|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ­­Delegated Report | | | Analysis sheet | | | | |  | Expiry Date: | | | 18/05/2021 | |
| N/A / attached | | | | | | **Consultation Expiry Date:** | | | 30/05/2021 | |
| Officer | | | | | | | Application Number(s) | | | | | | |
| Fergus Wong | | | | | | | 2021/1386/P | | | | | | |
| Application Address | | | | | | | Drawing Numbers | | | | | | |
| 43A St. Augustine’s Road  London  NW1 9RL | | | | | | | See decision notice | | | | | | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signature | | | C&UD | | | Authorised Officer Signature | | | | | | |
|  |  | | |  | | |  | | | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Erection of a single storey rear extension plus infill of side passage to provide additional accommodation to basement flat. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | Refuse | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Type:** | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | | Refer to Draft Decision Notice | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Informatives: | |
| Consultations | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Adjoining occupiers | | No. notified | | | **0** | No. of responses | | | | **0** | No. of objections | | **0** |
| Summary of consultation responses: | | N/A | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Local group comments: | | **Objection received from Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC):**  Land Use   * Space indicated as a study, but a shower room is indicated; * Questions whether extended area is to be used as separate unit of accommodation.   Design   * No information regarding materials.   Amenity   * New extension blocks light to existing bedroom.   Other Issues   * Drawings do not show sections or neighbouring properties; * Layout not logical; no internal connection from host property. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site Description | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The site is a semi-detached property located on the west side of St. Augustine’s Road, near the junction with Cantelowes Road. This application relates specifically to the lower ground floor flat within a semi-detached property.  The site is not listed, however it lies within the Camden Square Conservation Area. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Relevant History | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2016/3363/P** – Granted 12 October 2016  Conversion of existing 3-bedroom ground floor maisonette to 2x 2-bedroom self-contained flats.  Other sites on street:  45A St Augustine’s Road  2012/3795/P – Excavation to create a new basement level with front rooflight and rear lightwell, and erection of a single-storey rear extension at ground floor level to ground floor flat (Class C3). Granted 12/10/2010 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Policies** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021**  **London Plan 2021**  **Camden Local Plan 2017**  Policy A1 – Managing the Impact of Development  Policy D1 – Design  Policy D2 – Heritage  Policy H3 – Protecting Existing Homes  Policy H6 – Housing Choice and Mix  **Camden Planning Guidance**  CPG Amenity (2018)  CPG Home Improvements (2021)  **Camden Square Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011)**  Part 1: Section 5.8 – The character and appearance of green spaces  Part 2: Section 7.11 – Rear Garden Spaces | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposal**  The scheme involves replacing an existing small separate outbuilding in the rear garden by a larger structure to provide a study accessed from within the flat; this will be attached to the main property to form a rear extension covering more than half the width of the property and accessed from the front door by a new corridor infilling the partially open side passage.  **Land Use**  The CAAC has raised concern over the proposed internal layout, with no apparent internal connection between the main property and proposed extension. Whilst the new study cannot be accessed through the main part of the flat, it can be accessed from the entrance hall via several doors through the side alley passage.  There may be concerns that the extended area would be used as separate living accommodation, given that there is a small shower room proposed within the area. However it is thought that this rather convoluted layout is just a result of trying to avoid carrying out more costly major alterations to the rear wall and other rooms in order to introduce one additional bedroom to the host property. The fact that this is labelled as a study on the layout is not an issue as the Council cannot control the future internal use of the property. The new room is clearly within the overall flat as it can only be accessed through its entrance hall; inclusion of an ensuite bathroom is merely because of the room’s distance from the main bathroom in the flat. The Council cannot prove beyond reasonable doubt that this space would be used as a separate unit of accommodation.  As such, the proposal is acceptable in land use terms.  **Design**  The properties on the west side of St. Augustine’s Road are semi-detached, and retain a distinctive gap between each semi-detached property. This is important in preserving the character and appearance of these properties, the surrounding area as well as the wider conservation area. However, the side passage to the application property has already been partially infilled to provide its main entrance lobby.  As existing, the open side passage between the host property and adjoining property no. 47, measuring approx. 1m in width, can only be observed from the rear and not the front elevation of the property. Thus infilling the side alley with a larger extension behind this front door would not harm the character of the property and streetscene.  There is a small single-storey outbuilding/shed measuring 2.2m in height and 7sqm in area, situated on the side boundary with no. 45A. Whilst the red line boundary of the site plan shows the existing shed to extend approximately half of the depth of the rear garden, the site photos and floorplans provided show that the existing shed abuts the rear boundary of the garden. It is therefore considered that the site plan and red line is not accurate.  A wrap-around extension is proposed at lower ground level. It measures 4.38m in depth protruding from the rear elevation, 4.79m in width and wrapping around to fill the side passage. In total the extension measures 9.2m in depth including the infill section. According to the site photos, the proposed extension would therefore extend the full depth of the rear garden, contrary to what is shown on the plans.  The extension as proposed would have a negative impact on the appearance of the property. Its size and scale is considered excessive in both depth and width, especially in relation to the size of the garden, and would not be read as a subservient addition to the property. Its footprint is significantly larger than the existing outbuilding and would occupy a hugely significant proportion (more than half) of the rear garden area, thus reducing its amenity value to occupants. It would result in the original plan form and rear elevation of the property being less legible and therefore would have a harmful impact on the appearance of the property. It is acknowledged that no. 45A is extended to the rear; however the extension to no. 45A is smaller in scale, as well as being sited within a much larger rear garden.  The extension would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the host property, the local area or the wider conservation area. It would be contrary to design guidance in Camden CPG and the Conservation Area Statement. The proposal is therefore unacceptable in design terms.  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.  **Amenity**  The rear extension as proposed would measure approximately 3m in height at the boundary with no. 45A. Given that there is an existing single storey outbuilding parallel to this side boundary, it is not considered that the extension as proposed would result in any significant additional impact in terms of loss of light or sense of enclosure. There would not be any unacceptable loss of privacy to adjoining neighbours. The proposal is therefore acceptable in amenity terms.  **Summary and conclusion**  It is considered that the proposed extension would not be acceptable in design terms, owing to its size and scale, which would have a negative impact on the appearance of the host property and the wider conservation area. As such, this application is recommended for refusal on design grounds.  **Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |