

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		08/01/2014	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		31/12/2013	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Rob Tulloch				2013/6719/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
91 Torriano Avenue London NW5 2RX				See decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a roof extension with 2 rear balconies and 3 rooflights, to create an additional one-bedroom flat							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Application					
Conditions:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	14	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultation responses:		Site notice n/a Press advert n/a <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections were received from nos. 89 and 93B Torriano Avenue: • The previous application was refused on grounds of bulk and location and detailed design, the current scheme has a larger footprint • The previous scheme was also refused on detailed design, the current scheme has a glazed curtain wall that is out of keeping with the surrounding area • Major building work has already caused damage to neighbouring properties 					
CAAC/Local group comments:		n/a					
Site Description							
The site comprises a basement plus 3-storey terraced property located on the west side of Torriano Avenue, north of the junction with Leighton Road and backing on to Torriano Mews. The building is in residential use with access to the upper floors and the basement from a side elevation on Torriano Mews. The building is not listed nor does it lie within a conservation area.							
Relevant History							
2012/4606/P Erection of a mansard roof extension to create an additional flat (Class C3) Refused 26/10/2012 for the following reasons:							

- (1) The proposed roof extension, by reason of its location, bulk and detailed design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and street scene contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
- (2) The proposed development has failed to demonstrate how it would incorporate sustainable design and construction measures, contrary to policy CS13 (Tackling climate change and promoting higher environmental standards) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policy DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
- (3) The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement for car-free housing, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area, contrary to policies CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policies DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking) and DP19 (Managing the impact of parking) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

2012/2443/P Variation of condition 3 (development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans) pursuant to planning permission ref 2010/6141/P dated 19/04/2011 (Change of use of basement and ground floors from retail (Class A1) to maisonette (Class C3), including creation of front basement lightwell, installation of railings; alterations to front elevation and replacement of all windows with double glazed timber framed windows); namely, the removal of chimney and lowering of rear roof level, alterations to doors and window at lower ground floor level on front elevation, removal of door and installation of gas meter cupboard on side elevation. **Granted 29/06/2012**

2010/6141/P Change of use of basement and ground floors from retail (Class A1) to maisonette (Class C3), including creation of front basement lightwell, installation of railings; alterations to front elevation and replacement of all windows with double glazed timber framed windows; (ref.); **Granted 19/04/2011**

2010/3798/P Change of use of basement and ground floors from retail (Class A1) to 2 x one bedroom self-contained flats (Class C3), including creation of new basement lightwell, new glazed doors and replacement double glazed timber framed windows in association with the residential use; **Refused 16/09/2010**

93B Torriano Avenue

2006/3599/P Erection of mansard roof extension to upper maisonette. **Granted 12/10/2006**

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS6 Providing quality homes

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS11 Promoting sustainable and efficient travel

DP6 Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes

DP17 Walking, cycling and public transport

DP18 Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking
DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction
DP24 Securing high quality design
DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

**Camden Planning Guidance 2013
NPPF 2012**

Assessment

1 Proposal

1.1 Consent is sought for the erection of a roof extension with rear balconies, to create an additional one-bedroom flat. The main issues are:

- Standard of proposed accommodation
- Design
- Transport
- Amenity
- Sustainability

2 Standard of proposed accommodation

2.1 The proposal would provide a self-contained flat of approximately 55sqm. Camden's minimum space standards recommend 48sqm for a two person unit, with the London Plan seeking 50sqm. The bedroom would be 16sqm, and the flat would be dual aspect with good daylight, natural ventilation, and regular sized and shaped rooms. The unit would also benefit from external amenity space in the form of two balconies.

2.2 Policy DP26 requires development to provide facilities for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste and outdoor amenity space where practical. No area for refuse storage is proposed, and the constraints of the site make external storage difficult. It is considered that refuse and recycling waste could be put outside on days of collection as is the case for other flats in the building.

Lifetime Homes

2.3 Policy DP6 requires all new residential accommodation, including conversions, to meet Lifetime Homes standards. The flat would have adequate circulation space and an entrance level living space, there is also potential for hoists and grab rails. It is acknowledged that conversions may not be able to meet all of the criteria due to existing physical constraints, and the proposal is considered to meet the criteria where possible.

2.4 As such the proposed basement unit is considered to provide an adequate level of residential amenity and would comply with policies CS5, DP6 and DP26 of the LDF and Camden Planning Guidance.

3 Design

3.1 The application site forms a pair with no. 89 Torriano Avenue. These two buildings are three storeys high and unaltered at roof level retaining their original valley roofs. No. 91 is wider than no. 89 and extends over one of the vehicular entrances to the mews behind. The pair sit forward of the original building line of nos. 93-119 to the north, and level with the front extension to no. 93.

