

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>16/07/2019</b>			
<b>(Refusal)</b>		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		17/06/2019			
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>					
Joshua Ogunleye				1) 2019/3647/P 2) 2019/4098/L					
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>					
67 Gloucester Crescent London NW1 7EG				See draft 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 rear infill extension at lower ground and ground floor level (following demolition of existing lower ground floor infill extension); reconfiguration of front vaults and external alterations to include new spiral staircase at rear to dwelling house (Grade II).									
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Ref conditional planning permission							
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Application / Listed Building Consent							
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice							
<b>Informatives:</b>									
<b>Consultations</b>									
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. of responses		05		No. of objections		04	
		No. Electronic		00					
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Site notice consultation: 15/08/2019 until 08/09/2019 Press notice consultation: 14/08/2019 until 07/09/2019  <b>One response was received from the Primrose Hill CAAC. Details of objections have been summaries below</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We object to the destructive nature of the application in terms of the Listed building. We object to the glazing of the ground floor rear room entrance door for the loss of details and sense of enclosure of the staircase volume which is a key element in the listed building.</li> <li>2. At the rear the conservatory should be a single storey in conformity with guidance, it should be set back to respect the original building line at the rear.</li> </ol>							

## Site Description

- 1.1. The application relates to a mid-terrace three storey property with basement property on the western side of Gloucester Crescent. The host property was constructed with yellow stock bricks and hosts timber sash windows with 2/2 glazing bars on its front and rear elevations. The property also benefits from a three storey pre-existing rear projection (on its left side) with a dual pitched roof design. This pattern is repeated across other properties on the terrace.
- 1.2. The application property is a Grade II listed building (LEN 1078319). The property is located within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. The property sits on a sloping topography with ground level in the front garden area being at a higher datum level to ground level within the rear garden area.

## Relevant History

2013/7563/L – Creation of new opening in flank wall at 2nd floor into adjacent mansard roof extension (consented 2013/033 1/P & 2013/0356/L, 14/03/2013). Granted on 03/01/2014

2013/0356/L - Erection of roof extension to No. 66 and part of No 67. Gloucester Crescent and internal alterations all in connection with dwelling (Class C3). Granted on 14/03/2013

2013/0331/P - Erection of roof extension to No. 66 and part of No 67. Gloucester Crescent all in connection with dwelling (Class C3). Granted on 14/03/2013

9003223 - Erection of a conservatory at rear basement level and a balcony with stairs to garden at rear ground floor level as shown on drawing nos. 657/09 10 revised on 01.06.90. Granted on 21/02/1991

### No.22 Gloucester Crescent

2015/5582/P - Two storey rear extension at ground and first Floor levels. Withdrawn on 15/09/2016 - 22 Gloucester Crescent

2015/5943/L - Two storey rear extension at ground and first Floor levels. Withdrawn on 15/09/2016 - 22 Gloucester Crescent

### No. 57 Gloucester Crescent

2016/6644/P - Erection of new single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level to replace the existing rear conservatory. Granted on 28/02/2017 - 57 Gloucester Crescent

2016/6920/L - Erection of new single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level to replace the existing rear conservatory, alterations to the internal layout at lower ground floor level and installation of higher quality fittings and services. Granted on 28/02/2017 - 57 Gloucester Crescent

### No. 64 Gloucester Crescent

2016/2038/L - Erection of rear extension at lower ground floor level and conservatory at rear upper ground floor level. Enlargement of existing window openings and associated external and internal works – Granted on 25/10/2017

2016/1407/P - Erection of rear extension at lower ground floor level and conservatory at rear upper ground floor level. Enlargement of existing window openings and associated external and internal works – Granted on 25/10/2017

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2019

### London Plan 2016

### Camden Plan 2017

A1 Managing the impact of development

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

### Other Planning Policies / Guidance

CPG Altering and extending your home (2019)

CPG Design (2019)

CPG Amenity (2018)

## Assessment

### 2. Proposal

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the rear lower ground infill extension and the erection of a two-storey infill rear extension at lower ground and ground floor level.
- 2.2. The proposed extension would have measure 3.2m(d) 2.7m(w) with an overall height of 6.63m.
- 2.3. Other works include the relocation of an existing rear elevation stair case from the right side to the left side (elevation view)
- 2.4. The application includes the installation of a double glazed white painted timber sash window on the rear elevation. The proposed timber window would replace a non-original uPVC framed door. The proposed window would be installed into existing openings. The replacement window would comprise a 2/2 glazing arrangement.
- 2.5. With regards Listed Building Consent works, the proposals also involve the internal reconfiguration of room arrangements at ground and basement level together and the covering of the front vaults.

