

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

to accompany planning application

Roof extension at 96B Queens Crescent, NW5 4DY

for Julietta Cochrane.

27 January 2014

PREFACE

This Design & Access Statement is prepared according to "*Guidance on Changes to the Development Control System*" Circular 01/2006 by the Department for Communities and Local Government and "*Design and Access Statements – How to write, read and use them*" by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought to change the roof of this second floor flat to provide additional accommodation. Use, amount, layout, scale, landscaping, appearance and access respect the original property and its surroundings by assessing and evaluating the site context, and designing the work professionally.

STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Public involvement of neighbours and the local council is invited by statutory consultation.

APPLICANT

Julietta Cochrane is the applicant having acquired the property in June 2013.

AGENT

Mr. Gregory Munson MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA is the designer. He is a chartered architect who has twenty one years experience in practice. He is qualified to extend buildings like this.

PHYSICAL CONTEXT

Queens Crescent is a ¼km access road between Prince of Wales Road and Gilles Street. West of Grafton Road the Crescent is residential. East of Grafton Road it is a neighbourhood shopping parade with a twice weekly street market. <http://www.qcca.org.uk/qcmarket.php>

No.96B is a one bedroomed second floor flat in a mid terraced property on the south side of the east end of the Crescent opposite a library. Below it is another one bedroomed flat and a shop known as no.96. It is a nondescript 19th century construction of fairfaced brickwork with plastic and steel joinery beneath a slate pitched valley roof hidden from the street by a parapet. The site is part of a parade of shops with upper parts which varies in detailed design. It seems to have survived bomb damage and slum clearance redevelopment which has affected property nearby. Neither building designer, builder nor sponsor is known.

The site is not in a Conservation Area and is not an area of Special Architectural Quality. Nor is it on the statutory or local list of heritage structures and none are nearby. It contains no trees subject to preservation orders. Movement routes are retained unaltered. Pedestrian access is from the street to the communal front door and up internal stairs.

The site is Controlled Parking Zone CAL. Public transport accessibility rating is PTAL 3. Local cycle route 6A is nearby at Grafton Road. Three bus routes are nearby, 270m away at Malden Road and 570m away at Prince of Wales Road. National and local railway networks are accessible via the Overground 670m away at Gospel Oak station and London Underground 950m away at Chalk Farm station. Parking is controlled Monday to Friday 9am-11am.

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

The application site was converted from the upper parts of no.86 by planning permission ref. 2007/1499/P dated 8/8/07 granted to Keenest Services Ltd. This also altered the front of the shop previously extended according by planning permission ref. TP6395/147290 dated 29/11/55 to was granted to a previous occupier (Home Colonial Stores Ltd.).

The site is flanked by no.98 to the east and no.94 to the west. Each property is a 19th century construction of a shop below two flats except that no.98's staircase has a half landing and its flats are accessed from Weedington Road not Queens Crescent, and no.94's staircase is at the front and its roof is flat not pitched like the rest of the terrace. Behind the site is a three storey part of 129 Weedington Road which was built in 2008 and does not overlook the site. Opposite the site is Ashdown Crescent flanked by the three stories of no.163 Queens Crescent and the public library at no.165 below four floors of flats. This was built as slum clearance in 1978 and is dissimilar to the rest of the street like its neighbours further north and east.

South of the terrace properties rise to 4 stories (49 Allcroft Road and its neighbour 129 Weedington Road) and both the LPA and the Planning Inspectorate consider four stories to be acceptable for the redevelopment of 47 Allcroft Road proposed by planning application 2013/0857/P.

Neither Queens Crescent nor the terrace in which the site sits is a complete composition whose architectural style would be undermined by additions at roof level. Instead the character and appearance of the street includes terraced properties with roof extensions which fulfil the demand for additional space at sites which constrain other forms of extension. Most of the street is three storey terraces with roof extensions which are subordinate to the original buildings and parts of the street are altered, extended and rebuilt. Some properties are detached. Building height extends to 5 stories. Shopfronts, windows and other architectural detail are largely modern in scale, form, proportions and materials.

Appearance of the site is similar to the rest of the terrace.

Westwards from 171 Queens Crescent the site appears indistinguishable from the rest of the terrace and the terrace appears continuous with the terraces beyond. These appear dull and aged flanked by the bright render and of no.102 and the bright render and long balcony lines of no.165 opposite:



DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

Westwards from the southside of the street the site is invisible opposite no.165:



Westwards from the corner of Weedington Road the terrace appears as a slab of brickwork separated from 129 Weedington Road by the lower rear wing of 98 Queens Crescent at this end of the terrace and again flanked by the horizontal protruding canopy of no.165 opposite:



DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

Westwards from no.165 the site appears flanked by its slightly darker neighbours and the absence of parapet detailing and simpler window detailing becomes apparent. The terrace's uneven detailed design and various parapet detail is apparent from here in contrast to those beyond whose parapet is emphasized by paint. Roof extensions in the distance remain barely visible:



Southwards from Ashdown Crescent the site appears as the two higher windows within plain light brown brickwork above the Bavra Mini Market shopfront. It appears centrally within the terrace between the sides of no.163 and no.165, and it appears below a variously detailed roofline broken by chimneys and patched with render and copings. Ashdown Crescent is the car park of the library giving onto a short gated mews leading to the flats above the library known as 1 to 42 Ashdown Crescent and two properties behind 159, 161 and 163 Queens Crescent which are not visible from the site:



DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

Eastwards from no.151 the terrace appears flanked by the four stories of 49 Allcroft Road and 102 Weedington Road:



Northwards from Allcroft Road the site can be glimpsed above the ground floor of 129 Weedington Road across the vacant site at no.47 where it appears as two windows separated by a downpipe below a valley roof between the extract duct of no. 98 and the external stair of 129 Weedington Road below the landing of which is just visible the flat roof of no.94. The roofline of the site and terrace is dwarfed by the plant rooms of no.165 beyond and the extract flue of no.98. The grey third floor of 129 Weedington Road was considered by its case officer to add *"a degree of definition to the top of the Weedington Road elevation, which is a positive feature"*.



DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

The site is invisible to Weedington Road:



None of the streets mentioned above are subject to important London-wide and local views.

SOCIAL CONTEXT *(courtesy of Cameo and Sensation)*

The area is home to young and older singles and couples and some elderly. Couples are more likely than usual to be married or remarried. People are prosperous, predominantly white or mixed race, affluent, social grade ABC1 with a higher than average proportion of AB. A very high number are graduates, some postgraduates and many with professional qualifications. A higher than average proportion are Christian and most are aged between 20 and 59. They read broadsheets, order by mail rarely, and internet usage is very high. A slightly higher than average proportion of people donate to charity frequently. Unemployment is average. A higher than average proportion of those at work earn more than £40,000 and are more than usually professionals, office workers and self employed, and there are a very high number of company directors. Employers are typically service industries such as tourism and retail, as well as research, technology and education. Most travel to work by public transport, walk or cycle. Houses are worth more than average and a higher than average number are owned outright or mortgaged.

Social diversity is increased by the enlarged flat because it becomes capable of occupation by a young family. Freeholder benefits from the additional accommodation because the property becomes more spacious. Public benefits are (i) more housing capacity, (ii) capital investment in preserving and enhancing the neighbourhood centre, and (iii) reduced carbon emissions because the property becomes better thermally insulated. Government benefits from increased taxation.

ECONOMIC CONTEXT

Queens Crescent needs investment if it is to survive because it is acknowledged by the LPA and local residents to be in decline not least according to the Gospel Oak Residents Association. The extension intensifies existing land use by increasing local population capacity. This will help sustain the market and its shops, transport and facilities such as the library and nursery to better sustain this neighbourhood centre according to CS5, DP24 and NPPF 23. The social and economic contribution to urban regeneration of markets is widely acknowledged (Mary Portas etc.) and such benefits are significant not least according to NPPF 61.

POLICY CONTEXT

Local Policy context of the application is the Local Development Framework (LDF) according to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Core policies CS4 & 5 and Development policies DP24 & 26 are the only relevant policies to the application supplemented by sections 5, 6 and 7 of Camden Planning Guidance on Design and Amenity (CPG). Policies are quoted in the Appendix.

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

OTHER CONSTRAINTS

Work will comply with Building Regulations.

USE

Residential use remains the most sympathetic to the sites nature and location because (i) mix increases, (ii) housing is needed locally, (iii) the area is mixed, (iv) policies encourage more mix and (v) commercial remains unchanged downstairs. Housing remains small scale open-market because (i) this is the optimum use of the site's size and layout, (ii) the site is too small for large development, (iii) it is incapable of redevelopment, and (iv) it helps balance the social housing elsewhere in the borough. Accommodation is for families and sharers to improve the mix of existing accommodation on the site and support neighbourhood facilities. This use increases the site's accessibility to nearby community, retail and recreational facilities and public transport, and maintains the property's potential for future adaptation. It helps sustain the neighbourhood center – The Planning System and Crime Prevention" (ODPM/Home Office 2003).

AMOUNT

An extension is proposed because the flat is too small and its roof is of poor design because it is inadequately insulated and fails to provide habitable space yet is more bulky than a flat roof according to NPPF 9. The extension is at roof level because (a) the flat is otherwise incapable of extension, (b) a roof extension would not undermine the prevailing form of roof in the street according to DP24.12, (c) the form of roof extensions in Queens Crescent is established according to CPG5.7 which states that *"Additional storeys and roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where: There is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would help to re-unite a group of buildings and Townscape;..."*, and (d) the terrace of which the flat forms part does not have an unbroken run of valley roofs according to CPG5.8.

Roof extensions are a predominant characteristic of Queens Crescent and are evident in all the other 19th century terraces of the street. They are also the preferred roof form of private housing in the street because 51% of such property has sought planning permission for such an extension and mansards predominate not least according to the officer's report on planning application 2012/4538/P at no.147 which states that *"Mansard roof extensions are a dominant feature of the street scene in Queen's Crescent although there is no consistency in design in terms of number of dormer windows and height and bulk of each extension."* Character of the street is not subject to special control because it is not a Conservation Area but such extensions are an integral and evolving part of the history of Camden's built heritage which CS14 seeks to promote. Three properties failed to win approval variously because of design and substandard accommodation but they are different to the proposal here. An application at no.82A awaits determination and currently differs from the geometry prescribed by the CPG.

Roof extensions have added 42 habitable rooms to this street which is equivalent to 11 one-bed flats to current standards. Allowing remaining property in Queens Crescent to be developed in a similar fashion would contribute substantially to its size and quality of housing stock which is the aim of CS6 of the LPA's LDF and DP2 "Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing" which seeks *"to maximise the supply of additional homes in the borough..., by (a) expecting the maximum contribution to supply of housing on sites that are underused or vacant, taking into account any other uses that are needed on the site."* To put this in context, if this were repeated in every other of the 1379 streets in the borough the LPA's forecast need for housing would be fulfilled for the foreseeable future (33,000 new homes against the 22,000 households on the social housing or supply the affordable homes planned by Camden for the next seven years).

The extension enlarges habitable floor area 69% from 45m² to 76m² and allows it to be rearranged to gain a second bedroom. This widens housing choice by providing accommodation suitable for a small family rather than merely a single person or couple and is the size of open-market housing most sought by DP5.4 of the LPA's LDF. Such a size makes accommodation less substandard and almost the 83m² sought by the Mayors Design Guide for a two storey 2bed 4person dwelling. This is not substandard accommodation like that refused at no.94 ref. 2012/5567/P. Residential density increases 25% from 292hr/ha to 365hr/ha. Volume of the roof increases 390% by 83m³ from 21m³ to 104m³. Length and width of the property remains unaltered. Ridge of the roof rises 3m. Eaves rises 1.5m. Surface area of the roof enlarges 111% from 45m² to 95m². Gross site area remains unaltered at 0.0137ha.

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

Properties in Queens Crescent from Grafton Road to Malden Road (Y = Mansard extension, - = unaltered)

| Grafton Road | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------|-------------------------------|--|----------|
| Northside | | | Southside | | |
| Mansard? | | No. | No. | | Mansard? |
| - | Pub "The Mamelon Tower" | 149 | council flats | | |
| Shops below council flats | | | 104 | - | - |
| | | | 102A | 2003/0527/P approved 27.06.03 | Y |
| | | | 102 | 2007/5082/P withdrawn 2008/1393/P approved 09.04.08 | Y |
| Junction with Weedington Road | | | Junction with Weedington Road | | |
| Local library below council flats | | 165 | 100 | - | - |
| | | | 98 | 2010/6521/P refused 19.01.11 2013/5739/P refused 13.9.13 | - |
| Junction with Ashdown Crescent | | | 96 | APPLICATION SITE | - |
| - | - | 163 | 94 | 2012/5567/P refused 30.10.12 appealed unsuccessfully 18.07.13 | - |
| Y | 8501974 approved 25.11.85 | 161 | 92 | - | - |
| - | 2007/5428/P refused 11.01.08 2008/3587/P approved 08.08.08 | 159 | 90 | - | - |
| Y | PEX0000486 approved 23.01.01 PEX0100763 approved 11.04.02 | 155- 157 | 88 | - | - |
| Junction with Ashdown Crescent | | | Junction with Allcroft Road | | |
| | | | 86 | - | - |
| | | | 84 | - | - |
| - | 2013/2341/P approved 15.05.13 | 149 | 82 | 2013/7939/P registered 24.12.13 | - |
| - | 2012/4538/P approved 07.09.12 | 147 | 80 | - | - |
| Y | 2006/0660/P withdrawn 03.03.06 2006/24043/P approved 17.05.06 | 145 | 78 | 78 8701142 approved 17.06.87 | Y |
| - | - | 143 | 76 | - | - |
| - | - | 139- 141 | 74 | 74 2010/4207/P approved 12.08.10 | - |
| Junction with Gilden Crescent | | | Junction with Bassett Street | | |
| | | | 72 | - | - |
| Y | PEX0000558 approved 17.08.00 | 137 | 70 | - | - |
| Y | 8903715 approved 22.11.89 | 135 | 68 | 8802097 approved 23.02.88 | Y |
| Y | 8902715 approved 22.11.89 | 133 | 66 | - | - |
| Y | 8502092 approved 10.12.85 | 131 | 64 | - | - |
| Y | PE9800023R1 approved 20.04.98 | 131A | 62 | - | - |
| Y | 8701361 approved 25.09.87 | 110 | 60 | 8903360 approved 30.05.89 | Y |
| Malden Road | | | 58 | 8802245 approved 25.04.88 | Y |
| Malden Road | | | 56 | - | - |
| Malden Road | | | | | |

LAYOUT

Layout becomes compliant with the Mayor's Design Guide because the living kitchen grows to 28m² and becomes dual aspect (and gains sunlight), the master bedroom grows to 12m² including wardrobes (indeed both bedrooms are doubles) and rooms become more regularly shaped. This is all reached from the unaltered private 1st floor landing and supported by the Landlord's general and refuse storage. Accommodation becomes more energy efficient according to EcoHomes because of insulation, controls and passive solar gain. All this improves the quality of life of occupiers according to DP26. Quality of life of neighbours remains unaltered not least according to according to "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight; A Guide to Good Practice" by P.J.Littlefair, Building Research Establishment, 1991. Other neighbouring amenity remains unaltered according to similar approvals.

SCALE

Scale and form of the extension respects the locality according to CPG4.7 and 4.8 not least because the extension is within prevailing building lines and makes the property a mansarded three storey terrace which is characteristic of the rest of Queens Crescent.

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

Scale of the extension is subordinate to the host building according to CPG5.8 because it adds only one additional storey to the existing three so does not overwhelm no.96 or the rest of the terrace according to CPG5.8. Height complies with CPG5.15 and the property remains lower than the five storey property diagonally opposite at no.165 so the extension does not add significant bulk.

Form of the extension is a mansard because (a) this is the established form of roof extensions in Queens Crescent according to DP5.14, (b) CPG5.15 acknowledges this is *“often the most appropriate form of extension for a Georgian or Victorian dwelling with a raised parapet wall and low roof structure behind.”*, (c) such extensions are a substantial part of the appearance of Queens Crescent with 47% of private housing having such extensions or under or pending construction (21 of the 44 19th or early 20th century properties), (d) the roof extension refused at no.98 ref. 2010/6521/P was not a mansard, and (e) a mansard is the architectural form of roof extension which is most historically sympathetic to the age and character of the building.

Geometry of the mansard is “true” with slopes pitched at 70° and 30° according to CPG5.15 and 5.19 because a steeper slope contributed to the refusal of planning application ref. 2013/5739/P at no.98 and may have given rise to withdrawal of the mansard element of the original application ref. 2007/1499/P to convert the upper parts of no.96 into flats. Such pitch is similar to that noted as acceptable by planning permission 2013/2341/P at no.149 and the mansard is set back from the parapet similar to it and similar to that noted as acceptable by planning permissions 2012/4538/P at no.147. The proposal is therefore unlike the mansard refused at no.98, ref. 2013/5739/P and at no.94 ref. 2012/5567/P.

The parapet is retained unaltered at the front and the valley form of brickwork is retained as a parapet at the rear all according to CPG5.19 similar to that noted as acceptable by planning permissions 2012/4538/P at no.147 and revisions demanded to planning permission 2008/3587/P at no.159. Rooflights are subordinate in size and number to, and flush with, upper roof slopes all according to CPG5.22 and similar to those noted as acceptable by planning permissions 2013/2341/P at no.149 and 2008/3587/P at no.159. Solar panels in the rear roof slope comply with 5.29. Dormer windows of upvc within traditionally detailed lead cheeks and roof are similar to those noted as acceptable by planning permissions 2012/4538/P at no.147 and are aligned with windows below according to CPG5.11 and similar to those noted as acceptable by planning permissions 2013/2341/P at no.149, 2008/3587/P at no.159 according to CPG5.9. If it is preferred that new windows be timber sliding sash this is also acceptable to the applicant. Roof tiles are grey slate similar to those noted as acceptable by planning permissions 2012/4538/P at no.147 and 2013/2341/P at no.149 according to CPG5.9. Party walls and chimneys are extended in brickwork to match existing to form gables clear of the mansard slope similar to those noted as acceptable by planning permission 2013/2341/P at no.149 according to CPG5.9.

The roof extension is therefore well designed and achieves a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of the site according to NPPF 17.

LANDSCAPING

Landscaping remains unaltered.

APPEARANCE

None of the roof extensions proposed in the terrace of which the site forms part have been built (at the application site but withdrawn, at its neighbour at no.94 and two at its neighbour at no.98) so its roofline remains alone in Queens Crescent for being largely unimpacted by alterations or extensions according to 5.8. Appearance of the terrace therefore belies this demand for extension, appears dissimilar to the rest of the street, and contributes less than the rest of the street to Camden’s housing stock. The terrace is not so special that its appearance is incapable of sensitive alteration by high quality design because the street is not a Conservation Area. This is confirmed by the officer’s report approving the mansard at no.74 2010/4207/P albeit no extensions were adjacent and the site was a prominent corner property: *“The proposal includes the installation of a mansard roof and alterations to the existing building. There are 2 other mansards on the terraces on the south side of this road (built in 1980-90’s) while the opposite side of the road have numerous mansards; although this is a prominent corner property, it is not in the context of an unaltered roofscape. Therefore it is considered that the principle of a mansard is acceptable here.”* No.74 and its extension was demonstrably more visible than the application site and the extension proposed here.

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

Appearance of the site is largely unchanged by the extension. This is because (a) it is not highly visible because its form is a mansard which CPG5.14 states is "... a traditional means of terminating a building without adding a highly visible roof.", (b) the parapet hides all but its dormers and gables from the pavement except to Ashdown Crescent where it will appear centrally to focus the view as an architectural composition according to CPG5.8, (c) it will not appear elsewhere once 47 Allcroft road is redeveloped (unlike the roof extensions proposed at no.98 ref. 2010/6521/P and 2013/5739/P which would have been visible from Weedington Road), meanwhile its profile will be similar to the existing profile of no.165, and (d) it will only appear obliquely to 155 to 165 Queens Crescent and this is not the public realm. Such modest change benefits the street because the terrace becomes less out of keeping with its neighbours because the skyline becomes more varied like its context not least versus no.165 and those in Weedington and Allcroft Roads. Just like the existing chimneys are integral to its existing appearance, the building's new dormers and parapets will be integral to a new appearance of the site. Such change is not so marked that it imperils the integrity of the roof apparent to the street. So although the terrace's skyline is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, the extension does not necessarily adversely affect that skyline according to CPG5.8 and not sufficiently to outweigh its non-aesthetic benefits.

Form, materials, textures and colours are vernacular and respect existing materials, style and proportions and hark back to the past according to Camden's Planning Guidance. Daylighting and sunlighting of external space and neighbouring property remains unaltered. Appearance maintains existing visual and physical access. Appearance therefore maintains the area and site's character by perpetuating the modest and vernacular architectural character of Queens Crescent prior to local authority redevelopment.

Westwards it will look like this:



DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

Eastwards it will look like this:



From Ashdown Crescent it will look like this:



DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

ACCESS

The flat remains inaccessible to wheelchairs because it is above ground and there is no lift. Equality, convenience, flexibility and adaptability of residential access to and within, and access to public transport, remain unaltered.

CONCLUSION

The economic and social drivers and benefits of the application have significant weight according to NPPF 61 and the LPA's guidance does not prohibit roof extensions on terraces whose rooflines are largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions especially in the context of NPPF 151, 9, 15, 23 and 58 especially where design quality is high as here according to NPPF 63. Indeed paragraph 65 demands that, *"Local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with an existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design (unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset and the impact would cause material harm to the asset or its setting which is not outweighed by the proposal's economic, social and environmental benefits)."* According to DP24.7, (a) the site has a roof capable of alteration into a mansard, (b) the site is within a terrace whose roofs are largely unaltered in a street of terraces all the rest of which have been altered in an immediate context of higher buildings, (c) the extension would make the terrace less out of keeping with its neighbours, (d) materials of the extension are traditionally vernacular, (e) the elevation of the extension is proportional to the existing, (f) the design is suitable for its use, (g) the design improves the public realm by increasing access to the street without undue visual change, (h) the result has negligible effect on views, vistas etc. The visual impact of the extension is minimal and is outweighed by its other economic, social and environmental benefits according to NPPF 152. The application causes no amenity issues and does not contravene CPG5.8 because it does not have an adverse effect on the skyline, nor an adverse effect on the appearance of no.96 or the surrounding street scene, nor is there an unbroken line of valley roofs, nor does the terrace already have an additional storey or mansard; nor is it higher than neighbouring properties where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural composition; nor is the roof line exposed to important London-wide and local views from public spaces; nor is the roof construction or form unsuitable for roof additions such as shallow pitched roofs with eaves; nor is the terrace a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level; nor is the terrace part of a group where differing heights add visual interest and where a roof extension would detract from this variety of form; nor are the scale and proportions of no.96 or the terrace of which it forms part susceptible to being overwhelmed by the extension.

The application is therefore commended as delivering new floorspace leading to improved quality of life, equality of opportunity and economic growth for the applicant without necessarily adversely affecting the appearance of the environment to bring sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains jointly and simultaneously according to National Planning Policy Framework 8.

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

LOCAL VALIDATION CRITERIA

LIFETIME HOMES AND WHEELCHAIR HOUSING STATEMENT

Not required because the application creates no new units.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING STATEMENT

The application is not liable to provide affordable housing because it creates no new dwellings.

STUDENT HOUSING STATEMENT

The application doesn't involve student housing.

HERITAGE STATEMENT

Conservation Area consent and Listed Building consent is not sought by this application.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Included in body text.

STRUCTURAL REPORT

Not required because the building is not Listed.

STATEMENT OF JUSTIFICATION

Not required because the building is not Listed.

SCHEDULE OF WORKS

Not required because the building is not Listed.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

Not required because ground is undisturbed.

AIR QUALITY ASSESSMENT

The site is not subject to assessment because the road is not busy with poor air quality.

BASEMENTS

The application doesn't involve student housing.

BIODIVERSITY SURVEY AND REPORT

Site does not adversely affect protected species or adjoin a site of Nature Importance..

LAND CONTAMINATION ASSESSMENT

It is unreasonable to believe that the land might be contaminated.

DAYLIGHTING / SUNLIGHT ASSESSMENT

No daylight or sunlight to nearby property is obstructed so rights of light remain unaffected. Daylight to adjoining property is not materially affected because it becomes no less than both 80% of its current value and 27% vertical sky component.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The application needs no environmental statement according to the Town and Country (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations. The development will not have (i) a Code for Sustainable Homes, (ii) renewable energy, (iii) a green roof, (iv) sustainable drainage, (v) a green procurement plan, or (vi) a construction waste plan. It copes with climate change according to EcoHomes and the Building Regulations, uses 125l of potable water per person per day, and is already car free.

LIGHTING ASSESSMENT

Floodlighting is not involved.

NOISE VIBRATION AND VENTILATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Noise disturbance will be insignificant nor is noise sensitive development near major sources of noise like main roads, railways or industry.

PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

Section 106 agreements are unwarranted.

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION STATEMENT

Not applicable because the application provides no new dwellings or large non-residential uses.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT

Not required because masts and antenna are not involved.

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN

Not required as development is not a major application.

TREE SURVEY/ARBORICULTURAL STATEMENT

Neither site nor adjoining neighbours have trees or hedges.

WASTE STORAGE COLLECTION

Not required as development is not a major application.

MAJOR APPLICATIONS

Additional copies of documents and drawings, a Crime Impact Assessment, an Open Space assessment, a Regeneration Statement and a London View Management Framework assessment are not required because the application is not major.

FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT

The application does not increase the site's risk from flooding according to PPS 25 because it is existing, above ground, floor levels will be no lower than existing, and cracks and joints in walls and around openings are sealed.

ECONOMIC STATEMENT

Included in body text.

FOUL SEWAGE AND UTILITIES ASSESSMENT

Existing private foul drainage is extended above ground. Surface water drainage remains unaltered.

LANDSCAPING DETAILS

Not applicable because existing remains unchanged.

PARKING PROVISION

The property is not entitled to park on street.

PLANNING STATEMENT

Included in body text.

SITE WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Not required because demolition costs less than £300,000.

STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Included in body text.

TOWN CENTRE USES EVIDENCE

Not required because development is not retail.

TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

Not required because development is below DoT Guidance on Transport Assessment thresholds and it is not major according to appendix A of TFL's Transport Assessment Best Practice Guidance.

TRAVEL PLAN

Not required because development is insignificant.

TREE SURVEY/ARBORICULTURAL STATEMENT

Neither site nor adjoining neighbours have trees or hedges.

VENTILATION/EXTRACTION STATEMENT

Extract ventilation is limited to ventilating domestic kitchens and bathrooms according to the Building Regulations.

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

APPENDIX - PLANNING POLICY

CS5 "Managing the impact of growth and development" seeks to ensure that *"... development meets the full range of objectives of the Core Strategy and other Local Development Framework documents with particular consideration give to:...(c) sustainable buildings..., (d) protecting and enhancing our environment and heritage and the amenity and quality of life of local communities. The Council will protect the amenity of Camden's residents and those working in and visiting the borough by: (e) making sure that the impact of developments on their occupiers and neighbours is fully considered; (f) seeking to ensure development contributes towards strong and successful communities by balancing the needs of development with the needs and characteristics of local areas and communities;..."*

CS14 "Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage" seeks to ensure that *"Camden's places and buildings are attractive, safe and easy to use by: a) requiring development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character,..."*

DP24 "Securing High Quality Design" requires *"all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider: a) character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed; c) the quality of materials to be used; d) the provision of visually interesting frontages at street level; e) the appropriate location for building services equipment; f) existing natural features, such as topography and trees; g) the provision of appropriate hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatments; h) the provision of appropriate amenity space; and i) accessibility."*

The preamble to this development policy states:

"Core Strategy policy CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage sets out the Council's overall strategy on promoting high quality places, seeking to ensure that Camden's places and buildings are attractive, safe, healthy and easy to use and requiring development to be of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character. Camden has a unique and rich built and natural heritage, with many areas with their own distinct character, created by a variety of elements including building style and layout, history, natural environment including open spaces and gardens, and mix of uses. We have a duty to respect these areas and buildings and, where possible, enhance them when constructing new buildings and in alterations and extensions."

Paragraph 24.4 of the DPD commits the Council to promoting high quality sustainable design which *"is not just about the aesthetic appearance of the environment, but also about enabling an improved quality of life, equality of opportunity and economic growth"*. Para 24.5 states that *"Camden is a densely built-up borough where most development involves the replacement, extension or conversion of existing buildings. Design should respond creatively to its site and its context. This concerns both smaller-scale alterations and extensions and larger developments, the design and layout of which should take into account the pattern and size of blocks, open spaces, gardens and streets in the surrounding area (the 'urban grain')"*.

Paragraph 24.7 demands development consider (a) the character and constraints of its site, (b) the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development, (c) the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape, (d) the compatibility of materials, their quality, texture, tone and colour, (e) the composition of elevations, (f) the suitability of the proposed design to its intended use, (g) its contribution to public realm, and (h) its impact on views and vistas, and the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value.

Paras 24.11 to 24.13 consider local character.

Para 24.12 states *"In order to best preserve and enhance the positive elements of local character within the borough, we need to recognise and understand the factors that create it. Designs for new buildings, and alterations and extensions, should respect the character and appearance of the local area and neighbouring buildings. Within areas of distinctive character, development should reinforce those elements which create the character. Where townscape is particularly uniform attention should be paid to responding closely to the prevailing scale, form and proportions and materials. In areas of low quality or where no pattern prevails, development should improve the quality of an area and give a stronger identity"*.

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

Para 24.13 states *“Development should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street or ignore patterns or groupings of buildings. Overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions. Extensions should therefore be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation unless, exceptionally, it is demonstrated that this is not appropriate given the specific circumstances of the building. Past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations and extensions.”*

DP26 “Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours” commits the Council to *“protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors we will consider include:*

- a) visual privacy and overlooking;*
- b) overshadowing and outlook;*
- c) sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels;*
- d) noise and vibration levels;*
- e) odour, fumes and dust;*
- f) microclimate;*
- g) the inclusion of appropriate attenuation measures.*

We will also require developments to provide:

- h) an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space;*
- i) facilities for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste;*
- j) facilities for bicycle storage; and*
- k) outdoor space for private or communal amenity space, wherever practical.”*

The National Planning Policy Framework seeks to ensure that local people and their accountable councils produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities. It advises that, to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously.

Paragraph 7 outlines *“three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles*

Economic – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;

Social – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being

Environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.”

Paragraph 9 pursues sustainable development not least by *“replacing poor design with better design, improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure, (and) widening the choice of high quality homes.”*

Paragraph 15 demands that local plans are based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Paragraph 17 notes that *“Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These 12 principles (include that) planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.*

Paragraph 23 outlines that *“Planning policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period. (This includes recognising that “residential development can play an important role in ensuring the vitality of centres and set out policies to encourage residential development on appropriate sites; and where town centres are in decline, local planning authorities should plan positively for their future to encourage economic activity”.*

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

for Julietta Cochrane

Paragraph 58 requires that *“Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics. Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments will (a) function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; (b) establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit; (d) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks; (e) respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation....”*

Unless it is intended that some forms of development be prohibited, local authorities should consider imposing design codes to prescribe acceptable patterns of roof extension to fulfil demand according to paragraph 59: *“Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.”*

Otherwise Camden's guidance conflicts with paragraph 60: *“Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.”*

Paragraph 61 reinforces the weight to be given to the economic and social demands for and benefits of the roof extension that *“Although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.”*

And paragraph 63 demands that the high quality of the proposed demand be credited: *“In determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area.”*

The LDF and its supporting documents can't be interpreted to prohibit development of the kind proposed by the application according to paragraph 151; *“Local Plans must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. To this end, they should be consistent with the principles and policies set out in this Framework, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development.”* And likewise paragraph 152; *“Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate.”*

Otherwise Queens Crescent the LPA, *“...should consider using Local Development Orders to relax planning controls for particular areas or categories of development, where the impacts would be acceptable, and in particular where this would promote economic, social or environmental gains for the area, such as boosting enterprise.”* according to paragraph 199. If it is unwilling to do this paragraph 201 provides for *“Communities (to) use Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders to grant planning permission. Where such an order is in place, no further planning permission is required for development which falls within its scope.”* This would need to occur according to paragraph 202; *“Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders require the support of the local community through a referendum. Therefore, local planning authorities should take a proactive and positive approach to proposals, working collaboratively with community organisations to resolve any issues before draft orders are submitted for examination. Policies in this Framework that relate to decision-taking should be read as applying to the consideration of proposed Neighbourhood Development Orders, wherever this is appropriate given the context and relevant legislation.”*

END