- 3.2 To the south of the application site are nos. 83-87 Torriano Avenue. These properties share the building line with nos. 89 and 91, but are more modest in design and scale than the rest of the street and only two storeys high. The building line of nos. 83-91 is approximately 4m in front of nos. 93-119 to the north. As the application site marks the change in the building line, its flank elevation is particularly prominent in views looking southwards. The flank wall of the pair is also highly prominent adjacent to the two storey terrace at nos. 83-87 in views looking northwards. As such, the site is a highly prominent feature in the street scene making any addition of a roof extension likely to appear overly dominant and discordant with its surroundings.
- 3.3 An application for a mansard style roof extension at the site was refused in 2012 (2012/4606/P). One of the reasons for refusal was location, bulk, and detailed design. The refused scheme had a slightly smaller footprint as the extension had a mansard style front elevation set back 800mm behind the parapet. At the rear, the parapet would have been raised to roof level. The design of the mansard was considered unacceptable as it would have given the building a top heavy appearance. It attempted to match the height of the roof extension to no. 93 which is less obtrusive as the parapet is higher and the extension set back further from the parapet reducing its visual impact.
- 3.4 To the north of the site are nos. 93-119 Torriano Avenue. This group is markedly different to the group of buildings the application site forms a part of. It comprises four storey mid-Victorian buildings built in London stock brick with stucco surrounds. There is a uniformed building line set back from the footway by lightwells, although nos. 93, 97 and 99 have front extensions. Seven of the fourteen houses in this terrace (nos. 93, 97, 101, 103, 105, 107 & 117) have roof extensions of various designs, some with mansards, and some with sliding doors facing terraces behind the front parapets. Only three of these appear to benefit from planning permission, and only two (nos. 93 and 117) were granted in the last 30 years.
- 3.5 The proposed extension would not be set back from the parapet but sit directly behind it, and would be a box-like shape. At the front, instead of the two dormers of the previous scheme, the proposed extension would be a more modern design with a glazed curtain wall. At the rear the proposed scheme replaces the solid rear elevation of the previous scheme with a glazed curtain wall with two balconies in front. The sides, which would also be particularly prominent in the street scene, would be clad in grey aluminium.
- 3.6 As the proposed extension is not set back from the parapet, the roof extension would be visible in most views from the street, which due to its modern design, would create an incongruous addition at roof level. The sides of the proposed extension would also be highly visible, and whereas the impact of the roof extensions to the north is mitigated by set backs and sloping party walls, the verticality of the front elevation of the proposed roof extension would emphasise its bulk and mass, which would be particularly evident in views south. As no. 91 is double width compared to its neighbour, it would also unbalance the pair in direct views from the street, and from views of the rear in public views from Torriano Mews. The introduction of balconies at top floor level to the rear would also give the rear of the building a top heavy appearance from Torriano Mews.
- 3.7 However, it was not just the bulk and detailed design of the previous scheme that made it unacceptable, it was also its location. As stated above, the application site is particularly prominent as the group it forms a part of sits forward of the building line to the north and is a storey higher than the next group of buildings to the south.
- 3.8 The terrace to the north of the application site has suffered due to the nature and number of unsympathetic alterations and extensions. The front extensions are considered to be detrimental to the appearance of the terrace and the various extensions at roof level contribute to a

disparate and unappealing rofopscape that contrasts to the largely unified upper floors of the buildings. Policy DP24 states that in areas of low quality, or where no pattern prevails, development should improve the quality of an area and give a stronger identity, and that past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations and extensions.

- 3.9 Planning permission was granted in 2006 for a roof extension at no. 93, although it is visible in the street scene it was considered acceptable as it forms part of a terrace where there are a number of roof extensions, and it was revised to reduce its visual impact. It is considered to have less visual impact than the proposed scheme.
- 3.10 The proposed design is also considered to be harmful to the appearance of the wider terrace. It is accepted that half of the buildings in the terrace north of the application site have roof extensions, but as mentioned previously this is a distinctly different group to the application site. Not only would the addition of a roof extension harm the application site's relationship with its pair, it would further emphasise the difference in building lines between the pair and nos. 93-119, by accentuating the largely featureless flank elevation of the building, which is already visible from the north of the street. Similarly, the extension would appear prominent and intrusive when viewed from the south.
- 3.11 As such the proposed roof extension by virtue of its bulk, location and design is considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and wider street scene contrary to Policies CS14 and DP24 of the LDF and Camden Planning Guidance.

4 Transport

Cycle Parking

- 4.1 The proposal is for a new self-contained flat at third floor level, accessed via the existing staircase, with minor alterations being required to the floor below. There is no scope for including cycle parking within the site on the ground floor level and cycle parking cannot be located on other floors because these floors are only accessed by staircases. As a result, it would be unreasonable to require this proposal to include provision for cycle parking to the CPG 7 design guidance.

Car-free and Car-capped Development

- 4.2 The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 5 (very good) and is within a Controlled Parking Zone. Not making the development car-free would increase demand for on-street parking in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) the site is within. This is considered unacceptable in CPZ's that are highly stressed where overnight demand exceeds 90%.
- 4.3 The London Plan 2011 and policy DP18 identify that car-free and car-capped housing, and developments in general, should be ensured by Boroughs in areas of high public transport accessibility. Therefore, if the application were acceptable the proposed flat would need to be made car-free via a Section 106 agreement.

Construction Management Plan (CMP)

- 4.4 Due to the scale and kind of this development and the likely method of construction a CMP will be not be required in this instance.

5 Amenity

5.1 The proposed roof extension is not considered to cause any significant additional harm through loss of privacy to occupiers of neighbouring buildings. The proposal would have a limited impact on sunlight to nos. 93 and 95 Torriano Avenue, but this is not considered to be significant. The buildings behind in Torriano Mews are in commercial use. The introduction of a small residential unit is not considered to harm the amenity of a largely residential street.

6 Sustainability

6.1 Policies CS13 and DP22 require all development to take measures to minimise the effects of, and adapt to, climate change. Schemes must demonstrate how sustainable development principles have been incorporated into the design and proposed implementation; and incorporate green or brown roofs and green walls wherever suitable. Camden Planning Guidance (CPG3 – Sustainability) also states that all buildings, whether being updated or extended, are expected to reduce their carbon emissions by making improvements to the existing building. As a guide, at least 10% of the project cost should be spent on the improvements. The applicant has indicated the new unit would have a green roof, but no details have been submitted. If the application were acceptable, further details would be required by condition. .

4 Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission