classical visual appearance by carefully controlling the proportion and rhythm of the columns and height of the extension.

3.11 It is acknowledged that the railing now abuts the bay window, however the railing would not interfere with the historic fabric and the bay window is considered to be read clearly, due to the nature of such minor lightweight development.

3.12 With the above taken into consideration the extension would appear subordinate to the host building which is 4 storeys high at the rear and would allow for the retention of an adequate sized garden. Although it may be seen from the Canal to the rear, such views would not be prominent due to factors such as trees, the rear boundary and distances from boats and the towpath. Thus, the appearance of the rear elevation of the property would only change marginally when viewed from Regent's Canal. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be in line with current policy and guidance which seek to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area subject to condition requiring additional information materials, and design details.

## Front lightwell extension

3.13 The Primrose Hill CAS states within PH39; *Infill or extension of basement lightwells will not normally be acceptable. These works are often unduly prominent, detract from the original design of the building, the established character of the street or involve the loss of significant garden space or historic fabric.* It is considered that such lightwell has been covered historically with existing glazing, it is considered that such proposal would be replacing a cover of the lightwell and would not be considered to be infilled.

3.14 The proposal would be a replacement flat glazing over the existing lightwell, there were number of concerns from the CAAC and residents with regards to the initial proposed glazing being larger than existing, however following revised plans, it would be lower than the current position, and would be significantly lower than the surrounding metal railing and would be screened by the front boundary. The original metalwork railings will be retained and refurbished.

3.15 The plinth will be rendered and decorated to match the existing house. A proprietary rooflight will be set into one bay of the glazing in a similar way to the existing. The new rooflight and flashings will be detailed in a more sympathetic manner than the existing, providing an improvement on the aesthetics and considered to preserve the character of the conservation area which is welcome to keep the traditional appearance. The opening vent has been moved to the right hand side, making it visually more discreet than the existing hinged unit that sits in the centre of the lightwell glazing. The proposed modern glazing bars are considered more robust than the existing, allowing for the glazing spans to increase, resulting in a reduction in the number of glazing bars compared to the existing and proposed planter adjacent to No.11's boundary further reducing the visual impact and the original metalwork railings will be retained and refurbished which is welcome.

3.16 There would be minimal external alterations as a result of the works and they would therefore preserve the character of the host property and wider Conservation Area subject to condition requiring additional information materials, and design details.

## **4.0 Amenity**

4.1 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.

4.2 The rear extension would be at lower ground floor level overlooking Regents Canal and the roof terrace would be located at the same level as the existing balcony. The development is therefore considered to not result in a significant increase in overlooking of neighbouring properties than the current situation. As mentioned above, permission 2016/1637/P at No.14 most recently approved nearby has the balcony approved being right on the boundary.

4.3 Compared to the existing the balcony which abuts the wall with No.11, the proposed balcony is setback away from the boundary by 800mm and submitted sightline drawings demonstrating that there would be no increase of overlooking compared to the existing situation. With the balcony only extending on the existing by 300mm (Existing is 2.3 metres depth), it would be still set back from the boundary with No.13 by 1.5 metres, and would not materially increase the floor area of the roof terrace than the existing. The new side glazed doors, is considered it would not create overlooking due to its location, sunken height and would be screened by the boundary between No.12 and No.13. With the above taken into consideration, it is unlikely to increase overlooking to the next door neighbour.

4.4 It is acknowledged that the extension is due south of the adjoining neighbour of No.11, however as mentioned with above with the measurements and the proposed sunken level, it is considered that the proposal would not create any material difference in terms of any loss of light to the nearest neighbouring property being No.11. As mentioned, the extension has been revised a reduction of 500mm on the second iteration and would be set away from boundary by 800mm compared to the existing which is on the boundary, and such neighbouring bay window is considered to be wider than your average window and would stay clear of the 45 degree angle rule of thumb when measured from elevations and as such would still receive adequate



sunlight/daylight. With the above taken into consideration, it is unlikely to decrease outlook or result in a significant decrease in light levels entering adjoining neighbouring property no.11.

## **5.0 Impact on trees**

5.1 It is considered, the only significant tree as far as this proposal is concerned is tree 1, the weeping willow in the rear garden of the application site, this is protected by a TPO. It is proposed to retain the tree and appropriate advice has been sought from an arboriculturist who has written the submitted report and diagrams for the appraisal of the impact from the proposed design and the proposed protection measures. The existing extension is within the Root Protection Area (RPA) that would be specified by BS5837 and the proposed structure extends slightly farther into it.

5.2 The apple tree 2 also to the rear of the site is well clear of the new extension and work area. One corner of the extension is in the RPA of tree 3, the weeping willow at no.13, but the amount concerned is insignificant, the same points cited for tree 1 reduce any risk further and the boundary wall between the gardens gives additional protection.

5.3 The Council's Tree Officers have assessed the proposals and supporting documents and do not object to the development provided it is carried out in accordance with the submitted arboricultural method statement and condition for tree protection measures to be installed in accordance with approved drawings and evidence of this shall be submitted to the council.

## **6.0 Recommendation**

6.1 Grant conditional planning permission.

### **Disclaimer**

*The decision to refer an application to Planning Committee lies with the Director of Regeneration and Planning. Following the Members Briefing panel on Monday 20th February 2017, nominated members will advise whether they consider this application should be reported to the Planning Committee. For further information, please go to [www.camden.gov.uk](http://www.camden.gov.uk) and search for 'Members Briefing'.*

