

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		22/06/2017	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		22/06/2017	
Officer				Application Numbers			
Anna Roe				2017/2415/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Flat 14, 128 Atlantic House, Albert Street, London, NW1 7NE				Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Extension of existing roof terrace into the existing roof space.							
Recommendation:		Refuse Permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	N/A	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:		<u>Planning</u> Advertisement in local press on 01/06/17 - 22/06/17 Site notice displayed on 26/05/17 – 16/06/17					
CAAC comments:		Camden Town Conservation Area Advisory Committee regarding: 1. We do not object to this application but our experience with glass sheets at roof level (the triangular fins each side of the terrace) is that there can be unpredictable and annoying reflections into neighbouring properties (even at great distance) so some form of sandblasting on both sides of the triangular sheets would be advisable. Also this would help to limit 'sideways overlooking'. If there is a problem with the 'fins' the applicant could slide or fold upwards a temporary glass screen as a wind barrier, if that is the reason for the fins.					

Site Description

The property is located on the north-eastern corner of Albert Street, adjacent to the junction with Parkway (a street leading up to Regents Park).

Albert Street has a high quality streetscape. Lined on both sides almost without interruption by uniform historic terraces. The finely detailed brick and stucco terraces were built in most part by George Bassett, surveyor to the Southampton Estate, in the years 1844-48.

Built in the 1920's, No. 128 is one such 'interruption'. The property was originally in industrial use but was converted in the early nineties into a mixed-use property containing retail, commercial and residential accommodation. Today the ground floor comprises retail units fronting onto Parkway and a public house (The Earl of Camden). The first floor is occupied by offices, while a new steel structure forms a second and third floor of residential apartments, accessed from Albert Street.

The property is located in the Camden Town Conservation Area; it is not listed but is identified as a positive contributor in the Camden Town Conservation Area Statement.

Relevant History

2016/5829/P - Replacement of existing common entrance door and associated alterations to building in mixed use. Granted 19/12/2016.

2010/2934/P - Installation of new awnings and external doors to Flat 3 and 4 (Class C3). Granted 10/08/2010.

2006/5372/P - Installation of 6 x rooflights and 1 air conditioning unit to the rear of the existing roof area above flat 14. Granted 27/04/2007.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework, 2012

London Plan, 2016

Camden Local Plan, 2017

A1 Managing the impact of development

A4 Noise

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design, 2015, chapter

CPG6 Amenity, 2011, chapter

Camden Town Conservation Area

1. Proposal

- 1.1 The proposal is to enlarge the existing roof terrace that is modest in size and set back into the apron of the rear roof slope. The depth of the terrace would be increased closer to the eaves of the building. A glass balustrade would be placed across the width of the enlarged roof terrace.
- 1.2 The existing terrace measures 10.8 metres wide by 2.2 metres deep. The proposed terrace would measure 10.8 metres wide by 3.1 metres deep.

2. Assessment

The principle considerations material to determining the application are:

- Design (the impact on the character and appearance of the host building and wider conservation area); and
- Impact on neighbouring amenity.

3. Design and Conservation

- 3.1 Camden's Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance the environment and heritage. Policy D1 require all developments, to be of the highest standard of design and the Council will expect developments to consider the character and proportions of the existing building and the quality of materials.
- 3.2 Chapter 4 of Camden Planning Guidance: Design (CPG1) offers more detail advice on roof alterations including terraces and balconies. Paragraph 5.25 advises that terraces at roof level should not adversely affect the appearance of the roof and should complement the elevation upon which they are to be located. Furthermore, any handrails required should be well set back behind the line of the roof slope and be invisible from the ground.
- 3.3 The Camden Town conservation area statement emphasizes this point: insensitive alterations and poor materials can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will not be acceptable.
- 3.4 Extending the roof terrace closer to the eaves would noticeably elongate the opening at roof level and would materially erode the integrity of the roof form. In doing so, it is considered that an awkward and discordant feature would be introduced into the rear roof slope which would be harmful to the roofscape of the host property and the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 3.5 It is noted that none of the neighbouring properties have a roof terrace which extends so close to the eaves; those properties with roof terraces have them set back behind the pitch of the roof slope in accordance with planning policy.
- 3.6 Although not visible from most public vantage points, the proposal would be seen from the rear garden and the rear windows of some properties on Arlington Road to the rear.
- 3.7 In addition the position of the new balustrade marking the edge of the extended terrace would visually break the line of roof. The increased forward projection of the balustrade and the additional height would increase the prominence of the roof terrace and the visibility of the full-length doors behind.
- 3.8 This arrangement would conflict with the advice in the Camden Planning Guidance: Design (CPG1), which states that handrails required should be well set back behind the line of the roof slope. Overall, the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the host

building and the local area.

3.9 The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets, as they are irreplaceable and any harm should require clear and convincing justification. In this case, it is considered that the harm identified to the Conservation Area would, in the context of the significance of the heritage asset, would be less than substantial. The Framework requires that where the harm identified would be less than substantial, that harm should be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal. In this case, the proposal would increase the otherwise limited external private amenity space available to occupiers of the appeal flat and improve the living conditions of the appellant and his family. However, this benefit does not outweigh the harm identified.

4. Residential Amenity

4.1 Camden's Local Plan seeks to conserve and enhance the features which make Camden an attractive place to live, work and visit and promoting and protecting high standards of amenity is a key element of this.

4.2 Policy A1 seeks to protect 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, outlook and noise.

4.3 It is not considered that the proposal would materially increase opportunities to overlook adjoining properties. The views from the proposed terraces would not be markedly different from those possible from the existing terrace and privacy screen are proposed to protect the amenity of the neighbouring terrace. The development is therefore not considered to cause harm to neighbouring amenity in terms of overlooking.

4.4 There is considered to be limited potential for noise and disturbance given the small footprint of the proposed terraces, furthermore terraces are common within the surrounding area and are not out of keeping in a dense, urban environment such as this.

5. Recommendation

Refuse Planning Permission