

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	07/11/2013
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	12/10/2013
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Seonaid Carr			2013/5813/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
72 Shoot-Up Hill London NW2 3XJ			See draft decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of single and part first storey rear extension, both with associated green roofs; installation of two side dormers and two front, one side and one rear rooflight, installation of a new side gate and garage door and alterations fenestration throughout in connection with change of use from 3 x 3 bed flats to 3 x 1 bed and 4 x 2 bed flats (Class C3). -					
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional permission subject to Section 106 agreement			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	38	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	00
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>2 objections have been received from neighbouring residents, a summary of which is provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Concern the double storey rear extension is not aesthetically pleasing, the building is big enough with the lower rear extension and main building for the development;Concern there will be direct views from my bedroom velux window to the side of this cube and not the sky;The daylight and sunlight report has omitted a window from my property which serves my bedroom, the daylight and sunlight report talks of an ‘acceptable’ figure of a 20% loss of daylight that may be incurred as a result of the proposal, my window is original and the existing original bay window at No.72 already obscures 50% of the daylight that enters my bedroom, any alteration will remove 100% of the daylight entering my room which is totally unacceptable. <p>One neighbour has also submitted a letter they sent to the agent and applicant regarding the omission of the window to the side elevation.</p> <p>Officer comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Following receipt of the neighbours comments the applicant added an amendment to the daylight and sunlight report to assess the side window.The concerns raised in respect of design form part of the assessment below.					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	N/A					

Site Description

The application relates to a three storey building located to the north west side of Shoot-Up Hill which is largely residential. As existing the property comprises of three self-contained units. To the front of the building is a garage built into the dwelling together with an area of hardstanding, for off-street car parking. Accessed via a separate entrance and exit.

The site is not located within a conservation area and no buildings are listed.

Relevant History

2013/4598/P - Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of part single part two storey rear extension with terraces at first floor level, erection of three dormer windows one to each of side and rear elevations, installation of two front and one side rooflights, alterations to fenestration to all elevations and reconfiguration of internal layout to provide 7 self contained units (three 1-bed, three 2-bed, one 3-bed). Application withdrawn.

Relevant policies

The National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

The London Plan (2011)

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies (2010)

CS1 (Distribution of growth);
CS4 (Areas of more limited change);
CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development);
CS6 (Providing quality homes);
CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel);
CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage);
CS18 (Dealing with our waste and encouraging recycling);
DP2 (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing);
DP6 (Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing);
DP16 (The transport implications of development);
DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport);
DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking);
DP19 (Managing the impact of parking);
DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction);
DP24 (Securing high quality design);
DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours);
DP 29 (Improving access);

Camden Planning Guidance(CPG) (2010)

CPG1 (Design);
CPG2 (Housing);
CPG4 (Basements and lightwells)
CPG6 (Amenity);
CPG7 (Transport);
CPG8 (Planning obligations).

Assessment

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing rear extension and erection of single and part first storey rear extension, both with associated green roofs; installation of two side dormers and two front, one side and one rear rooflight, installation of a new side gate and garage door and alterations fenestration throughout in connection with change of use from 3 x 3 bed flats to 3 x 1 bed and 4 x 2 bed flats (Class C3).

At roof level the proposed dormers would each measure 2.4m wide and 1.7m deep. The dormers would be clad in a lead finish.

The proposed rear extension would extend the full width of the property. In terms of depth it would be of a stepped nature and allow for a 1.6m deep lightwell to the rear wall of the original dwelling. Towards the eastern side of the building the extension would project 5m beyond the rear elevation of the building for a width of 5.7 at which point it would project a further 1.2m. The extension would be of a flat roof construction measuring 3m in height. At first floor level it is proposed to extend the extension for a further 2.7m in height and width of 4.1m, this would be set in from both sides of the dwelling by 4.2m to the east and 2.4m to the west. The first floor extension would project 5m deep.

In terms of fenestration the ground floor level would accommodate two sets of four glazed doors. The first floor extension would incorporate two single sash windows. The application is also seeking to alter the windows through the building and replace with timber windows.

Land Use

At present the application site is used as three self-contained units, the proposed development would result in the creation of 7 units, an additional 4 onsite. The proposal includes 3 x 1 bed and 4 x 2 bed. Given the use of the land would not change from Class C3, no objection is raised on land use grounds.

Design

Policies CS14 and DP24 seek to ensure all development is of the highest quality design and considers the character, setting, context and form of neighbouring buildings.

The application property is set in a row of three detached dwellings all of a similar scale. The architectural form and detailing of the application site and the neighbour No.74 are similar however No.70 has different detailing to both the front and rear elevations and at roof level.

