
Planning Statement

125 Albert Street, London, NW1 7NB

Planning Statement

125 Albert Street, London, NW1 7NB



Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Site and Surroundings	2
3.	Planning History	5
4.	Pre-application Discussions	6
5.	Proposals	9
6.	Planning Policy Context	10
7.	Planning Considerations	13
8.	Conclusions	20

1. Introduction

1.1. On behalf of the applicant, Savills have been instructed to prepare and submit this application for planning permission at 125 Albert Street, London, NW1 7NB for the following development:

Demolition of the existing ground floor outrigger extension and two outbuildings; replacement rear ground floor extension; erection of mansard roof extension with terrace to rear; full restoration/refurbishment of the building including roof, windows, balconies, brick, render, doors and railings; internal alterations/refurbishment including doors, cornicing, flooring and lighting; in conjunction with the use of the property as a single family dwellinghouse.

1.2. The application is submitted following pre-application consultation with the Local Planning Authority, with the proposals amended taking account of this advice.

1.3. This Planning Statement has been prepared following an examination of the site and surroundings, research into relevant planning history and an examination of adopted and emerging planning policy documents. This Statement provides background information on the site and an assessment of the proposals in relation to planning policy and other material considerations, set out under the following sections:

- **Section 2** assesses the site and its surrounding context;
- **Section 3** provides an overview of the planning history;
- **Section 4** details the pre-application discussions with the LPA;
- **Section 5** outlines the proposals;
- **Section 6** outlines the planning policy context;
- **Section 7** examines the main planning considerations;
- **Section 8** draws conclusions in respect of the proposals.

1.4. The application is supported by, and should be read in conjunction with, the following supporting documents:

- Application Forms, including certificates;
- CIL Forms;
- Site Location Plan;
- Existing and Proposed Plans, elevations and sections, prepared by Mors + Harte Architects;
- Design and Access Statement, prepared by Mors + Harte Architects;
- Heritage Statement, prepared by HCUK Group;
- Cost document, prepared by GSB Building.

1.5. This statement finds that the proposed development complies with the Development Plan, as well as other relevant material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), concluding that the proposed development will deliver sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF.

2. Site and Surroundings

- 2.1. The application site is located in the London Borough of Camden and specifically within the Camden Town and Primrose Hill ward. The site is located on the south-western side of Albert Road, which runs north-west to south-east from Parkway to Delancey Street.



Figure 1- Aerial view of the site from the West

- 2.2. The site comprises of an early Victorian 3-storey mid-terrace property, constructed from brick and stucco. It has a butterfly roof and later additions to the rear including ground floor outrigger extension and two outbuildings. There have been a number of alterations to the property, including rebuilding of partial front and rear elevations and internal reconfiguration to ground and second floor. Albeit the original plan form to the main building has predominantly been retained. The majority of windows are non-original.



Figure 2- Site frontage

Planning Statement

125 Albert Street, London, NW1 7NB



- 2.3. The property forms part of a run of 9 similar terrace houses, comprising number 123-139, forming the south-west side of Albert Street. The properties cumulatively are Grade II listed, with the listing description for the property is as follows:

“Terrace of 9 houses. C1845. Multi-coloured and yellow stock brick, (No.125, painted), No.137, grey stock brick. Rusticated stucco ground floors. No.127, slate mansard roof with attic dormers. Nos 135-139, slightly recessed. 3 storeys and basements. 2 windows each. No.129 incorporate in No.131 with 3 windows. Round-arched doorways with pilaster-jambs carting cornice-heads; fanlights (Nos 133-137, radial) and panelled doors. No.131, square-headed doorway with C20 door. Gauged brick flat arches to recessed sashed (except No.125 2nd floor, C20 metal-framed casements); 1st floors with cast-iron balconies, Nos 123-127 with stucco facing. INTERIORS: not inspected. SUBSIDIARY FEATURES: attached cast-iron railings with spearhead finials.”

- 2.4. The building is in a very poor state of repair and is currently uninhabitable. It has been unoccupied for a number of years. The brick to the front is pitted. There are substantial cracks to the stucco and apparent movement affecting the door arch, threshold, window lintels and cills. The roof has felt burnt onto slate with failing lead and felt upstands and gutters, The building requires substantial refurbishment to bring it up to a habitable standard and secure its long term viability.



Figure 3- Photograph showing condition of front door



Figure 4- Photograph showing condition of existing rear outrigger and outbuilding

- 2.5. The site is located within the Camden Conservation Area. The immediate surrounding context of Albert Street is residential, however the Camden Town centre designation boundary is located to the north of the site, and indeed this area is commercial in character. The Jewish Museum London is located north of the site at 129-131 Albert Street.
- 2.6. The site is located approximately 0.2 mile south-west of Camden Town London Underground Station, whilst the site is well served by a number of local bus services operating in the vicinity of the site, accessed most locally on Parkway to the north, and Delancey Street to the south. Consequently, the site benefits from a Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) of 6a, indicating excellent public transport access.
- 2.7. At pre-application stage the building was identified as a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class C4), laid out as 4no. bedsits. Following the pre-application stage, further investigation has been carried out in terms of the building's lawful planning use. There is no evidence that the House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class C4) is lawful in planning terms, and indeed the Council's pre-application response confirmed that the "Councils Environmental Health Officers (Private Sector Housing) was consulted and has confirmed that the property is not licensed as a House in Multiple Occupation (Class C4). Moreover, the property has no visible fire doors or automatic fire alarm system which would meet licensing standards and consequently would provide substandard facilities." It is noted that several applications submitted to the Council in 2019 were "householder" applications.

3. Planning History

Application Site

- 3.1. The Council's online planning register indicates that there is a limited planning history for the site, much of which dates back significant periods of time and is of little relevance to the current proposals.
- 3.2. The site was subject to two concurrent planning and listed building consent applications (4 applications in total) during 2019. The first of these proposals was for the demolition of existing ground floor extensions including existing outbuildings and construction of new single storey extensions (2019/1219/P and 2019/1748/L). The second set of these applications was for internal and external alterations and the erection of a mansard roof extension with dormer extensions as well as the installation of a rear Juliet balcony (reference 2019/1215/P and 2019/1720/L). Both applications were withdrawn by the applicant.

Relevant Surrounding Planning History

- 3.3. A number of neighbouring properties display existing mansard roof extensions, and indeed the western side of Albert Street is now characterised by such roof forms, with the application property and the neighbouring 123 the only properties not including a mansard roof extension.
- 3.4. Details of those most relevant and local to the application property are listed below.
 - Planning permission and listed building consent was granted at the neighbouring 127 Albert Street in 1986 (reference 8502180) for the erection of a roof extension, comprising of the mansard roof visible on the property today.
 - Planning permission and listed building consent for the erection of a roof extension and a rear extension on three floors at number 129-131 Albert Street was initially granted in 1989 (reference 8970448) and was subsequently revised in 1990 (reference 9003128).

4. Pre-application Discussions

- 4.1. Prior to submission of these applications, the applicant sought pre-application advice from the London Borough of Camden with a request submitted on the 9th March 2021 for feedback on proposals for internal and external alterations, including the erection of a part single, part one and half storey extension to the rear, following the demolition of the existing outrigger extension, demolition of the original butterfly roof structure and erection of a mansard roof, and alterations to the fenestration to the front and rear, all associated with the use of the building as a single family dwellinghouse (use class C3). The Council's written advice was received on the 9th June 2021 (reference 2021/1046/PRE).
- 4.2. A summary of the feedback provided is detailed below in plain text. The Applicant's response to the pre-application feedback is set out in italics.

Land use

- The conversion back into a residential dwelling was considered acceptable. *This support is noted.*
- In respect of any loss of homes with shared facilities, an equivalent amount of floorspace for permanent self-contained housing is required, and secure low cost housing is usually sought. Further information regarding the cost of conversion back to a single family dwellinghouse was requested. *A further assessment of land use is set out in the subsequent sections of this statement; including that there is no evidence that the HMO was lawful in planning terms; that a change of use from C4 to C3 benefits from permitted development rights and therefore does not require planning permission; that greater listed building benefits would be derived from use of the property as a single family dwellinghouse. Notwithstanding this, information regarding costs is being provided as requested by the Council.*
- Notwithstanding the above, it was noted that works needed for the re-provision of bedsits would be more intrusive and harmful from a listed building perspective than the works to fully restore the use as a single dwelling house. *This assessment is noted.*

Design and heritage

- The principle of a mansard roof extension is unacceptable. *The mansard is retained in the proposals. A further assessment of design and heritage is set out in the subsequent sections of this statement; including that mansards are an established feature in the streetscape and conservation area; the proposed mansard is well designed and traditionally detailed reflecting the existing form at no. 129; the addition of a mansard would not cause substantial harm to the listed building and any harm is outweighed by listed building benefits proposed as part of the applications.*
- There is scope for alterations to the rear. *This assessment is noted.*
- The extension to the rear should be subservient and allow the closest addition to remain dominant and clearly visible. *The rear extension has been amended from one and a half storeys to one storey. The composition of the rear extension has also been amended to an outrigger in brick with traditional style sash window; and lightweight infill extension with brick pier and glazing which will be recessive to the brick outrigger.*

- The first floor window is the only original window in the rear elevation and must remain in situ and should not be obstructed. *The proposals have been amended to show the first floor window retained, protected and refurbished.*
- Proposals to alter the rear fenestration may be acceptable if they reinstate a historical arrangement, however double glazing is a modern intervention that is not supported. *All windows to the rear (with the exception of the first floor window as above) will be reinstated with traditional timber sash windows (single glazed).*
- The proposed design to relocate the kitchen back to its original location is welcomed, including the reinstatement of the original opening. *This support is noted.*
- The proposed flooring will need to preserve any original floor. *The applications are supported by floor details which show original floors retained.*
- The proposal to demolish the wall dividing the hall and the living room at ground floor level is unacceptable. *This proposal has been omitted and it is proposed to reinstate the original opening which was previously blocked up.*
- The subdivision of the rear room at first floor level is unacceptable and it is expected that the entire room is used as a bathroom. *This proposal has been omitted and the rear room is proposed as a bathroom.*
- The removal of the intrusion into the front room at second floor level is welcome. *This support is noted.*
- The subdivision of the rear room at second floor level is unacceptable and the proportions of these rooms will need to be preserved. *This proposal has been omitted and the rear room is proposed as a bathroom.*
- The provision of air source heat pumps are likely to require high levels of alterations to the historic fabric, as well as roof level or external works. *This proposal has been omitted.*
- A lighting schedule will be required and recessed spotlights are not acceptable. *The applications are supported by lighting details and recessed spotlights are not proposed.*

Transport

- The new dwelling would be required to be secured as car-free via the S106 agreement. *This assessment is noted.*

Construction Management Plan

- The applicant will be required to enter into a S106 agreement in respect of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and associated Implementation Support Contribution of £3,136. *This assessment is noted.*

Amenity

- The proposed extension would not have any harmful due to the finishing height of the parapet wall combined with a setback of the extension by approximately 1.2m. *This assessment is noted.*
- The proposal is unlikely to have any amenity impacts in regards to daylight/sunlight, overshadowing not would the extension contribute to a sense of enclosure. *This assessment is noted.*
- The proposal would not exacerbate any impact in regards to loss of privacy or overlooking given that no new roof terrace is being proposed. *This assessment is noted. An inset balcony is proposed however this is modest in size and its inset nature will mean that overlooking impacts are minimal.*

Planning Statement

125 Albert Street, London, NW1 7NB



- 4.3. Following receipt of the Council's advice, the scheme has been revised taking account of the comments received and are reflected within the final design proposals as detailed in the following sections.

5. Proposals

5.1. The applications seeks planning permission and listed building consent for the following proposals:

Demolition of the existing ground floor outrigger extension and two outbuildings; replacement rear ground floor extension; erection of mansard roof extension with terrace to rear; full restoration/refurbishment of the building including roof, windows, balconies, brick, render, doors and railings; internal alterations/refurbishment including doors, cornicing, flooring and lighting; in conjunction with the use of the property as a single family dwellinghouse.

5.2. The proposals are detailed in the supporting documents including:

- Existing and Proposed Plans, elevations and sections, prepared by Mors + Harte Architects;
- Design and Access Statement, prepared by Mors + Harte Architects;
- Heritage Statement, prepared by HCUK Group.

6. Planning Policy Context

- 6.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that all planning applications are determined in accordance with the development plan for an area, unless any material considerations indicate otherwise. This legal requirement is reiterated in the introduction to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Adopted Development Plan

- 6.2. For the purposes of S.38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, the London Borough of Camden's currently adopted development plan comprises the following documents:
- Camden Local Plan (July 2017)
 - London Plan (March 2021)

Camden Local Plan (July 2017)

- 6.3. The Camden Local Plan was adopted in July 2017 and sets out the Council's policies to deliver the strategic vision for the borough. The most relevant policies within this document are considered to be as follows:

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development- seeks to protect the quality of life of building occupiers and neighbours. States that permission for development will be granted unless this causes unacceptable harm to amenity.

Policy D1 Design- seeks to secure high-quality design in development, requiring development to, inter alia, respect local context and character; is of sustainable design; and comprise details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character.

Policy D2 Heritage- seeks to preserve, and where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation and listed buildings. The Council will not permit the loss or substantial harm to a designated heritage asset.

Policy H3 Protecting Existing Homes- seeks to ensure that existing housing continues to meet the needs of existing and future households by resisting the net loss of residential floorspace; and resisting development that would involve the net loss of two or more homes, unless, inter alia, they create large harms in a part of the borough with a relatively low proportion of large dwellings.

Policy H6 Housing Choice and Mix- seeks to create mixed, inclusive and sustainable communities by seeking a variety of housing suitable for Camden's existing and future households, having regard to household type, size, income and any particular housing needs.

Policy H10 Housing with Shared Facilities- seeks to ensure continued provision of housing with shared facilities to meet the needs of small households with limited incomes and modest space requirements. States that the council will resist the net loss of housing with shared facilities (houses in multiple occupation) or the self-containment of any part of such a housing unless, inter alia, it can be demonstrated that the accommodation is incapable of meeting the relevant standards or houses in multiple occupation, or otherwise genuinely incapable of use as housing with shared facilities.

Policy T1 Prioritising Walking, Cycling and Public Transport- seeks to promote sustainable transport by prioritising walking, cycling and public transport in the borough.

Policy T2 Parking and car-free development- seeks to limit the availability of parking and required all new developments in the borough to be car-free.

London Plan (March 2021)

6.4. The London Plan was adopted in March 2021 and is the statutory Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London prepared by the Mayor of London. The most relevant policies within this document are outlined as follows:

Policy HC1 Heritage Conservation and Growth- states that development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets significance and appreciation within their surroundings.

Other Material Considerations

6.5. In addition to the adopted development plan, the following documents are material considerations in this case:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (July 2021);
- Design CPG (January 2021)
- Home Improvement CPG (January 2021)
- Amenity CPG (January 2021)
- Transport CPG (January 2021)
- Housing CPG (January 2021)
- Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal (October 2007)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (July 2021)

6.6. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does not form part of the development plan, but is an important material consideration and sets out the Government's planning policies. The NPPF was revised in July 2021 and maintains the presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11) which is defined in paragraph 8 as incorporating economic, social and environmental objectives.

Planning Statement

125 Albert Street, London, NW1 7NB



- 6.7. The NPPF sets out the government's planning policies in relation to the historic environment and states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.

7. Planning Considerations

7.1. This section of the report provides a detailed consideration of the proposals, taking account of policies within the adopted development plan, and other material considerations. The main planning considerations for the development, and those will be assessed in the following section, are considered to be as follows:

- a) Land Use
- b) Design and Heritage
- c) Amenity
- d) Transport

7.2. Each of the above considerations are addressed in turn as follows.

Scheme Assessment

a) Land Use

7.3. As set out above, at pre-application stage the building was identified as a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class C4), laid out as 4no. bedsits. Following the pre-application stage, further investigation has been carried out in terms of the building's lawful planning use. There is no evidence that the House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class C4) is lawful in planning terms, including in relation to Council tax and planning history records, and indeed the Council's pre-application response confirmed that the "Councils Environmental Health Officers (Private Sector Housing) was consulted and has confirmed that the property is not licensed as a House in Multiple Occupation (Class C4). Moreover, the property has no visible fire doors or automatic fire alarm system which would meet licensing standards and consequently would provide substandard facilities." Given this context, both existing use scenarios – single family dwellinghouse (C3) and small HMO (C4) will be considered and assessed in this section of the statement.

7.4. It is noted that the building has been vacant for a significant period of time and is currently unoccupied having fallen into disrepair from past neglect.

7.5. On the basis that the existing lawful use of the property is residential as a single family dwellinghouse, no change of use is required, and the proposal would comply with Policy H3.

7.6. Regardless of the above, should the Council consider that the existing lawful use of the property is small HMO (C4), the following points are relevant in relation to Policy H10:

- A change of use from C4 to C3 benefits from permitted development rights (Class L) and therefore does not require planning permission. This is a material fall-back position.
- Notwithstanding the above, the existing building does not meet the relevant standards for a HMO. Policy H10 allows the net loss of housing with shared facilities in certain circumstances, including where accommodation is incapable of meeting the relevant standards for HMOs. Indeed, this was noted by the Council at pre-application stage, stating in their pre-application response that "*the conversion back into residential dwelling (sic) is considered acceptable*".
- An equivalent amount of residential floorspace, would be secured as part of the proposals.

- In respect of the policy provisions relating to the provision of low cost or affordable housing, the application is supported by evidence relating to the cost of converting the building to its original use. This demonstrates that considerable investment will be required to reinstate, repair and refurbish the listed building as a single family dwellinghouse. Given the best use for a listed building is the original use it was intended, it is considered more appropriate to direct these considerable funds to the restoration of the listed building.
- Furthermore, the listed building implications of the land use proposals must be considered as follows:
 - The building would require substantial intervention to bring the HMO units up to modern standards in order to obtain a HMO licence. The required works and interventions such as fire doors and alarm systems would be harmful to the listed building. Indeed, it was noted at the pre-application stage that *“the works needed for the re-provision of various bedsits would be even more intrusive and harmful from a Listed Building perspective than the works to fully restore the use as a single dwellinghouse”*.
 - The proposals seek to convert the property back into its original use as a single dwellinghouse and propose considerable restoration and refurbishment works to secure its longevity. This is considered to be the most appropriate and viable optimum use for the property, and one which ensures the future preservation of the listed building, and will result in heritage benefit.
 - The benefits to the listed building which would be brought forward by the proposals are considered to outweigh any requirements for the provision of low cost or affordable housing in this exceptional case.

7.7. For the reasons set out above, we believe that the proposals are in accordance with the Development Plan and other material considerations in relation to land use.

b) Design and Heritage

7.8. Local Plan policy D1 seeks to secure high-quality design in development which inter alia, protects local context and character and preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets. Policy D2 relates specifically to heritage and states that the Council will preserve and enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including Conservation Areas and listed buildings.

7.9. In addition to local planning policy, section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering applications for listed building consent, special regard must be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest. Section 72 goes on to state that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of appearance of a Conservation Area.

- 7.10. These principles are reiterated within the NPPF, which goes on to state at paragraph 194 that in proposals affecting heritage assets, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. Paragraph 197 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them into viable use consistent with their conservation; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities, including their economic vitality; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- 7.11. The application is supported by a Heritage Statement which outlines and describes the significance of the heritage assets and makes an assessment of the impact of the development proposals on this significance, in accordance with paragraph 194 of the NPPF. This report notes that the building is a good example of a relatively complete early Victorian terraced London townhouse, however its historical interest is primarily illustrative with the artistic interest limited to the few decorative features found at the building. Due to the buildings listing, the overall significance of the property is considered high, however the building's general condition is very poor.

Design

Rear extension

- 7.12. The existing ground floor outrigger extension and two outbuildings will be demolished and replaced as part of the proposals. The outrigger extension and outbuildings are non-original and in a poor state of repair, therefore their demolition and replacement is considered to be acceptable. The replacement ground floor extension will be considerably reduced in depth when compared to the existing extension. It will be limited to the ground floor only and sit within the existing boundary wall to no. 127. The ground floor extension will be full width however it will be comprised of two forms. First, a more traditional outrigger extension will sit along the northern boundary comprising of brick to match the existing building and a traditionally detailed timber frame window. This will read as the predominant form at ground floor level. Second, a smaller infill extension with lesser depth will sit in place of the existing outbuilding along the southern boundary. The smaller infill extension will read as a lightweight form further subservient to the traditional outrigger extension with brick pier, stone coping stone and glazing. The containment of the rear extensions to the ground floor, and considerable reduction in building depth in this location, will mean that the proposed extensions read as subservient to the existing building. The two form approach will be successful in design terms allowing a more contemporary lightweight infill extension to complement a the more traditional outrigger form. The high quality design and use of traditional and complementary materials will mean that the proposals will be wholly acceptable in relation to the existing building and wider streetscape.

Mansard roof

- 7.13. The proposals seek to remove the existing roof and install a mansard roof form similar to that seen on neighbouring properties along the terrace and the proposals mirror the design, form and materiality of the existing neighbouring extensions.

7.14. The application property, alongside its neighbour number 123, are the only remaining properties within the terrace (comprising number 99-139) which retain a hipped butterfly roof with all other properties now displaying mansard roof extensions. Within this context, the property now appears isolated and out of context with its neighbours. Indeed, in approving a new mansard roof extension at No. 81 Albert in 2017 (2017/1808/P), the Council noted that “*the application building is one of the few remaining properties, within the immediate area, without a mansard roof extension and the proposed extension would help to visually complete the terrace*”. Indeed, similar conclusions were made by the Council in the assessment of an application for a mansard roof at 92 Albert Street (2010/1263/L) and 76 Delancey Street (2018/2936/P). Given the surrounding precedence, and the fact that the terrace is now characterised by identical mansard extensions to that which is proposed, this element of the proposals is considered to be acceptable.

7.15. The proposed mansard design is in-keeping with the neighbouring mansard extension and will be finished to match the existing adjacent mansard at number 127, with slate tiles and lead clad dormers fitted with 3 over 3 timber sash single glazed windows. To the rear, an inset terrace is proposed, similar to that at 127 which will push the addition away from the existing rear elevation, reducing any impact to the existing parapet formation.

External refurbishment

7.16. The proposals will refurbish a considerable number of external features both to the front, rear and roof of the building. All of the proposals will enhance the quality and appearance of the building.

Impact on the significance of the listed building

Internal alterations

7.17. A full assessment of the proposed internal alterations is set out in the supporting Heritage Statement and so will not be repeated here. However, it is noted that the Heritage Statement does not outline any harm caused by the internal alterations and on the contrary will result in restoration, preservation and enhancement to many elements of the building including plan form, doors, windows, flooring, historic features including staircase, panels and plasterwork.

Rear extension

7.18. A full assessment of the proposed rear extension is set out in the supporting Heritage Statement and so will not be repeated here. However, key components of the Heritage Statement are noted below.

7.19. Historic analysis of the building show that the existing rear outrigger extension was extended and adapted during the late 19th century, however was replaced altogether between 1945 and 1953. The outrigger is therefore a non-original feature of the building. It contains no historic features of interest but a buttress chimney stack indicates the original location of a kitchen. The loss of this outrigger is considered to have a neutral impact on the listed building and therefore its replacement with a well designed replacement is considered a sound approach. The loss of the outbuildings are considered to have a neutral effect on the listed buildings.

