

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		08/02/2019	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		16/02/2019	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Emily Whittredge				1) 2018/6141/P 2) 2019/0229/L			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
133 Arlington Road London NW1 7ET				S001-S005, S100, S200, S201, D001-D003, D100, D200, D201, A001-A004, A100, A200, A201, Heritage Statement by the Heritage Practice dated December 2018.			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
1) & 2) Erection of single-storey rear extension to ground floor.							
Recommendation(s):		1) Refuse Planning Permission 2) Refuse Listed Building Consent					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		No Comments Received					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		Camden CAAC 16 th February 2019: No Objection. 'The proposed rear ground floor extension is not full width, nor overly large, and the house itself is a different pattern to others at the rear (this one has nor rear mansard roof, but a taller brick butterfly parapet instead)- we therefore do not object to the ground floor extension.'					

Site Description

133 Arlington Road was built in the 1840s, is Grade II listed as part of the group at 101-145 Arlington Road, and lies within the Camden Town Conservation Area.

Relevant History

It has an extant permission for alterations and a lower ground floor extension 2017/4922/P and 2018/0497/L granted November 20th 2018.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Chapter 12- Achieving well-designed places (paragraphs 124-128, 130, 131).

Chapter 16- Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paragraphs 190, 193 and 196).

The London Plan March 2016

Policy 7.4- Local character.

Policy 7.6- Architecture.

Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology.

Camden Local Plan 2017

A1- Managing the Impact of Development

D1- Design

D2- Heritage.

Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal (2007)

Supplementary Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (July 2015, Updated March 2018).

Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (October 2007).

Assessment

The Significance of the Rear Elevation:

133 Arlington Road is taller and wider than the rest of the buildings in the listed group and has a strong vertical emphasis to its rear elevation. Owing to these, it is considered to be an odd one in the set of listed buildings. It has a well preserved, robust rear elevation which contributes to the significance of the listed buildings in the group. As noted in 2.20 of Appendix A of the Heritage Assessment dated December 2018, the rear elevation has 'a robust appearance, very much vertical in emphasis'. 133 Arlington Road's well preserved condition and appearance notwithstanding, its unique position in the group acting as a link to the listed buildings on either side provides a strong reason that its rear elevation is preserved (or sustained) and enhanced. According to Para 192 of the NPPF (2019), local planning authorities are required to place an onus on 'the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets'.

The Impact of the proposal:

- The proposed extension appears visually over-bearing and dominant on the rear elevation. The bulk, mass and volume of the proposal affects the strong vertical emphasis of the building and undermines the significance of the rear elevation. The proposed extension is not in keeping with the character of the existing building and is considered to cause a 'less than substantial' degree of harm to the heritage asset.
- The pre-existing extension at No 135 pre-dated the listing of the terraces. It was apparently built as a replacement for a historic extension and is considered to be a poorly designed example. It does not contribute to the character and appearance of the listed building and should not act as a precedent for future development in the vicinity.
- The proposed glazed extension is intended to be used as a kitchen, which would be a highly used utilitarian space. During the day and particularly at night this will be a very visible, highly lit occupied living space and not just a simple conservatory, which will detract from the character and appearance of the listed buildings and will impact on neighbouring visual amenity. The detailing in the proposed drawings is not sufficient to reflect the intention of the space as a kitchen.
- The introduction of a glazed extension will harm the building's historic plan form at ground floor level, which will undermine its significance. The function of the proposed extension as a kitchen will be detrimental to the setting of the heritage assets- the listed building/s and the Camden Conservation Area and harms the significance of the heritage assets.
- Cumulative impact of the effect of the proposals are also considered to be harmful to the setting of the heritage assets.
- There are no public or heritage benefits associated with this application, which would outweigh the harm caused by the proposal.
- As mentioned in the Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal (2007), *'Within the Camden Town Conservation Area there are many interesting examples of historic rear elevations. The original historic pattern of rear elevations within a street or group of buildings is an integral part of the character of the area and as such rear extensions will not be acceptable where they would compromise the special character.'*
- The Camden Town Conservation Area appraisal also places an emphasis on views into rear gardens with mature trees in an area lacking in open space and street trees.

In Conclusion, the principle of the ground floor extension was unacceptable during pre-application discussions during the course of the earlier consented application. The proposed rear extension, by reason of the siting, of the detailed design, materials, scale, and visibility within the wider setting of the listed grade II terrace and the character and appearance of the conservation area, would be harmful to the historic significance of the listed building. In addition to the reasons stated above, the conservation officers remain of the view that the proposed development is not acceptable.

