

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>06/03/2020</b>
<b>(Members' Briefing)</b>		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	01/03/2020
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Kristina Smith			2020/0119/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
174 Regent's Park Road London NW1 8XP			Refer to 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 part-replacement single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level; demolition of garden structure; relocation of garden gate on Berkley Road; and other external alterations to rear.					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Grant Conditional Planning Permission</b>			
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Householder Application</b>			

<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. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two site notices were displayed (1 outside side; 1 on Berkley Road) from 02/02/2019 (expiry 26/02/2020)</li> <li>A press advert was published on 06/02/2020</li> </ul> <p><i>No responses received</i></p>			
<b>CAAC comments:</b>	<p><u>Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee objected on the following grounds:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PHCAAC acknowledges that we have been consulted pre-application. It sustains its pre-application advice that the proposals are excessively destructive of open garden space. Our comment pre-app was: <i>'The Committee would wish to see in any proposal for the rear of the house no further loss of open space. That is, the total area of the rear extensions should not exceed the area currently taken by the existing rear extension and the cabin. We would prefer to see a restoration of the extent of open garden space. Further, the garden space retained should be permeable, not paved as at present. It should have grass and at least the possibility of planting in the ground. It is characteristic of the conservation area that rear open space is also green space, contributing to bio-diversity and green rear views.'</i></li> <li>Note that the application reduces the garden open space by an estimated further 10m2.</li> <li>While we welcome the demolition of the cabin the existing area of the cabin should not be exceeded in the new work.</li> <li>We note that the north-point shown is incorrect: the garden has a south-west orientation.</li> <li>We have no objection to the relocation of the gate in the Berkley Road wall: the piers should be as simple as possible, we take the drawings to show brick-on-edge with a tile creasing, which we advise is appropriate to a rear garden wall in the conservation area.</li> </ul> <p><i>Officer Response: please refer to Design and Heritage and Trees and Landscaping sections of report</i></p>			

## Site Description

The application site refers to a four-storey Victorian end-of-terrace single dwelling house situated at the junction of Regent's Park Road and Berkley Road. It has undergone several extensions to the side, rear and roof.

There is a garden / courtyard at lower ground floor level which comprises a non-original 'cabin' structure. The garden has separate access from a garden gate off Berkley Road. It is largely hard landscaped.

The property is not listed; however, is situated in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area and identified as a positive contributor in the Conservation Area statement.

## Relevant History

**2012/4284/P** - Erection of conservatory (following demolition of existing conservatory) at rear lower ground floor level, creation of balcony, and replacement of window with door at rear ground floor level, alterations to windows on front, side and rear elevations and relocation of front entrance from Berkley Road to Regent's Park Road, and alterations to studio in rear garden all in connection with existing dwelling-house (Class C3).  
**Granted 16/10/2012**

**2006/2636/P** – Erection of glass roof over existing front basement – **Refused 29/08/2006; allowed on appeal 03/07/2007**

**2005/0206/P** - Demolition of existing side extension to single dwellinghouse and erection of new two storey side extension including extension to ground floor. **Granted 24/03/2005**

**9401219** - Alterations to front and side elevations and construction of conservatory at basement to rear – **Granted 30/09/1994**

**8401840** – The erection of a roof extension at third floor level – **Granted 11/12/1984**

## Relevant policies

**National Planning Policy Framework (2019)**

**The London Plan (2016)**

*Intend to Publish London Plan (2019)*

**Camden Local Plan (2017)**

A1 - Managing the impact of development

D1 - Design

D2 – Heritage

**Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG Altering and extending your home (2019)

CPG Amenity (2018)

**Primrose Hill Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2000)**

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

1.1. Planning permission is sought for the following works:

- Single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level (47.5 m<sup>2</sup>) following demolition of existing (18.4 m<sup>2</sup> footprint);
- Demolition of non-original cabin structure (18.6 m<sup>2</sup> footprint);
- Conversion of rear French door to window at ground floor level;
- Revert closet wing to brick from white render;
- Relocation of garden gate from Berkley Road to the boundary with 1 Berkley Road.

1.2. During the course of the application, the following revisions were made:

- Incorporation of green roof on rear extension

### 2. Assessment

2.1. The planning considerations material to the determination of this application are as follows:

- Design and Heritage
- Amenity
- Trees and Landscaping

### Design

2.2. The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy D1 states that all development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings whilst Policy D2 'Heritage' states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.

#### *Erection of rear extension at lower ground floor level following demolition of existing*

2.3. The existing rear extension would be demolished and a replacement 'L' shape extension constructed in its place. The extension has two broad elements: a section that runs parallel to the rear elevation and a section that runs parallel to the Berkley Road elevation below the side boundary wall.

2.4. The rear elevation section would respect the building line established by the existing extension and would remain set back from the neighbour's rear extension. It would be slightly wider, infilling the area between the closet wing and side boundary wall. Here it would turn the corner and continue along, but set below, the Berkley Road side boundary wall, finishing just before the repositioned garden gate.

2.5. The massing of the extension has been designed to wrap the geometries of the site without being visible from street level. The 'L' shape form of the extension would create a courtyard garden which would incorporate areas of soft planting and high quality surface treatment. The proposed extension (47.5 m<sup>2</sup>) would slightly increase the amount of floorspace when compared to the existing rear extension (18.4 m<sup>2</sup>) and cabin (18.6 m<sup>2</sup>) combined; however, the massing would be well considered and carefully positioned, concealing its appearance from the street. The proposed extension is considered to represent a more coherent and higher quality design than the existing situation. Furthermore, the existing courtyard is predominantly hard landscaped and so the extension would not result in the loss of green garden space. On the contrary, the proposal seeks to incorporate more soft planting and attractive landscaping features as well as a large green roof.

2.6. In terms of detailed design, the extension has been designed to read as a distinct and contemporary addition to the Victorian host property. The materiality would be largely steel framed glass on the

courtyard elevation with panels of travertine (form of limestone) to provide some solidity. The design is considered to be high quality.

- 2.7. The roof of the extension, which would have some visibility from the street would be a combination of flush rooflights and green roof. Full details of the green roof would be secured by condition to ensure that the quality and type of coverage is appropriate for a prominent roof in a conservation area setting.

#### *Demolition of non-original cabin in rear garden*

- 2.8. It is proposed to demolish a non-original cabin structure in the rear garden situated adjacent to the flank wall of no.1 Berkley Road. It is raised on steps and as such is visible from Berkley Road.
- 2.9. The cabin is an incongruous addition to the property due to its form and use of materials. Its demolition is therefore supported and welcomed by Primrose Hill CAAC as a benefit of the scheme.

#### *Conversion of French door into sliding sash window at ground floor level*

- 2.10. The previous extension comprised a terrace over part of its roof, accessed by French doors at ground floor level. The terrace would not be reprovided and so it is proposed to revert the doors back to a timber sliding sash window that would have originally featured in this location. The glazing bar detail would match that of the windows elsewhere on the property. The alteration is sensitive to the property and supported.

#### *Revert closet wing to brick from white render*

- 2.11. It is proposed to remove the white render from the existing rear closet wing to reveal the brick underneath. The closet wing would have originally been exposed brick finish and there is no objection to reverting to this finish.

#### *Alterations to location and design of side garden gate*

- 2.12. The entrance gate would be moved further along the side boundary wall, closer to no.1 Berkley Road and the previous location would be made good with matching brickwork.
- 2.13. The design of the new gate would correspond with similar gates in the conservation area. The gate itself is to be made of solid oak and the piers would be understated and of matching brick construction to the existing wall.

#### *Design and conservation – concluding comments*

- 2.14. Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013
- 2.15. Overall, the proposed works are considered to be sensitive and well considered additions that would avoid harm to the character and appearance of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. The Council's Conservation officer has reviewed the plans and considers the scheme as a whole to enhance the conservation area. The lower ground extension would be hidden from view and in lieu of a visible incongruous 'cabin' structure. Reverting back to brickwork on the closet wing and a rear ground floor window in place of doors are regarded as heritage benefits.

#### **Amenity**

- 2.16. By virtue of the scale and location of the extensions at lower ground floor level, and the distance from neighbouring properties, there would be no impact on the amenity of surrounding occupiers in terms of loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook or loss of privacy.

2.17. A condition would be attached to the planning permission that prevents the roof of the proposed extension from being used as a terrace / amenity space.

2.18. The construction work is not considered sufficient to require a Construction Management Plan.

### **Trees and Landscaping**

2.19. The rear garden is to be redesigned from its existing to support more planted beds with an increased permeability for natural drainage. The design consists of an assemblage of paved areas - stepping down from the street to the basement level. The lowest level accommodates a rain pond that acts as a home for wildlife and the collection of rainwater whilst also reflecting natural light into the basement floor plan.

2.20. The CAAC have expressed concern over the loss of garden space and would like to see the garden restored to soft planting. By way of comparison, the proposed scheme would provide 28 sqm of soft landscaping (including rainwater pond and green roof) compared to the 6.4 sqm at present. This is a welcome improvement.

### **3. Conclusion**

3.1. Grant Conditional Planning Permission

***The decision to refer an application to Planning Committee lies with the Director of Regeneration and Planning. Following the Members Briefing panel on Monday 30<sup>th</sup> March, 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'.***