- 7.20. Overall, the proposed rear extension will replace an existing poor quality post-war outrigger with a new high-quality contemporary extension which reinstates the historic kitchen function within this part of the building. This element of the proposals has been assessed to result in an enhancement of the building's significance, specifically the ability to appreciate the building's historic and architectural values and as such is considered to be acceptable.

Mansard roof

- 7.21. The proposed loss of the original roof has been assessed to result in a low level of less than substantial harm, however it is considered that this harm is outweighed by a number of benefits that this element of the proposals would contribute, namely, the reintegration of the property with its neighbours which is considered to offer a streetscape benefit and the benefit of an improvement to the standard of living accommodation within the building which will contribute to securing the sustainable long term use of the property. However, it is also outweighed by the other listed building benefits delivered through the internal alterations, external refurbishment and restoration of the buildings for its optimum use as a single family dwellinghouse.

External refurbishment

- 7.22. A full assessment of the proposed external refurbishment is set out in the supporting Heritage Statement and so will not be repeated here. However, it is noted that the statement outlines the proposed works to the rear elevation including restoration of original window openings, refurbishment of one original window at first floor level and improvements to servicing would result in enhancements to the listed building. It also outlines that the proposed works to the front elevation and roof of the building would result in appreciable enhancement of the listed building.

Summary

- 7.23. In summary, when considering the proposals as a whole, they would not cause any harm to the significance of the listed building and listed terrace at 99-121 Albert Street, with its special interest preserved along with its setting and features. While the mansard would result in a low level of harm itself, this would be outweighed by the other heritage benefits of the scheme, overall enhancing the listed buildings.

Impact on the Conservation Area

- 7.24. The proposed external components of the proposals represent minor changes to the buildings appearance and the character and appearance of the listed terrace within the conservation as a whole. The changes have been assessed to result in a positive impact on the contribution of the terrace to the conservation area. The proposed repair of the front wall, refurbishment of the railings to the front of the property and repair and redecoration of the original front door would result in an appreciable enhancement to the listed building and thus to the conservation area.

- 7.25. As noted previously, the proposed mansard extension has been designed to mirror those existing extensions at neighbouring properties, which now form part of the character of the area. While this has been assessed to result in a very low level of less than substantial harm, it is considered that the heritage benefits of the scheme, and the fact that the proposals will result in an overall enhancement of the listed building and its contribution to the conservation area, far outweigh this harm, thus are in accordance with NPPF paragraph 202.

Summary of impact on heritage assets

- 7.26. The proposals have been sensitively and appropriately designed taking account of their context, whilst ensuring an overall enhancement of the significance and appearance of the building and its contribution to the conservation area. The proposals comprise details and materials that are of a high quality and complement the existing building and local character and the proposed external elements integrate well with the existing building. Internally, the proposals improve the quality of the building significantly, restoring historic plan form where possible and refurbishing original features of the building.
- 7.27. Further, the proposed scheme would enhance the viability of the property as a single-family residence, a use that is consistent with its long-term conservation, arguably its optimum viable use.
- 7.28. The proposals represent high quality design, in line with policy D1, and have been assessed to preserve and enhance the significance of the listed building and its contribution to the conservation area in accordance with policy D2. The proposals are further in accordance with paragraph 197 and 202 of the NPPF, and suitably preserve the building in accordance with sections 16 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

c) Amenity

- 7.29. Local Plan policy A1 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours of development and seeks to ensure that the amenity of communities, occupiers and neighbours is protected. In determining the level of impact, policy A1 goes on to state that the Council will consider, inter alia, visual privacy, outlook; sunlight, daylight and overshadowing; and transport impacts. The Council's Amenity CPG reiterates the need to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties and provides specific guidance for developers in order to ensure no adverse impacts arise.
- 7.30. The proposed external elements of the proposal have been designed to ensure that neighbouring amenity is protected and the development is not considered to result in any impact on outlook, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing.
- 7.31. The proposed external elements of the proposal have been designed to ensure that neighbouring amenity is protected and the development is not considered to result in any impact on outlook, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing. The extensions are contained to the ground floor only and will sit within existing boundary walls. Indeed, the length of the extension along the northern boundary of the site will be reduced by the proposals and the existing outbuildings will be removed. There will be no openings proposed to the boundaries.

- 7.32. The Council agreed with this assessment as part of the pre-application feedback, stating *“the proposal is unlikely to have any amenity impact in regards to daylight/sunlight, overshadowing nor would the extension contribute to a sense of enclosure”*. Further, the *“proposed extension it is not anticipated the extension would have any amenity impact in regards to the loss of daylight/sunlight nor would the extension contribute to a sense of enclosure.”*
- 7.33. At roof level, the proposed mansard extension has been designed to reflect the design of the existing neighbouring mansards and is set within the existing footprint, with set-backs from the parapet edges, thus will bring rise to no impact in respect of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties. The proposed mansard will bring rise to no impact in respect of overlooking to properties opposite or to the rear of the site above that which is already experienced, notwithstanding the significant distance between properties, and is acceptable, from neighbouring properties and indeed windows sited at the lower floors of the building. Indeed, as noted above, the proposed mansard is set in from the parapet edge and thus the proposed openings are set further from neighbouring properties than windows as existing at lower levels.
- 7.34. A inset terrace is proposed at mansard roof level, similar to that at no. 127 Albert Street, which has been sited such to sit behind the existing parapet. The principle of a terrace in this location is set by the neighbouring terrace at 127 and will be used solely by residents of the property. Given its location and use, it is not considered that this element of the proposals will bring rise to any material impact in respect of noise disturbance.
- 7.35. In light of the above, the proposed development will not bring rise to any impacts on neighbouring properties existing amenities and ensures that the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours will not be harmed.

d) Transport

- 7.36. Policy T2 of the Local Plan seeks to limit the availability of parking and requires all new developments in the borough to be car-free. The Council advised at pre-application stage that where proposals result in a less intense use of the site, the Council will also seek car-free development and a reduction in the parking provision. The existing property has no on-site car parking.
- 7.37. On the basis that the existing lawful use of the property is residential as a single family dwellinghouse, no change of use is required nor is there a change to the intensity of the use, we propose that there is no change to the existing on-street parking arrangements.

8. Conclusions

- 8.1. This Planning Statement has been prepared in support of a planning application submitted to the London Borough of Camden in relation to 125 Albert Street, London, NW1 7NB for the demolition of existing outrigger extension and construction of replacement ground floor rear extension; construction of mansard roof extension and internal alterations in conjunction with the conversion of the property from 4no bedsits (Use Class C4) to a single dwellinghouse (Use Class C3).
- 8.2. The proposed scheme follows pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority regarding the proposals, since which the proposals have been revised to take account of officer comments.
- 8.3. The property is currently in a poor state of repair and the proposals seek to sensitively restore and repair the Grade II listed building to bring it back into viable use as a single dwellinghouse which will secure the properties long term sustainability. The proposals include the sensitive internal restoration, retaining and refurbishing all original features, whilst restoring historic plan form wherever appropriate.
- 8.4. Externally, the proposals seek to demolish the non-original rear outrigger extension and replace it with a contemporary rear extension of a high quality, sensitive design. The new rear extension will allow for the kitchen function to be re-established within this element of the building. At roof level, the proposals seek to provide a mansard roof extension, mirroring that on neighbouring properties, and which is now a feature commonplace in the terrace and wider streetscene.
- 8.5. The proposals are supported by a heritage assessment which concludes that the development will preserve the listed building, its setting and features of interest and that there would be no harm to the building's significance. Likewise, the proposed development would preserve the special character and appearance of the Camden Town Conservation Area and would not result in any harm to its significance.
- 8.6. This Statement has found that the proposals are in full conformity with the adopted development plan and other material considerations, and represent sustainable development, in line with the NPPF. The development will result in significant heritage benefits, ensuring the long-term sustainability of the heritage asset in an optimum use, whilst delivering a high-quality family home in a sustainable location which contributes towards the needs of the borough. As a result, the development proposals should be considered positively, with a view to granting planning permission.