### 3. Revisions

- 3.1. Revised drawings were submitted showing a reduction in the width of the proposed opening between the existing sunroom and proposed extension.

### 4. Assessment

#### Design and heritage

- 4.1. The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions are proposed. Policy D1 of the Local Plan requires development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, which improves the function, appearance and character of the area; and Policy D2 states that the Council will preserve, and where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas and listed buildings. Camden's Local Plan is supported by CPG documents 'Design' and 'Altering and extending your home' and the Camden Town Conservation Area Statement.
- 4.2. Sections 16 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("the Listed Buildings Act") are relevant. Section 16(2) provides that in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works to a Listed Building special regard must be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or

historic interest which it possesses. Section 72(1) requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area when considering applications relating to land or buildings within that Area.

- 4.3. The effect of these sections of the Listed Buildings Act is that there is a statutory presumption in favour of the preservation of the character and appearance of Conservation Areas and the preservation of Listed Buildings and their settings. Considerable importance and weight should be attached to their preservation. A proposal which would cause harm should only be permitted where there are strong countervailing planning considerations which are sufficiently powerful to outweigh the presumption.

#### Significance

- 4.4. The application building is Grade II Listed and forms part of a paired listing with number 66 (List Entry Number 1078319). The pair were first listed on 30th October 2004 and are described in the listing description as follows:
- 4.5. Pair of terraced houses. Mid C19. Yellow stock brick. 2 storeys and semi-basement. 3-window range. Symmetrical design. Doorways flanked by pilasters supporting entablatures; panelled and part-glazed doors with overlights. Architraved sashes; 1st floor with pediments and cast-iron window guards to 2 right hand windows. Timber dentil cornice.
- 4.6. The building's significance is considered to derive from its architectural and historic interest, including the group value arising from its uniform and symmetrical appearance shared with the wider terrace. The house largely retains its historic plan form. To the rear, there is a three storey rear projection with modern glazed conservatory. The building features a modern rooflights on its rear roofslope proportionately spaced apart. It is not considered that these modern additions detract from the significance of the building due to its modest form and sympathetic design and materials

#### Front Vaults

- 4.7. The proposal is to unify the existing two front vaults by demolition of the co-joining wall which would alter the plan form of the space. The vaults were constructed as individual storage spaces and as such they should remain. They are architecturally significant within the context of the host property and in understanding its use.
- 4.8. Whilst it is accepted that the existing (TPO) oak tree in the front garden would have some impact on the structural as existing vault, officers are concerned that the applicant has not sufficiently explored suitable alternatives to rectify these issues. Granted they are not the most architecturally significant part of the premises but they do have significance in their existing form, which helps shed light on the uses for which they were built. The front vaults should be retained as two separate spaces. As such, it is considered that the proposal to unify them would result in further structural harm to the existing vaults and the loss of its historic form and character.

#### Internal Alterations

- 4.9. The intervention within the basement lacks sympathy for the existing plan form. The inserted 'music room' sits uncomfortably within the back room. The new 'music room' obscures the existing fireplace and results in an unsympathetic subdivision of the existing room. The existing plan form of the house would have seen a sequence of rooms one leading into the next via a single doorway. Through-rooms are the result of modern intervention and an alien feature to historic houses such as this. Further opening-up between the living room, the music room and the conservatory, serve to detract from the historic plan form's as such resulting in significant harm to the as an heritage asset. Further division of existing spaces or demolition and no further introduction of linings to block existing features would not preserve or enhance the host heritage value.

## Proposed Infill Extension.

- 4.10. The proposed infill extension, replacing the existing lower ground floor and extending at ground floor level would be incorporated into the existing three storey rear extension at ground and lower ground floor level. The proposed infill extension would result in the creation of a full width double storey rear extension. The resulting structure would visually appear as a 3/2 storey infill this is due to the contrasting roof designs that would make up the structures. The new two storey infill would comprise a monopitched roof design alongside the existing three storey structure with a dual pitched roof design.
- 4.11. The proposed sloping roof would be and partially glazed and visually set down below the first floor level with and its ridge height setting below the cill of the first floor window. This on its own does little to make the design appear sympathetic within its context. The rear infill extension's roof forms would lack visual cohesion or consistency when viewed within the context of the host property's rear elevation or within the wider views of neighbouring properties.
- 4.12. Where modern rear extensions exists on the rear elevation of neighbouring properties on Gloucester Crescent and Regent's Park Garden, they typically have a consistent flat roof design with the infill space visually set apart from the roof of the original rear projection. The differing roof designs, with half a story visual separation in the context introduces two competing visual forms on the host property's rear elevation. Differences between existing three storey dual pitch roof form and the proposed two storey with mono-pitch roof form would appear as an incongruous addition within its context of the surrounding rear garden area. The design would not appear in keeping with the prevailing pattern of development within the surrounding rear garden area and would detract from the listed terrace's historic significance.
- 4.13. The proposed infill extension would enclose an existing void space between the side wall of an existing rear projection on its left side and the side wall of the property at No.65 on its right. In doing so the proposed infill would compromise the view of the existing rear elevation and sash window at ground floor level. The use of timber framed glazing framed extension would typically be considered lightweight and sensitive to the character of conservation areas. However, in this instance officers consider the complete enclosure at ground floor level would introduce substantial visual mass that would obscure significant architectural detailing on the host property's rear elevation. As such would be harmful to the host property's character and appearance.
- 4.14. In the submitted heritage statement the applicant asserts that the proposed extension's scale and massing be similar to previously consented schemes on the rear elevations of No.64 Gloucester Crescent (application ref: 2016/2038/L and 2016/1407/P). Officers note that there were also concerns about the scheme in particular its impact on the host property's historic significance. During the officers' site visit it was noted that the previously approved scheme at no.64 was yet to be built. It was further noted that there were no other full width extension at ground floor level on the rear elevation of neighbouring properties. Where modern rear extensions exists on the rear elevations of No.7 and 8 Regents Park Terrace, the pattern of development are not full width at ground floor level. Therefore officers consider the proposed full width rear extension at ground floor level would appear out of character with the character and appearance of the neighbouring properties and surrounding conservation area.
- 4.15. Whilst the proposed rear extension would not be visible from the public realm officers note that the property would be visible from rear garden of neighbouring properties and the rear of properties on Regent's Park Gardens. Given that the property is part of a listed terrace officers consider its visual character contributes to the wider enjoyment of views of the rear garden area. Therefore, incongruous additions within this context would be considered harmful to the prevailing visual amenity.
- 4.16. Officers would raise no objection to the relocation of the existing rear elevation staircase. The iron staircase is a relatively modern feature and its scale within the context is not sufficient to be visible enough to have an impact on the visual character and amenity of the host property.

Given this, it is considered that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

- 4.17. Overall the proposals would result in significant harm to the existing listed building's historic significance and the character and appearance of the surrounding Primrose Hill Conservation Area.

#### Amenity

- 4.18. The proposed external space would be 3.2m deep and be flanked by existing structures on its sides. Given the context it is not considered that it would give rise to adverse overbearing or increased sense of enclosure impact, nor a material loss of light.
- 4.19. It is considered that the proposed rear facing glazing would facilitate outlook similar to existing condition. Therefore, officers do not consider the proposed rear elevation glazing would give rise to adverse overlooking impact.

### **5. Conclusion**

- 5.1. The proposed two-storey infill rear extension by reason of its full width massing and inappropriate roof design, would appear as an inappropriate and incongruous addition that neither preserves or enhances the host property's historic significance and the character and appearance of the surrounding Primrose Hill Conservation Area. Further to this, officers consider the proposed internal alterations and works to the front vault would serve to adversely alter host property's plan form to the detriment of its historic significance.

### **6. Recommendation**

- 6.1. REFUSE planning permission and listed building consent for the following reasons
- 6.2. The proposed floor plan and front vaults alterations by virtue of its unsympathetic scale would adversely alter the host property's plan form to the detriment of the host property's historic significance and the character and appearance of the surrounding Primrose Hill Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and the emerging London Plan 2019.
- 6.3. The proposed two storey infill rear extension by reason of its full width massing and inappropriate roof design, would appear as an inappropriate and incongruous addition that neither preserves or enhances the host property's historic significance nor the character and appearance of the surrounding Primrose Hill Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and the emerging London Plan 2019.