



Camden
Planning Solutions Team
Planning and Regeneration
 Culture & Environment
 Directorate
 London Borough of Camden
 2nd Floor
 5 Pancras Square
 London
 N1C 4AG

Date: 21/03/2019
Our ref: 2019/0660/PRE
Contact: John Diver
Direct line: 020 7974 6368
Email: john.diver@camden.gov.uk

Margo Sagov
 Brunswick House
 30 Wandsworth Road
 London
 SW8 2LG
 By email

www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Dear Margo,

Re: Flat A, 38 Allcroft Road, London, NW5 4NE

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry for the above property. The following advice is informed by a site visit to the property which took place on the 7th March 2019.

1. Drawings and documents

1.1. The following documentation was submitted in support of the pre-application request:

Dwg no	Rev	Dwg title	Scale	Size	Issued	Date
MURRAY JOHN ARCHITECTS LTD DRAWINGS						
791/01		Location plan, site plan	1:1250; 1:500	A3	Pre-Plan.	31/01/2019
791/02		Plans as Existing	1:50	A1	Pre-Plan.	31/01/2019
791/03		Front and Rear elevation as existing	1:50	A2	Pre-Plan.	31/01/2019
791/04		Longitudinal sections as Existing	1:50	A1	Pre-Plan.	31/01/2019
791/05		Plans as Proposed	1:50	A1	Pre-Plan.	31/01/2019
791/06		Front and Rear elevation as proposed	1:50	A2	Pre-Plan.	31/01/2019
791/07		Longitudinal sections as Proposed	1:50	A1	Pre-Plan.	31/01/2019
791/08		Side and rear elevations as Proposed	1:50	A2	Pre-Plan.	31/01/2019
		DWG and Documents Schedule		A4	Pre-plan.	31/01/2019

1.2. In addition, further information in the form of a covering letter, photos of the existing site, historic maps and aerial imagery were provided to aid discussion.

2. Proposal

2.1. Advice is requested in relation to the following proposed developments:

- Erection of a single storey side and rear infill extension following demolition of existing.
- Replacement of ground floor side window.

2.2. The works would include the demolition of the existing, tired rear extension and its replacement with a single storey wrap-around extension articulated in two parts. The combined extensions would have an area of approximately 25sqm and would remain single storey. The internal changes shown are minor in nature and would not include excavation, meaning planning permission is not required for these works.

3. Site description

- 3.1. No.38 Allcroft Road is a three storey, terrace property within the Haverstock ward, which appears to have been built in the 1860's. The property has historically been sub-divided into two self-contained flats. The 'application site' for the purposes of this advice relates to the ground floor flat (A).
- 3.2. The property is located within the West Kentish Town Conservation Area. The West Kentish Town Conservation Statement (adopted 2005) classifies the application property as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. There are no trees protected by tree preservation orders on or adjacent to the application site.

4. Relevant planning history

- 4.1. The following planning history is relevant to this site:

No.38 (Application Site)

9101069: Planning permission was granted on the 06/11/1991 for the 'Erection of a single storey rear extension at ground floor level'

F10/24/6/18667: Planning permission was granted on the 08/07/1974 for the 'Change of use, including works of conversion, and the erection of a rear bathroom extension at second floor level to provide one self-contained ground floor flat and one maisonette.'

5. Relevant policies and guidance

- [National Planning Policy Framework \(2019\)](#)
- [London Plan \(2016\)](#)
- [Camden Local Plan \(2017\)](#)
 - G1 - Delivery and location of growth
 - C1 - Health and well-being
 - C5 - Safety and security
 - C6 - Access for all
 - A1 - Managing the impact of development
 - A3 - Biodiversity
 - A4 - Noise and vibration
 - D1 - Design
 - D2 - Heritage
- West Kentish Town [Conservation Area Statement \(2005\)](#)
- Emerging [New London Plan \(submission draft\) 2018](#)
- [Camden Planning Guidance:](#)
 - CPG Amenity (2018)
 - CPG Biodiversity (2018)
 - CPG 1 Design (July 2015 updated March 2018)
 - CPG 6 Amenity (September 2011 updated March 2018)
 - CPG 7 Transport (September 2011)

6. Assessment

6.1. The main issues to consider in this case are as follows:

- Design, heritage and nature conservation; and
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

7. Design, heritage and nature conservation;

7.1. Policy D1 (Design) sets out the Council's expectations for high quality design in development and sets parameters for assessment, including that development should respect local context and character. Policy D2 (Heritage) states that the Council will require that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area. This includes by (h) preserving trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character and appearance of a conservation area or which provide a setting for Camden's architectural heritage. Further to the above, policies A2 (Open space) and A3 (Biodiversity) both seek to resist development that would lead to the loss of spaces with nature conservation, biodiversity, townscape and amenity value, including gardens, where possible.

7.2. The property is typical for its time and remains consistent with the rest of the terrace, meaning that its plan is broadly L shaped due to its two-storey rear closet wing that projects into the rear garden. A historic single storey rear extension projects beyond the closet wing at lower ground floor level and abuts the rear boundary of the site. The property retains its original character, including a number of historic features and is defined as a 'positive contributor' to the conservation area. The proposed works would relate to the rear garden area of the property only, with no external alterations required to the front elevation. This part of the site is not visible in any public view, and even private views are limited as a result of the existing boundary treatment and level of enclosure from surrounding built form.

7.3. The area of the combined extensions would equate to less than 50% of the original footprint of the dwelling (c.53sqm), however, cumulatively they would occupy the majority of the original rear garden area. Generally, this would be objectionable. In this instance however, during the site visit it was noted that the existing garden area of the property offers limited amenity value, being a confined courtyard area that is predominantly hard surfaced. Whereas rear gardens to properties further South along the terrace remain fairly open, sizable and verdant, the street turns more commercial in character towards its northern end where rear gardens are much smaller (due to the converging street pattern), more enclosed and feature numerous infill extensions. In light of the above, the level of infilling to the rear garden would not, in this instance, result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property or terrace. In terms of scale, the proposed extensions would therefore be considered to remain subordinate to the host property.

7.4. In terms of detailed design, the articulation of the extensions in two parts (one single pitched glazed roof, one flat, green roofed) would appropriately maintain the visual distinction between the original rear closet wing and courtyard garden via the more lightweight lean-to structure. The lean to extension would be differentiated from the original rear elevation via the retention of a courtyard which would allow for the original rear fenestration to be maintained. This is welcomed. The design of such a structure should include high quality materials (uPVC would be resisted) and slim frames to reflect the fine detailing of the house. The installation of a green roof to the second element would be strongly supported, especially given the further loss of garden area and associated opportunities for greening. However, allowances for sufficient substrate depth should be factored into proposed sections to allow for long-term sustainability and to maximise its biodiversity value. To demonstrate this, we would expect to see details of the proposed green roof construction (via sections) as well as installation and maintenance details ideally up front, or via condition. Further guidance on the appropriate construction and

maintenance of green roofs can be found in the Biodiversity CPG. In order to increase natural light to the green roof and well as neighbouring properties, the removal of the existing double height close-boarded fence in this location would also be encouraged.

- 7.5. The installation of a replacement window to the side elevation of the closet wing would not be objectionable in terms of design and conservation subject to the use of high quality materials (again, uPVC would be resisted).

8. Neighbouring Amenity

- 8.1. Policy A1 (Managing the impacts of development) seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. Factors to consider, and which is particularly relevant to this case, include sunlight, daylight, artificial light levels, outlook and visual privacy and overlooking.
- 8.2. Whilst proposed sections showing the relationship with no.36 have not been provided, it is not anticipated that the replacement of the existing flat roofed extension would give rise to any loss of neighbouring amenity. This would assume that the existing parapet level does not need any material alteration and so the above comments relating to green roof are of relevance. Given the siting of the extension and its orientation, if it were necessary to increase its height significantly then further consideration of the resulting impacts to natural light to no.40 may be required. Please see section 3 of the Amenity CPG for further guidance. If a formal submission was made that was otherwise acceptable, it would be likely that a condition preventing the use of the green roof as a terrace would be applied to protect privacy.
- 8.3. The proposed lean-to extension would have a potential to give rise to a loss of amenity, principally to the occupiers of no.40 Allcroft Road and the opposing ground floor property on Bassett Road (assumed to be no.32).
- 8.4. With regard to no.40, the proposed extension would project along the majority of the shared boundary to this property (7.5/9.5m). Given that no.40 features a habitable room window to its rear elevation (same position as application property) impacts to outlook, natural light and visual sense of enclosure to this neighbouring property are all of concern. Submitted sections would suggest that the eaves height of the lean-to would be 2m meaning that the garden wall would be built up to this height. This would be likely to result in a harmful sense of enclosure and, as such, it would be recommended to lower the extension / eaves height to be no greater than 1.8m. This height would not be objectionable given the pitched roof and the height of the existing boundary wall. Such a reduction, combined with the single pitched roof, would most likely avoid a harmful loss of natural light and sense of enclosure to this neighbouring property. Notwithstanding the above, during the site visit it was noted that Allcroft Rd is subject to a North to South downwards gradient meaning the garden level to no.40 appears to be some 3 brick courses (approximately 200mm) higher than the application site. The above request for a lowering of heights may therefore be negated if full surveyed sections illustrate the eaves to be no higher than 1.8m when measured from the neighbouring property.
- 8.5. In relation to the rear gardens of Bassett Road, the manner in which the rear boundary wall is reconstructed and the resulting sense of enclosure to the rear gardens of Bassett Road would also need careful consideration. We would want to ensure that this wall would not create an overbearing sense of enclosure to these adjoining garden spaces. Whilst access to this site was not afforded, we would also want to see sections through this shared boundary to evidence the existing/proposed relationship. The use of a triangular rear flank for the lean-to would help to mitigate this impact.

9. Conclusion

9.1. Overall the proposed works are considered likely to be supported during a formal application, subject to appropriate detailed design as well as sectional analysis that demonstrates that there would be no harmful loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers. It is recommended that the height of the lean-to is reduced slightly to ensure that this is the case, though further surveying may demonstrate that this is not required.

10. Consultation

10.1. Prior to a formal submission, it is strongly advised that you notify and enter into a dialogue with your adjoining neighbours to inform them of your intentions.

11. Planning application information

11.1. If you submit a planning application which addresses the outstanding issue detailed in this report satisfactorily, I would advise you to submit the following for a valid planning application:

- Completed form – [full planning]
- Planning application fee [£234.00]

Plans

- An Ordnance Survey based location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red.
- Floor plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Roof plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Elevation drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Section drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed' (including across boundary walls in all directions)

Supporting Information / Reports

- Design and access statement
- Daylight / Sunlight Report (if increases to heights of replacement extension necessitate such a report)
- Please see [supporting information for planning applications](#) for more information.

11.2. We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would notify neighbours by sending out e-alerts, putting up notices on or near the site and advertising in a local newspaper. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.

This document represents an initial informal officer view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage and would not be binding upon the Council, nor prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact me direct. Thank you for using Camden's pre-application advice service.

Yours sincerely,

John Diver

Senior Planning Officer
Regeneration and Planning
Supporting Communities
London Borough of Camden