Looking firstly to the alterations at roof level. It is acknowledged that side dormers are not a regular feature of roof slopes within the locality, however given their siting on the side roofslope, set in from the eaves and roof ridge and positioned in the middle of the roof coupled with the fact that the site is separated from the neighbouring properties by 1.2m, the views of the dormers would be limited from street level in both directions. As such it is considered they would not appear as dominating and overly visible additions to the roof.

With regard to the rooflights, there would be two to the front, one to the rear, one to the south east and one to the flat roof area of the roof. Given these would be flush with the plane of the roof and of a modest scale in relation to the roof it is considered these would be an acceptable addition to the roof slopes.

The proposed part single and part two storey rear extension is considered to be of an appropriate size in relation to the application property and site within which it is located. As the property exists it has

been extended by way of a 5m deep and 5.7m wide rear extension which appears to have been in situ for some time. The proposal would rebuild this element of the extension in the same location with the addition of a further 5.1m wide element that would project a further 1.2m, resulting in a stepped rear elevation. Such a treatment aids in breaking down the bulk of the extension in creating some relief, rather than having a single plane.

With regard to the first floor element of the extension, the proposed first floor extension would accord with the guidance of CPG1 in the sense that it would be set down more than a storey from the eaves of the building, furthermore it would be a much smaller footprint than the ground floor extension and significantly set in from the side elevations of the building to reduce its visual mass and bulk. Although the extension would be visible in views from Minster Road, given the scale of the extension it wouldn't cause demonstrable harm to the character of the area. As such no objection is raised to this element of the proposal.

When considering the proposed extension within the context of the surrounding properties, a number of the neighbouring properties have been extended at ground floor level with full width and part width extensions, including both properties either side of the application site, as such it is considered the principle of having a full width rear extension would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. With regard to the first floor rear extension, although the two neighbouring properties are limited to a single store extensions, there is development at first floor level floor to the properties to the north west, although this may form part of the character of the building, in this instance it contributes to the proposal of a first floor level extension not appearing incongruous.

In respect of the alterations to the windows, to the front elevation it is proposed to replace the existing windows with new timber windows to match the existing. To the rear, as existing there are three sizes of window openings each with a different style of window. The proposal includes altering the openings to the majority of the windows within the rear elevation although the proportions and windows types would be altered, the proposal would retain a strong solid to void relationship. The development would remove some sainted glass windows within the rear elevation, however given the site is not within a conservation area and the building is not listed or noted to be of significant architectural merit. To the south east elevation it is proposed to alter the fenestrational composition however it is considered that this would not result in harm to the character of the building and no objection is raised. It is considered that no objection is raised to the proposed fenestration.

Standard of Accommodation

Policy CS6 aims to make full use of Camden's capacity for housing, which is linked to DP2 which also has the same objective. Policy DP26 seeks to secure development which provides an acceptable standard of accommodation with respect to internal arrangements, rooms sizes and amenity space.

The table below notes the room sizes for all units, demonstrating each unit would meet the required room sizes.

Unit No.	No. of Bedroom	Floorspace (sqm)
1	2	80.5
2	2	63
3	2	70.1
4	1	45.9

5	1	50.3
6	1	45.2
7	2	74.4

In terms of daylight and sunlight into the new units, all units are dual aspect and would receive good levels of daylight and sunlight. Unit 7 would likely receive the least level of daylight and sunlight given it would only be served by 2 dormers and rooflights, however, given the unit would be in the upper level all openings would be unobstructed and the unit would be of a suitable standing.

In terms of outlook, all units would appreciate a good level of outlook, it is noted that bedroom 2 within unit 1 would be limited to an internal courtyard, however it is considered that the unit as a whole would provide a good level of outlook and this alone would not warrant a reason for refusal.

There is slight concern in regard to the outlook that would be experienced from within unit 7, the living room/kitchen area would be serviced via a dormer and rooflight, the master bedroom via a dormer and the single bedroom via a rooflight. The main outlook would be via the dormer windows, the windows of which would be 2m wide, given the width of these windows and as they would be a roof level they would provide a sufficient level of outlook. When considering the development as a whole it is considered the slight concern with unit 7 would not warrant a refusal of planning permission.

It is considered future occupiers would experience a good level of privacy from within the units.

Impact on neighbour amenity

Daylight and sunlight

With regard to the impact of the development, it would be only Nos. 70 and 74 would be impacted by the proposed works. The application is supported with a daylight and sunlight report which demonstrates that both properties would continue to receive a sufficient level of daylight and sunlight.

In respect of No.70, there are no windows within 90 degrees due south of the proposal and as such no windows are relevant for Average Probably Sunlight Hours (ASPH). In respect of daylight, only one window would have a VSC less than 27%, Ground R2, however the existing VSC is also less than 27%, given the loss would be 12.65% it would be within 0.8 times the former value and the occupiers of this room would not notice a reduction in daylight. Therefore No.70 would remain unaffected in terms of daylight and sunlight by the proposed development.

