

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		05/05/2022			
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		05/06/2022			
Officer				Application Number(s)					
Nathaniel Young				2022/0975/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 single storey side and rear extension.									
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission							
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission							
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice							
Informatives:									
Consultations									
Adjoining occupiers				No. of responses		0	No. of objections		0
Summary of consultation responses:		Multiple site notices: 06/05/2022 – 30/05/2022 Press notice: 12/05/2022 – 05/06/2022 No responses received.							
Site Description									
The site contains a semi-detached property situated on the north-western side of St. Augustine's Road. This application relates specifically to the lower ground floor flat. The application building is located within the Camden Square Conservation Area, it is not listed but is identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.									

Relevant History

Site

2016/3363/P: Conversion of existing 3-bedroom ground floor maisonette to 2x 2-bedroom self-contained flats. **Approved 12.10.2016.**

2021/1386/P: Erection of a single storey rear extension plus infill of side passage to provide additional accommodation to basement flat. **Refused 18.05.2021.**

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed rear extension, by reason of its excessive size and scale especially in relation to the size of the garden, would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the Camden Square Conservation Area and would reduce the value of the existing garden amenity space. It would therefore not be in accordance with policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.”

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

Camden Planning Guidance 2021

CPG Amenity

CPG Home Improvements

CPG Design

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

Previous refusal on the site

A very similar scheme as the subject scheme was refused planning permission on 18.05.2021 under the reference 2021/1386/P. It is noted that the subject scheme is slightly smaller in scale (compared to the previous), however, it is still unacceptable. The previous extension measured 4.6m wide, and the current proposal would measure 4.3m wide where it joins the house, before kinking and reducing in width to 3.8m wide. The same issues which resulted in refusal for the previous scheme are still applicable to the subject scheme. The following assessment largely aligns which has already been stated within the previous officer report under application reference: 2021/1386/P.

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

Concern has been raised 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 is some potential that the extended area would be used as separate living accommodation, given that there is a small shower room and WC 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. As proposed, the new room is within the overall flat as it can only be accessed through its entrance hall. 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 side passage extension between the host property and adjoining property no. 45A, measuring approx. 1m in width, is largely only observed from the rear rather than 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. The site plan and red line are therefore not accurate as they shows the rear garden as extending to a greater length than is the case in reality (this has remained an issue for both the current and previous applications).

A wrap-around extension is proposed at lower ground level. It would occupy the entire side passage and extend the full depth of the rear garden, up to the rear boundary. It would also occupy over half the width of the rear garden.

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 substantial 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 fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the host property, or the wider conservation area. It would be contrary to guidance CPG Design and CPG Home improvements, and also the Camden Square Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011). The proposal is therefore unacceptable in design and conservation 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.

Residential 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 significantly more harm than what has been established. No new views would be afforded beyond what has been established into neighbouring habitable windows. The proposal is therefore acceptable in residential amenity terms.

Conclusion

It is considered that the proposed extension would be unacceptable on design and conservation grounds, 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.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission