

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	01/10/2012
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	13/09/2012
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Miheer Mehta			2012/4100/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
2 Antrim Grove London NW3 4XR			Refer to Decision Notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of roof extension (following demolition of existing lift overrun) to provide new 1 x 2-bedroom flat (Class C3) with roof terrace enclosed by glass balustrade, replacement of glazing to stairwell on front elevation, replacement of front entrance door and canopy.					
Recommendation(s):		Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	18	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed outside the property between 15/08/2012 and 05/09/12 and a press notice was published in the Ham & High on 23/08/2012.</p> <p>A further period of consultation has taken place as 123, 129 and 131 (Flats 1-20) Haverstock Hill were not consulted on the original consultation process.</p> <p>No responses have been received from local residents.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>Belsize CAAC have objected towards the proposal for the following reasons: <i>'This building is prominently sited and the proposed roof extension would be highly visible from three sides. The style and treatment of the extension is unsympathetic and the increase in height would spoil the proportion and result in the building becoming too dominant'.</i></p> <p>Belsize Residents Association have objected towards the proposal on the following grounds: <i>'This proposal is not a positive contribution to a prominent location within a Conservation Area'.</i></p> <p><i>There seems little difference to the previous application 2012/0728/P except for the reduction in the parapet wall extension to the existing building, it appears that this has been replaced with glass balustrading which does little to disguise the additional height and draws further attention to the new volume.</i></p> <p><i>As we commented before, the existing building is already taller than the adjacent buildings on Haverstock Hill and Antrim Grove, the latter especially so and where as a consequence of the corner site, the change in scale is highly visible and the addition would worsen this situation.</i></p> <p><i>Also as we commented before, we would not, in principle, be opposed to a smaller extension which is set further in from the edge of the existing building, as has been shown in some of photographs of neighbouring buildings shown in the applicants supporting documents.</i></p> <p><i>With the amount of glass walls to the extension there will be an increase in overlooking and light pollution which would both be invasive and unattractive for neighbouring occupants and this is worsened by the glass balustrades which give no protection.</i></p> <p><i>We object to the application, please refuse permission.</i></p> <p>Officer comments: See Assessment</p>					

Site Description

The site comprises a 1970's 5-storey apartment block on the northern side of the Haverstock Hill / Antrim Grove junction and represents a prominent feature on the streetscape. The property is located in the Belsize Conservation Area and considered to make a negative contribution to the area. However, the three pairs of semi-detached properties along northern side of Antrim Grove are identified as positive contributors.

Relevant History

CTP/G9/8/4/10656 – The erection at No. 2 Antrim Grove of a six storey block of ten flats with ground floor car parking accommodation – Granted 03/06/1971

2012/0728/P - Erection of roof extension (following demolition of existing lift overrun) to provide new 1 x 2-bedroom flat (Class C3) with roof terrace enclosed by glass balustrade, replacement of glazing to stairwell on front elevation, replacement of front entrance door and canopy and conversion of visitors parking space to resident bay – Refused for 2 reasons (see *below*) on 13/04/2012;

- 1) The proposed roof extension, by reason of its height, bulk and detailed design would appear as an unduly large and overly prominent addition to the host building and would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area, contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage), DP24 (Design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Policies.
- 2) The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement for car-free housing, would fail to encourage sustainable ways of travel and also likely result in increased parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area, to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to policy CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and to policies DP18 (Parking standards and the availability of car parking) and DP19 (Managing the impact of parking) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

Relevant policies

National Planning Framework (adopted March 2012)

The London Plan (July 2011)

Policy 3.3 (Increasing housing supply)
Policy 3.4 (Optimising housing potential)
Policy 3.5 (Quality and design of housing Developments)
Policy 6.13 (Parking)
Policy 7.6 (Architecture)
Policy 7.8 (Heritage assets and Archaeology)

Local Development Framework - Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 (Distribution of growth)
CS3 (Other highly accessible areas)
CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)
CS6 (Providing quality homes)
CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)
CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards)
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)
DP5 (Homes of different sizes)
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)
DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network)
DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)
DP23 (Water)
DP24 (Securing high quality design)
DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage)
DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Belsize Park Conservation Area Statement (2002)

Camden Planning Guidance (adopted 2011):

CPG1 (Design)
CPG2 (Housing)
CPG4 (Sustainability)
CPG6 (Amenity)
CPG7 (Transport)

Assessment

The Proposal

The application proposes the erection of a roof extension (following demolition of existing lift overrun) to provide new 1 x 2-bedroom flat (Class C3) with roof terrace enclosed by glass balustrade, replacement of glazing to stairwell on front elevation, replacement of front entrance door and canopy.

The proposal has been revised from the previous refusal. The main changes include the addition of a parapet wall around existing footprint of main building and the roof extension being set back by 2.75m at the front and set-in by 1m from the flank and rear walls of the existing building.

Assessment

The main planning issues raised by the application are:

- Principle of development and the provision of new housing;
- Standard of accommodation;
- Visual impact;
- Amenity;
- Transport;
- CIL.

These are assessed below in the context of planning policy and other material considerations.

Principle of development and the provision of new housing

Given the pattern of development and the planning history for similar residential apartment buildings along Haverstock Hill and in the surrounding area, the principle of a 6th floor roof extension to provide a penthouse is regarded to be acceptable.

Policy DP2 of the LDF seeks to maximise the supply of additional homes in the Borough and protect existing permanent housing. The proposed creation of a new housing unit complies with Policy DP2. In addition, the Dwelling Size Priority table set out in Policy DP5 of the LDF identifies market 2-bedroom flats as 'very high' priority. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy DP5.

Standard of accommodation

The new apartment measures approx. 96m² and therefore comfortably exceeds the minimum standards for a 2-bedroom / 4 person dwelling. In addition, the proposed double bedrooms measures 12m² and 15m² which also meet the Council's minimum standards.

All new homes should comply with Lifetime Homes criteria as far as possible. The applicants have submitted a Lifetime Homes assessment which addresses a number of the 16 points of the criteria. The constraints of the site are such that not all of the criteria can be met, but the measures proposed are considered acceptable in this instance.

Visual Impact

Policy DP25 of the LDF states that the Council will only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area. Paragraph 4.10 of CPG 1 (Design) requires extensions to be secondary to the building being extended and respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style. The Belsize Park Conservation Area Statement advises that roof extensions can have a harmful impact on the conservation area and are unlikely to be acceptable where they are detrimental to the form and character of the existing building, form part of a largely unimpaired group or terrace, upset a symmetrical composition or would be prominent, particularly in long views.

The proposed 6th floor extension would be reduced in height compared to the previous refusal. As refused the height was proposed to be 3.52m in the centre where the lift overrun was proposed. This then reduced to 3.325m for the main living accommodation. As now proposed these heights would be 3.365m and 3.075m respectively, representing a reduction of 0.155m and 0.25m.

The extension would be set in on each side and to the rear of the building by 1m, and from the front by 2.75m to allow for the creation of two terraces. This compares to the previous refusal, where the distances were 0.6m to either side, 0.9m to the rear and 2.5m to the front. Around the perimeter of the building's original roof where a 1m high glass balustrade was originally proposed an increase to the existing parapet wall is now proposed. This would be marginally taller at 1.06m, but has been deliberately matched to the regular bands of bricks between the rows of windows on each floor. On top of this would be a small glass balustrade to make the overall height 1.1m.

The site is prominently located along Haverstock Hill and adjoins a row of 2 storey semi-detached properties (No.4 – 14 Antrim Grove) which are identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area. Whilst the principle of an extension on the roof to provide additional accommodation is considered to be acceptable any addition of this nature would need to be sensitively designed to respect the architectural style of the host building and not represent an overly dominant feature within the streetscene.

The existing property is 5 storeys high with a brick exterior, wide inset balconies on the front elevation and flat walls on the side and rear elevations. Despite the building not being of particular architectural merit each floor level is of uniform proportion. The proposed roof extension, having been reduced in height and with increased setbacks to all sides is considered to be an improvement. Compared to the refusal it is now considered subordinate to the existing building. The parapet wall also serves to reduce the visibility of the extension and so make it seem less bulky.

It is important to note that the previous refusal also raised concerns about the detailed design, in particular the amount of glazing, the 1m high balustrade, and the powder coated aluminium cladding. The balustrade has now been replaced by the brick parapet, with the glazed element on top being only a small amount which would be barely noticeable from the street. However, the materials for the roof extension itself remain the same. As previously, it is the addition of the parapet that is considered decisive. It is considered to alter the situation quite significantly by concealing some of the glazing, and combined with the reduction in height and extent of the extension the overall visual impact would be changed. Although there is still proposed more glazing than exists on the floors below, those factors highlighted above would reduce the visual impact to the extent that this particular issue is considered to have been addressed. The same applies to the cladding. Therefore, the amendments made to certain elements of the design are considered to soften the concerns relating to those elements of the design which remain the same. Overall, it is now considered sympathetic to the main building and the character and appearance of the street scene.

The objections received raised concerns in regards to their being little difference to the previous application and the revised proposal. Concerns include “the current application does little to disguise the additional height, the change in scale is highly visible and the proposal could be set-in further from the existing footprint of the main building”. It is considered that the proposal has alleviated the previous reasons for refusal and the detailed design and use of materials assists in providing an extension of high quality which is sensitively designed on this corner location.

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its design and impact on the character of the conservation area for the reasons mentioned above and does meet the aims and objectives of core policy CS14 and development plan policies DP24 and DP25 of the LDF.

Replacement glazing to stairwell on front elevation

The proposed replacement windows in the existing stairwell are regarded to be minimalistic by having a limited number of thin glazing bars which ensure that they respect the 1970's design and architectural style of the building.

The hipped back glazed roof of the stairwell is proposed on the front of the 6th floor extension is regarded to be acceptable and considered not to detract from the appearance and design of the host building

Replacement of front entrance door and canopy

The existing canopy and entrance door on the front of the building are recognised as being dated and in a poor condition. The proposed replacement canopy and entrance door are an appropriately designed and regarded to improve the appearance of building.

Amenity

Policy DP26 states the Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity.

The windows on neighbouring properties to the side and rear to the site would not experience a loss of privacy by fenestration proposed on the 6th floor extension. Whilst there will be some overlooking from the terrace proposed at the front there are balconies on the lower floors so the existing situation would not be made materially worse. There are some concerns about the impact of the terrace to the rear and the side facing onto 4 Antrim Grove. It is considered appropriate to impose a condition that these do not form part of the terrace. Given that they are narrow spaces the loss is not considered to significantly affect the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed flat.

The only neighbours to be affected by potential overshadowing are those north of the application site, at No. 129 and 131 Haverstock Hill. The proposal would add an additional level to the existing building which would increase its overall height. It is not considered that the addition of one floor to the main building would result in a significant increase in overshadowing to the neighbouring properties. Although some additional early morning overshadowing may occur, it is not considered to be at a level which would be unacceptably harmful to the amenities of this neighbour.

The application building does not project beyond the front or rear building lines of neighbouring properties. Due to the orientation and location of the application site in relation to neighbouring dwellings, the proposal is considered not to have an overly dominant or visually intrusive impact on neighbouring properties.

The proposed development would intensify the existing residential accommodation on site, however this would not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of flats on the lower floors of the building by way of noise and disturbance.

In terms of lightspill, the application proposes floor to ceiling openings in the form of windows and doors around the extension. However, the applicant has proposed a brick parapet around the top floor to reduce full length visibility around the edge of the proposed extension. This would assist in mitigating lightspill during the evening and at night which would reduce any significant harm to the

amenity of the occupiers No.4 Antrim Grove.

Transport

The application proposes no additional parking for the proposed penthouse flat. This provision is considered to be acceptable as it would strengthen and encourage the use of more sustainable ways to travel in accordance with Policy DP18, particularly given that the site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 6a (excellent). As part of the recommendation for approval, the unit would be secured as car free through a Section 106 Agreement.

Policy DP18 requires 1 cycle space to be provided for each new residential unit of accommodation. Whilst this has not been demonstrated on the proposed plans, an area within the ground floor has been proposed for cycle parking and this would comfortably facilitate its provision.

CIL

The development would be liable for the Mayor of London's CIL through providing one unit of residential accommodation. Based on the MoL's CIL charging schedule and the information given on the plans the charge would be around £4,800 (approx. 96m² x £50).

Conclusion

The proposed roof extension is considered to be respectful to the integrity of the main apartment block and would result in a subordinate roof extensions feature within the street scene. The proposal would therefore be considered acceptable and would be in accordance with Core policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) and Development policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage).

Recommendation

Grant conditional planning permission subject to a S106.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 7th January 2013.

For further information see

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>