

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>15/11/2013</b>	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>25/10/2013</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Miheer Mehta				2013/5966/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
80 Greencroft Gardens London NW6 3JQ				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>							
Erection of single storey rear extension at ground floor level, two dormer roof extensions and inset terrace at roof level and new entrance door on side elevation at ground floor level to create 2 x self contained flats to ground floor and roof space (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant conditional permission subject to S106					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	17	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Ham & High Press Notice – 03/10/2013 – 24/10/2013 Site Notice – 26/09/2013 – 17/10/2013  No response received.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>		No response received.					

## Site Description

The application site is a 3-storey detached property on the north side of Greencroft Gardens. The property forms part of a group of a fairly uniform terrace built in the 1890s. The property has a traditional appearance.

The property is located within a residential area, with mainly large houses converted into self-contained dwellings. The application property has been converted into 4 self-contained flats previously.

The property is not listed but is located in the South Hampstead Conservation Area (CA). The property is a positive contributor to the CA. An article 4 direction was introduced within this part of the CA in September 2010.

## Relevant History

2012/6195/P – Non-determined (would have refused) 03/05/2013 and Dismissed 11/09/2013 - Erection of single storey rear extension, roof extension, and new entrance door on side elevation at ground floor level to create additional 2 x self contained flats (class C3).

*The Inspector dismissed the case due to the inadequate provision for car-free housing for the additional residential units proposed. No unilateral undertaking or S106 was provided as part of the appeal. The Inspector did not raise any concerns on the other elements of the proposal.*

## Relevant policies

### NPPF 2012

### The 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)  
CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)  
CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)  
CS17 (Making Camden a safer place)  
CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy)  
DP2 (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing)  
DP3 (Contributions to the supply of affordable housing)  
DP5 (Housing size mix)  
DP6 (Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes)  
DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport)  
DP18 (Parking standards and the availability of car parking)  
DP19 (Managing the impact of parking)  
DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network)  
DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)  
DP23 (Water)  
DP24 (Securing high quality design)  
DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)  
DP29 (Improving access)

### Supplementary Guidance

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

South Hampstead Conservation Area Statement

## Assessment

The application seeks the erection of single storey rear extension at ground floor level, two dormer roof extensions, inset terrace at roof level and roof lights to the front roofslope and new entrance door on side elevation at ground floor level to create 2 x self contained flats to part of the ground floor and the whole of the roof area.

The erection of a 2 dormer roof extensions, an inset roof terrace and roof lights would provide a 3 bedroom self-contained flat within the loft area.

The existing ground floor flat would be sub-divided. The proposal includes a single-storey rear extension and new entrance door to the side elevation to convert the existing ground floor flat to provide a 1 bedroom self-contained flats along with the reconfiguration of the existing three bedroom ground floor flat.

The roof extension incorporates 4 roof lights to the main roof, an inset roof terrace and 2 dormer windows to the rear roof slope. The single-storey rear extension would be 5m deep with a flat roof and would consist of 3 sets of French doors to the rear elevation.

The key considerations for assessment are:

- Principle of conversion
- Design
- Mix of proposed units, standard of accommodation and lifetime homes
- Amenity of neighbours
- Transport

### Principle of conversion

The provision of new housing is welcomed; however this would be subject to the new residential units being in accordance with the relevant housing policies set out in the LDF.

### Design

The scheme proposes two dormer roof extensions and an inset roof terrace to the rear roof slope to a currently unaltered roofscape. The roof extension also incorporates four roof lights to the front roofslope.

The Conservation Area Statement quotes the following, which is considered appropriate for this proposal. *“The variety of roof forms in the area means that each proposal must be carefully judged on its design merits; alterations should not result in increased visual bulk to the roof, nor should they draw more attention than existing to the roof slope. Where a building forms one of a harmoniously composed terrace or group, or indeed is a prominent corner building with a carefully designed hipped roof, insensitive alterations this can be particularly damaging to the design of the host building and the street as a whole. Roof lights inserted insensitively in the front or visible side roof slope, even when they are flush fitting, also erode character and upset the careful balance of solid to void on the principal elevation.”*

The recently dismissed planning appeal (see planning history) raised no concerns with the overall design of the roof alterations and additions. The Inspector stated: *“Part of the proposal would involve the conversion of the existing roofspace and I am mindful of the important role that local roofscapes play in maintaining the character of the Conservation Area. The proposed alterations would result in some change to the appearance of the building. However, I consider that the extent of these alterations, including the rooflights and dormer windows, would not be excessive. Due to their detailed design, size, siting and relationship with the remainder of the building, they would be complementary to its existing appearance and sympathetic to its overall design”.*

The Inspector also commented on the single-storey rear extension, stating: *“Relative to the overall scale of the existing building, the proposed single-storey extension would result in a relatively modest addition to the building, which would be clearly subservient and not be disproportionate to it. Its depth and height would not be excessive in relation to the main building and, in terms of its design, it would complement the character and appearance of this building”*. A condition has been attached to prevent the use of the roof extension as a roof terrace.

The alterations to the side elevation are also considered to be acceptable and not detrimental to the host building.

Overall the external changes to the building are considered to be satisfactory.

### **Mix of units**

Policy DP5 ‘Dwelling Size Priorities Table’ identifies there being a ‘very high’ need for 2 bedroom units in the borough. The Priorities Table identifies 2-bed market units as having a ‘very high’ need in the borough. The current proposal is to provide 2 new residential units within a converted building. The proposed units would be a 1 bedroom and 3 bedroom flat. Therefore the additional flats proposed would not necessarily be in strict compliance with policy DP5 in providing an appropriate mix of dwellings, however the property would comprise an additional 3 bedroom unit which would be welcome.

The proposals would result in a net increase of 1 x 3 bedroom and 1 x 1 bedroom flat (at roof level and ground floor levels). Therefore, the current property would comprise of 2 x 3 bedroom and 2 x 1 bedroom flats, with the proposal to total 3 x 1 bedroom and 3 x 3 bedroom flats, which would be acceptable in this instance due to the provision of 3 bedroom units which is within the spirit of the Council’s current priority as stated in policy DP2.

The recent appeal commented on the issue of housing mix and the Inspector confirmed *“Given this and taking into account the particular constraints involved with converting the building, I conclude that the proposal would provide for an acceptable mix of housing, which would reflect the character of the remainder of the development, the local area and the limitations imposed by the site.”*

The housing mix is therefore considered to be acceptable.

### **Standard of Accommodation**

The proposed accommodation would incorporate a 3 bedroom flat within the roofspace. All 3 bedrooms would have poor levels of outlook, with the sole outlook being a roof light for each bedroom. The accommodation provides for a good-sized family unit with amenity in the form of a roof terrace. Concerns are raised with the overall standard of accommodation, due to the poor levels of outlook for all habitable rooms, which benefit from a single-aspect roof light to the bedrooms, highlighting the potential overdevelopment of the loft area. Furthermore, the unit and room sizes are considered to be constrained and due to the varied height levels within the roof, it is considered that, on balance, they would be unacceptable.

The Inspector, had a different view and as this is a material consideration, her comments have to be taken into account. The Inspector stated: *“Although this would limit the outlook available from the bedrooms, taking into account the size and details of the remainder of the accommodation proposed, including the rear-facing dormer windows and balcony area to serve the large living room and kitchen, I consider that the overall accommodation provided within the proposed third floor flat would not be unacceptably constrained and would be adequate to meet the likely needs of its future occupiers.”*

The reconfiguration of the ground floor and proposed single-storey rear extension to provide an additional flat would also raise concerns with outlook. The proposed 1 bedroom unit would be considered the worst off, with a tightly formed and constrained living/dining/kitchen which lacks adequate circulation space. Furthermore, the sole bedroom to this 1 bedroom flat would have windows on the side elevation at ground floor level facing onto a fence which is within 1m, providing poor outlook. On the ground floor, the access to the one bedroom flat from the side access way and the access to the second and third bedrooms within the 3 bedroom flat via the living/dining/kitchen area would further confirm that the overall layout of the ground floor flats are not ideal.

The Inspector stated: *“Although, the proposed subdivision would result in the side facing bedroom windows of the additional one-bedroom flat receiving low levels of natural light and a poor outlook, the light available would be supplemented by the proposed high level window to the rear. Furthermore, the main shared living room/kitchen of this flat would be formed from one of the principle front-facing rooms of the building. From the submitted floor plans, I do not regard the accommodation provided within this room to be unacceptably constrained. Although the light available within, and outlook from, this new bedroom would not be ideal, I consider that, when taken overall with the remainder of the flat, the quality of the accommodation which would be provided would be acceptable in this instance. The proposed rear extension would result in a significant improvement to the accommodation provided for the remainder of the ground floor. Due to its position at the rear of the main open plan room, the kitchen would receive relatively low levels of light. However, I consider that the remainder of this large room, with its direct access onto the enclosed rear garden and additional high level windows between the living room and dining room areas, would more than adequately compensate for this. In addition, although the corridor access to bedrooms 2 and 3, off the dining room area, would be somewhat awkward, I consider that the general configuration of rooms within the flat, and the overall quality of accommodation provided.”*

On balance, due to the constraints within the site and the Inspector’s comments on the recent appeal decision, the proposed accommodation would be considered acceptable.

### **Lifetime homes**

The applicant has provided a lifetime homes statement which indicates what parts of the criteria would be met. The proposal is for a conversion of an existing property and therefore in the context of those constraints, it is considered that the proposals have adequately met the terms of policy DP6.

### **Amenity of neighbours**

The introduction of new residential units to the building can create the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring dwellings. In particular, the additional openings at roof level to the rear. However, the alterations do not introduce an excessive amount of windows to elevations where previously there were none. It is also considered that the inset roof terrace at roof level and the depth of the single-storey rear extension would not create significant impact on the privacy of nearby dwellings, both in terms of overlooking and loss of daylight/overshadowing to the neighbouring buildings. Therefore, the inset roof terrace and rear extensions would be considered acceptable.

### **Transport**

The site is located within the Hampstead area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 6a (excellent). Policy DP18 of the LDF expects new development within areas which are easily accessible and subject to controlled parking zones (CPZs) to be car free. It is therefore considered appropriate and reasonable to secure the 2 flats in the development as car-free by way of S106 agreement.

The proposals include relatively modest construction works and there is considered to be ample space within and around the site to contain the construction materials and site requirements (such as on the highway with the agreement of parking services and highways). It is therefore not considered

necessary to secure a Construction Management Plan for the development.

The proposal also requires space allocated for cycle parking and would require sufficient space for 3 cycle spaces; however, further details in respect of their location, how it is secured and covered would be sought by condition in accordance with policy DP17. The condition would also require implementation and retention of the facility.

#### **Waste and recycling**

The proposals include refuse storage within the front forecourt area. This would be subject to a condition securing design details, and implementation/retention.

#### **CIL**

The proposal would be liable for the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the conversion and extensions provide new residential units. At this point in time an estimation of the amount to be secured is £50.00 (LB Camden amount per square metre) multiplied by the new floor space for each unit in square metres (gross floor space). The CIL will be collected by Camden and an informative will be attached advising the applicant of the CIL requirement.

#### **Conclusion**

The application proposes 2 new flats within the existing building with roof and rear extensions to the host property which comply with current Council policy, in particular CS6 (Providing quality homes), CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage), DP5 (Housing size mix), DP19 (Managing the impact of parking) and DP24 (Securing high quality design). On balance, the proposed mix, due to the site constraints and the standard of accommodation is considered acceptable.

**Recommendation: Grant conditional permission subject to a S106 legal agreement.**