With regard to No.74, the rear windows are not within 90 degrees due south and as such are not relevant for the ASPH sunlight assessment. In terms of daylight, the assessment has reviewed the windows at first and second floor level, as the proposed works would not extend beyond the existing ground floor extension there would be no impact on the rear ground floor windows. In terms of the windows at first and second floor level all would have a VSC over 27% as a result of the works and as such would remain unaffected by the proposed development.

A neighbour had raised concern as the report initially submitted failed to address a window within the side elevation of their property which services a bedroom. Following this, the applicant provided a supplement to their report which demonstrated that this window has an existing VSC of 4.95 which would reduce to 4.01 as a result of the works. Therefore the VSC reduction would be 0.94 which equates to a loss of 18.97%, which is acceptable in terms of the BRE guidelines. When assessing the impacts of daylight and sunlight on neighbouring properties it is common practice to use the guidelines of the BRE, as discussed within the applicants daylight and sunlight report. Within the BRE

it is noted that should the VSC be below 27% as a result of the works then the impact would be determined by the degree of loss that would be caused by the proposal. Any reduction should be less than 0.8 times the former value equating to a loss of 20%, if the loss were to be greater than this, the occupiers would notice a loss of sunlight within the room. Therefore proposed development would not result in a detrimental loss of daylight to the occupiers of this neighbouring property.

Outlook

With regard to the impact on No.70, there is an existing rear extension to this property, which the proposed development would not project beyond, there is a skylight to the roof of this single extension, however given the height of the single storey element of the proposed extension it would not obstruct views from this skylight. With regard to the first floor element of the extension, as this would be set 5.5m from the side elevation of No.70 it would not obscure views from this skylight.

With regard to the impact on No.74, there is also a single storey extension to the rear of No.74 which would terminate in line with the proposed extension, as such there would be no impact to the outlook enjoyed from these rear windows. It is noted there is a side window which looks onto the passageway between Nos. 72 and 74 and serves a bedroom, the outlook from this window is already obscured due to it being covered in metal bars. Since submitting the application, the boundary wall adjacent to the rear of the properties has been reduced in height. It is considered the proposed development would not result in detrimental harm to the outlook from this window. With regard to the outlook enjoyed from the upper elevations, the first floor element of the extension would be sited 5.9m from the nearest window at first floor level, due to its siting in relation to this window, there would not be a detrimental harm to the outlook enjoyed by occupiers from the upper elevations of No.74.

Privacy

The proposed development would not increase opportunity for the future occupiers of the units to overlook neighbouring residents. There would be new side windows within the ground floor level as it adjoins, No.70, however given this would be a ground floor level it would not overlook neighbouring residents. At roof level there would be two new side dormers, given there are no openings on the roof slopes of neighbouring properties there would be no direct overlooking into neighbouring residents windows. In terms of looking down into windows to the top floor of neighbouring properties, given the angle of views that would be appreciated it is not considered there would be a readily available view into neighbouring windows and no objection is raised.

Transport

As existing there is a single garage within confines of the building together with a forecourt area to the front of the property for off-street car parking. The application is proposing the retention of the single garage together with the provision of on car parking space, given the size of the forecourt area it would not be possible for more cars to be parked on the site whilst still allowing vehicles to manoeuvre on and off the site in forward gear.

Given the application site already has the provision of one garage and off-street car parking within the forecourt it would be unreasonable to now take this away. As such to mitigate the impact on the surrounding transport network, a Section 106 would be sought to secure the new units are car free, so none of the future occupiers can attain car parking permits.

In terms of cycle parking the development proposes the provision of seven spaces within the existing basement area. These would be via wall mounted Sheffield stands. The cycle store would be accessed via a door adjacent to the existing garage and would only be access by occupiers of the property. It is considered the number of spaces, type of storage and location would all be acceptable and no objection is raised in this regard.

Waste

The application includes the provision of communal refuse storage to the front driveway, this would be off street and built into the front boundary. Details provided for this are limited as such should planning permission be granted a condition would be placed on the decision requiring detailed drawings of the storage.

Lifetime Homes

The applicant has provided a Lifetime Homes Statement within their Design and Access Statement addressing how they meet the 16 requirements of the Lifetime Homes Standards. Given the building is existing there are a limited number of points the development has been able to achieve as the front entrance is accessible only via stairs, however this is considered acceptable.

CIL

Given the development would create new residential units it would be liable to pay the mayoral CIL an informative will be placed on the decision advising the application they are liable to pay this.

Recommendation: Grant conditional permission subject to section 106 agreement.