

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	28/11/2012
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	22/11/2012
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Seonaid Carr			2012/5329/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
68 Belsize Lane London NW3 5BJ			Refer to draft decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Renewal of planning permission granted on 14/12/09 (ref:2009/3697/P) for extension at roof level with front terrace to create a new self contained, studio flat (Class C3).					
Recommendation(s):		Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement			
Application Type:		Renewal of Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	15	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. Electronic	01		
Summary of consultation responses:	A press notice was issues on 01 November 2012 (expiring 22 November 2012) and a site notice was erected 24 October 2012 (expiring 14 November 2012).					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>Belsize CAAC were consulted on the application and responded by stating they were unable to comment in the absence of drawing. They have since been notified that for an application such as this the applicant is not required to submit plans as they are the same as that approved under the original planning permission reference 2009/3697/P and they were advised to review the plans under this application reference. No response has been received to date.</p> <p>Belsize Residents Association objected to the application raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of the proposal Mansard roof does not appear to comply with guidance point 5.19 of the current CPG1: Design. This guidance has probably been published since the last permission (2009/3697/P). • Please refuse permission and recommend an amended scheme within the guidance. <p>Officer's Comments: The current CPG1 (Design) has been adopted since the extant planning permission was granted (Ref:2009/3697/P). However with regard to mansard roof extensions the guidance is the same as that within the previous Camden Planning Guidance (2006) paragraphs 41.16-41.21 which outline what the Council expects of mansard additions and works to valley roofs. In light of this it would be unreasonable to refuse this application to extend the time limit for the extant planning permission when there has not been a material change to the policy.</p>					

Site Description

The subject site is located on the western side of Belsize Lane, close to the intersection with Belsize Crescent. The rear boundary of the site adjoins residential terrace buildings relating to Burdett Mews. The site accommodates a four-storey terrace building, whereby the ground floor unit comprises of a restaurant (A3 use) and the upper floors comprise of three residential flats. The property is not listed but is located within Belsize Conservation Area.

Relevant History

No.68

PW9702550R2 – October 1998 planning permission granted for 'erection of a mansard roof extension at fourth floor level in connection with the provision of a three bedroom maisonette on the third and fourth floors with roof terrace at the front'. Development was not commenced within five years from the date of this decision.

2003/2644/P – October 2004 planning permission granted for 'the erection of a roof extension with front terrace and other external alterations to form part of the existing third floor flat'. Development was not commenced within five years from the date of this decision.

2009/5329/P – December 2012 planning permission granted for the 'extension at roof level with front terrace to create a new self contained, studio flat (Class C3).' This planning permission expires on 13 December 2012.

No.70

8500341 – August 1985 planning permission granted for the 'change of use of the first second and third floors and works of conversion to provide two self-contained flats and one self-contained maisonette including the erection of a roof extension.'

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS4 Areas of more limited change
CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development
CS6 Providing quality homes
CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
DP5 Homes of different sizes
DP6 Lifetime home 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
DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction
DP24 Securing high quality design
DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage
DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2011 and Conservation Area Statements

CPG1 Design
CPG6 Amenity
Belsize Conservation Area Statement

National Planning Policy Framework (April 2012)

Assessment

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a roof extension with front terrace in connection with the formation of a new self contained studio flat. The extension will alter the existing valley roof profile with a flat top mansard and will involve the inclusion of a front terrace with a depth of approximately 1m from behind the front façade wall.

Land Use

The proposed development is to provide an additional residential unit to an existing terrace building which contains 3 residential units; this is in accordance with Policy CS6, which aims to make full use of Camden's capacity for housing.

Design

Within the previous officer report it was stated that:

'Camden Planning Guidance states that where it is acceptable to infill on a valley or butterfly roof and where parapets are an important visual element these should be retained. It also states that the new roof form should slope from behind the parapet and form a slope of 70 degrees. The Belsize Conservation Area Statement also requires to be considered and this states that roof extensions should not be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building, should not be introduced where the property forms part of a symmetrical composition and should not be introduced if the roof is prominent.'

Since the granting of the extant planning permission (Ref: 2009/3697/P), the Council has adopted new Camden Planning Guidance however with regard to works to valley roofs and new mansard additions there has been no material change to what the Council considers acceptable for development of this nature. In this regard, the development would continue to be considered acceptable, in terms of design.

Furthermore it is important to note that within the previous officer report it was acknowledged that the proposed roof extension would not retain the butterfly profile to the rear however it was justified on the basis that the proposal is consistent with what was previously approved and that it would not be seen from the public realm and as such was considered acceptable. Overall it was previously considered that the proposed development is acceptable as it has minimal visual prominence and bulk and relates to the building and the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area. Given this previous conclusion and that there hasn't been a significant change in the objectives of the policy and guidance since the granting of the extant permission no objection is raised to the proposal to extend the time limit within which to implement the proposed works.

Attention is also drawn to No.70 which wasn't referenced within the previous officer report. No.70 has previously been extended with a roof extension similar to that which is being proposed within this development. As such the proposed works would not appear incongruous when considered within the context of the terrace within which it would be located.

In light of the above, in terms of design no objection is raised to the proposed development and the extension of the time limit within which to implement the proposed works.

Standard of accommodation

Within the previous application, it was considered that although the proposed unit would be some 31sqm when measured without the staircase and the minimum space standard required by Camden's Planning Guidance at the time was 32sq metres for a one bedroom flat given there would be an outdoor terrace of approximately 5sqm this would compensate for the shortfall of floorspace internally. Since the granting of the previous planning permission the Council has adopted new Camden Planning Guidance however the requirements for space standards has not changed and remains at 32sqm for a one bedroom unit. In light of this it would be unreasonable for the Council to refuse this current application to extend the time period of the original consent when there has been no material change to the policy in respect of room sizes.

With regard to the level of daylight and sunlight received into the proposed unit, as per the previous application given the unit would be dual aspect with two sets of double doors to the front elevation and three windows to the rear it is considered it would receive adequate light and ventilation.

Lifetime home standards

Policy DP6 requires development to meet lifetime home standards. As with the extant permission, as the proposal is for a conversion it is acknowledged that it is not possible to meet all of the standards. Within the previous application the applicant demonstrated a commitment to meeting as many of the standards as

possible given the limitations of the existing site. This should be encouraged further by way of an informative.

Amenity

It is considered that the proposed scheme would not cause loss of amenity value to occupiers of adjoining or surrounding buildings in terms of loss of privacy, overlooking, loss of sunlight and daylight and visual inappropriateness. The depth of the terrace sets the bulk of the extension back approximately 1m from the front façade, which effectively reduces its impact to the street scene.

Transport

The previous application was granted on the basis that a Section 106 agreement would be completed to ensure the development was car free, to prevent increase pressure on on-street parking. As per Policy DP18 the Council expects development to be car free within areas that are in Controlled Parking Zones that are easily accessible by public transport. As such another Section 106 agreement is required to ensure the additional unit is car-free.

Community Infrastructure Levy

Since the granting of the original planning application the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy has been introduced. Given the proposed development would result in the addition of one new residential dwelling it would be liable to pay the CIL.

The charge within Camden (as set by the Mayor of London) is £50 per square metre. An informative will be placed on the decision notice drawing the applicants attention to this requirement.

Conclusion

Since the granting of the extant planning permission which this application is seeking to extend, the Council has adopted a new Local Development Framework together with new Camden Planning Guidance. With specific regard to the relevant policies it is considered that there has not been a material change in the objectives of the relevant policies. It is also important to note that until 13 December 2012 the applicant would be able to implement the extant planning permission. As such it is considered that permission should be granted for extending the time limit to implement the proposed works.

Recommendation: Grant conditional permission subject to a S106 agreement

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 26th November 2012.
For further information please click [here](#).