

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	14/10/2013
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	26/09/2013
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Gideon Whittingham			2013/3640/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
25-26 Red Lion Street London WC1R 4PS			Refer to Decision Notice	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
Roof extension at 4th floor level to provide 2no. 1 bedroom flats and associated reconfiguration of existing extract duct to the rear.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	28	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 28/08/2013 and a public notice was published in the Ham &amp; High from 05/09/2013.</p> <p>A letter of objection was received from 1 Princeton Street, raising the following issues:</p> <p>‘I would like to object strongly to the proposed development. The planned extension will reduce daylight to our property and seriously cut off sunlight from our back terrace which provides an oasis for birds and other wildlife in an increasingly built up area. The scale of the development is out of keeping with the building next door and our own property which is a precious remnant of the early Georgian /possibly Stuart development of the area.’</p>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>Bloomsbury CAAC objected:</p> <p>‘The building is already considerably higher than its neighbours and the front elevation already has a large roof. It should not be allowed to become over-high and over bulky and unbalance an existing fine building which is a positive contribution to the CA’.</p>					

## Site Description

The buildings of Nos.25, 26, 27, have been identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area in the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

The application site contains 2 x 4 four storey plus basement, mid terrace buildings located on the east side of Red Lion Street, near its junction with Princeton Street. The basement and ground floor to Nos.25 and 26 are in use as a restaurant (Class A3). The upper floors are in residential use (C3). The immediate area surrounding the application site is characterised by a mix of restaurants, commercial and residential uses.

The site is located within Bloomsbury Conservation Area and Archaeological Priority Area.

## Relevant History

2010/5145/P (Granted 29/11/2010) Erection of single storey rear extension to existing restaurant (Class A3).

PSX0204503 (Granted 08/07/2002) Alterations at rear including single storey extension in connection with existing restaurant,

PSX0204504 (Granted 19/08/2002) Installation of kitchen extract flue located on the rear elevation.

PS9904623 (Granted 28/10/1999) Change of use of part basement and ground of no.25 from retail use, and amalgamation with existing restaurant use at basement and ground of no.26 to form a food and drink (A3) unit with associated shopfront alterations,

## Relevant policies

### National and Regional Policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2011

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

**CS1** (Distribution of growth)

**CS5** (Managing the impact of growth and development)

**CS6** (Providing quality homes)

**CS9** (Achieving a successful Central London)

**CS10** (Supporting community facilities and services)

**CS11** (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)

**CS14** (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

**CS19** (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy)

**DP2** (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing)

**DP5** (Homes of different sizes)

**DP6** (Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing)

**DP17** (Walking, cycling and public transport)

**DP18** (Parking Standards and limiting the availability of car-parking)

**DP19** (Managing the impact of parking)

**DP24** (Securing high quality design)

**DP26** (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

**Bloomsbury conservation area appraisal and management strategy (2011)**

**Camden Planning Guidance 2011/2013:**

CPG1 Design – paragraphs 4.6, 4.7

CPG2 Housing- Chapter 4 and 5;

CPG3 Sustainability – Chapter 4;

CPG6 Amenity – Chapter 6;

CPG7 Transport – Chapter 5

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal:

1.1 The application proposes:

- The erection of an additional storey located at 4<sup>th</sup> floor level covering both the main buildings (nos.25 and 26) and rear extension (No.26) for the provision of 2 x 1 bed self-contained flats of 37sqm and 45sqm.
- The elevational alterations at 4<sup>th</sup> floor level would include:
  - The increase in height of the existing front roof pitch from 5m to 7m, comprising 5 flush rooflights and cladding matching that of the existing front pitch.
  - The vertical increase in height of the rear elevation, rear extension and party walls by 3m of brick facing, matching that of the existing building. The rear elevation would feature 6 windows aligning with those at lower level.
- The replacement of an existing kitchen extract flue located on the rear elevation

1.2 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Design related issues/townscape
- Provision and quality of residential accommodation
- Adjacent residential amenity
- Transport, access and parking

### 2.Design related issues/townscape

2.1 Red Lion Street is characterised by a mix of land uses set along a relatively narrow street with continuous building frontages that provide a good sense of enclosure and subsequently are of a noticeably urban character. The street comprises 18th and early 19th century brick townhouses, 3 to 4 storeys in height, often with shops at ground-floor level. However other building types exist, particularly larger residential developments from the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century, reflecting the variety of uses within the streets.

2.2 The application site is located on the east side of Red Lion Street, 1 of 4 small scale terraced buildings (Nos.24, 25, 26, 27), each consistent with 4 storeys, a relative parapet height and two windows wide. Either side of this small terrace are the larger 6 storey building on the junction with Princeton Street and the 5 storey development of No.21-23 Red Lion Street.

2.3 In the early part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the small scale terrace was characterised by valley roofs. Whilst No.27 remains unaltered by later extensions, Nos.25 and 26 have subsequently been in-filled with a flat top extension to the rear and No.24 with a mansard extension. As a result, the terminating height of No.25 and 26 is somewhat higher by 1-2m than No.24 and 27.

2.4 With particular regard to roof extensions, the Bloomsbury conservation area appraisal and management strategy states: 'The Conservation Area retains many diverse historic rooflines which it is important to preserve. Fundamental changes to the roofline, insensitive alterations, poor materials, intrusive dormers, or inappropriate windows can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will not be acceptable. Of particular interest are butterfly roof forms, parapets, chimneystacks and pots and expressed party walls.

2.5 In consideration of CPG 1 (design), a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances where there is likely to be an adverse affect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding streetscene:

- Buildings are part of a group where differing heights add visual interest and where a roof extension would detract from this variety of form;
- Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.
- The building is designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level;

2.6 The proposal would retain the front parapet height, whilst increasing the terminating height of the pitched roof element to the front and vertical rear elevation to both buildings by 1m. As a result, the proposal would require the removal of the central chimney stack.

2.7 Given that Nos. 25 and 26 already rise above the neighbouring terraced buildings of Nos. 24 and 27, any further extension at roof level should be mindful of its relative roofline relationship. In this instance however, the increase of 1m to the roofline would further exacerbate its height disparity to the adverse affect of this small terrace.

2.8 With particular regard to scale, the height of No.25 and 26, from pavement to parapet is 11m and 10m respectively. The height of the roof pitch from parapet to ridge would be 5m (No.25) and 6m (No.26). As a result, the roof extension would not only represent an uncharacteristic double height roof extension, top heavy and out of proportion to the main buildings. Although the roof extension would pitch away from the front elevation, its terminating height and newly formed party walls would be the subject of clear and direct views along Red Lion Street and the junction with Princeton Street, adding a sense of bulk to the already top heavy roof extension. As a result, the positive contribution the small scale terraced buildings make to the Conservation Area would be unacceptably diminished

2.9 It is acknowledged that vertical element of the roof extension at the rear would not be seen from the street in the adjacent roads. However, none of the relevant policies suggest that alterations which would result in the adverse effects described above should necessarily be approved because of the absence of such viewpoints. Furthermore, they would be subject to clear and direct views from the rears of properties on Princeton Street In this case the absence of street level views does not prevent the rear of the terrace being part of the fabric of the Conservation Area.

2.10 The roof extension to the rear would, by virtue of their size and bulk, significantly envelope the rear façade of the building in a particularly unsympathetic manner. It is therefore concluded that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be preserved. This adverse impact is contrary to LDF Policies CS14, DP24 and DP25, which requires development to preserve and to take opportunities to enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

2.11 The replacement of the existing kitchen extract flue located on the rear elevation, modifying its arrangement is considered of no greater harm in design terms that the existing extract.

2.12 The proposal, in form and terminating height is unacceptable in this location and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. As a result the roof extension of this form is contrary to the criteria set out in CPG1 and fails to meet LDF policies CS14, DP24 and DP25, justifying a reason for refusal.

### **3. Provision and quality of residential accommodation**

3.1 The submitted information suggests the proposal would provide 2 x 1 bed units for residential accommodation. The east facing unit would measure 47sqm, whilst the west facing unit would measure 35sqm. Each unit would be accessed via a communal staircase.

3.2 The Council acknowledges that there is a need and/or demand for dwellings of every size, however Camden will focus and prioritise provision around the very high and high priority sizes. Set out in Policy CS6, the Dwelling Size Priorities Table identifies market homes with 1 bedroom of low priority, 3 and 4 bedroom units of medium priority and 2 bedroom units very high priority. The proposal

would therefore provide a particular type of residential accommodation identified by the Council of the lowest priority.

3.3 In accordance with CPG 2 (Housing), the Council has set minimum space standards to ensure rooms are large enough to take on varying uses. Space standards relate to the occupancy of a home rather than number of bedrooms and the developer will be required to state the number of occupants each dwelling has been designed to accommodate. The occupancy of housing at the time of its first occupation is not a reliable prediction of future levels of occupancy over the lifetime of a home. The only sensible assessment of occupancy is therefore the designed level of occupancy.

3.4 The Council (in accordance with CPG2) will expect a 1 bedroom unit designed to accommodate 2 persons, by way of a double bedroom in excess of 11sqm, to meet or exceed 48sqm. The London Plan will expect a 1 bedroom unit designed to accommodate 2 persons to meet or exceed 50sqm. In this particular instance, each unit, comprising a double bedroom would not meet with the minimum floorspace requirements for a 2 person unit, according to the CPG and London Plan standards.

3.5 Self-contained homes providing a floorspace below the minimum standards may be considered in exceptional circumstances, however their acceptability will depend on other aspects of the development proposed, such as those which benefit from good natural daylight and sunlight.

3.6 Residential developments should maximise sunlight and daylight, both within the new development and to neighbouring properties whilst minimising overshadowing or blocking of light to adjoining properties. Maximising sunlight and daylight also helps to make a building energy efficient by reducing the need for electric light and meeting some of the heating requirements through solar gain. The Council expects that all developments receive adequate daylight and sunlight to support the activities taking place in that building. All habitable rooms should have access to natural daylight. Windows in rooms should be designed to take advantage of natural sunlight, safety and security, visual interest and ventilation. Developments should meet site layout requirements set out in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice (1991).

3.7 In this instance, the east facing unit would comprise dual aspect accommodation, whilst the west facing unit would comprise single aspect accommodation, albeit via rooflights which allow an adequate outlook.

3.8 In the absence of an assessment using 'Average Daylight Factor', which typically quantifies the level of daylight in a room (kitchen, living room and bedroom), to establish whether each habitable room will have a predominantly daylit appearance, it is considered the levels of daylight to the proposed units would be adequate.

3.9 The applicant has submitted a Lifetime Homes statement identifying design features which would maximise accessibility and the site/building's constraints. The proposal largely complies with the Lifetime Homes criteria; however the constraints of the site, in particular the inability to install a lift, provide a parking space in close proximity to the site and split levels restrict compliance with, inter alia, criteria Nos.1, 2, 8, 9 and 12. The units would be capable of complying with the remaining criteria.

3.10 All habitable rooms should have minimum headroom of 2.3 metres. The exceptions are habitable rooms in existing basements, which may have 2.1 metres headroom. In this instance both units comply.

3.11 Whilst the units would provide adequate access to daylight and an outlook, it is considered these elements are not exceptional so as to outweigh the flats well below minimum floorspace standards, particularly those of a low priority to Camden's housing stock. A reason for refusal is recommended in this regard.

#### **4.Adjacent residential amenity**

4.1 The proposal would result in the increase in height to both the front pitch and rear elevation to the main building and rear extension. As a result, the terminating height of the buildings would rise from 14m above pavement height to 15m.

4.2 Given the pitch of the building would maintain rising away from the front elevation and thereby Nos.56-61, 55, 54 and 53 Red Lion Street, the proposal would not exert a materially harmful impact in terms of outlook, daylight and sunlight to those residential occupiers. To the rear, it is acknowledged the existing size, scale and arrangement of No.26 somewhat overshadows its smaller neighbour of No.27, diminishing both its access to sunlight and daylight. With this in mind however, given the extent to which the building would be increased in terms of height and size, the proposal would be of no greater detriment in this respect than the existing arrangement.

4.3 With particular regard to privacy, the proposal would introduce new windows at 4<sup>th</sup> floor level to both the front and rear elevation, capable of sightlines to properties on Red Lion Street and Princeton Street. To ensure privacy, there should normally be a minimum distance of 18m between the windows of habitable rooms of different units that directly face each other.

4.4 The distance from the opposing properties on Red Lion Street (Nos.56-61, 55, 54 and 53) and Princeton Street (Nos.7-23) would be less than 10m and 12m respectively. Given that this distance would include opposite sides of a street, and windows are already in situ at 3<sup>rd</sup> floor level, the proposal would be of no greater detriment to the privacy levels of the surrounding occupiers than the existing arrangement.

4.5 The applicant has submitted an acoustic report and background noise survey which includes calculations of predicted noise levels to support compliance with the Council's standards. The Council's Environmental Health officer has assessed the submitted acoustic report, and is satisfied the Council's required standards are capable of being met, subject to specific conditions regulating noise and vibration levels. As such no adverse amenity impacts are envisaged.

#### **5. Transport, access and parking**

5.1 In consideration of Policy DP18, the Council will expect development to be car free in areas such as central London and other areas with Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) which are highly accessible by public transport. 'Highly accessible areas' are considered to be areas with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4 and above.

5.2 The site has a PTAL of 6b, which indicates that it has an excellent level of accessibility by public transport. Within this context, in accordance with Policies DP18 and DP19, the 2 new residential units should therefore be made car-free, secured by a Section 106 planning obligation. In the absence of such a legal agreement a reason for refusal is recommended.

5.3 A development of this type would typically be required to provide a minimum of one cycle storage/parking space per new residential unit. Although the applicant has not included provision for the required amount of cycle storage/parking in the proposed design, given the lack of external space and commercial uses at basement and ground floor level, the constraints of the site indicate this requirement should be waived in this instance.

5.4 Policy DP21 seeks to protect the safety and operation of the highway network and for some development this may require control over how the development is implemented (including demolition and construction) through a Construction Management Statement (CMS) secured via a Section 106 Agreement. Issues related to traffic disruption and associated noise could also be controlled in this respect. The application site is not only located on a 'zebra' crossing with no parking permitted at any time, but also located within a CPZ. As a result, during the period of construction, vehicles would be displaced and likely require to park on the street. Pedestrian permeability and safety would also be impacted along this narrow pavement. Within this context and in accordance with Policy DP21, the development should therefore be secured by a Section 106 planning obligation. In the absence of

such a legal agreement a reason for refusal is recommended.

## **6.Other Material Considerations**

6.1 In accordance with Policy DP 22 and CPG3, the Council will expect residential developments (except new build) providing more than 500 sqm of floorspace or 5 or more dwellings to achieve “excellent” in EcoHomes assessments. This requirement would not apply in this instance as the proposal would only provide 2 dwellings.

## **7. Community Infrastructure Levy**

7.1 The proposal will be liable for the Mayor of London’s CIL Based on the Mayor’s CIL charging schedule and the information given on the plans the charge is likely to be £4,750 (95sqm x £50). This will be collected by Camden after the scheme is implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, submit a commencement notice and late payment, or and indexation in line with the construction costs index.

**Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission**