

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	07/11/2012
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	25/10/2012
Officer			Application Number(s)	
John Nicholls			2012/4711/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
1A Lyme Street London NW1 0EH			See decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of roof extension with terrace to front elevation, replacement of windows and door at ground floor level and windows at first floor level to front elevation, replacement of door at ground floor level and installation of 3x windows at first floor level to rear elevation of single dwelling house.				
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission		
Application Type:		Householder Application		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	17	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	03
			No. electronic	01		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed on 28/9/2012 and a press notice on 4/10/2012. Three letters of objection have been submitted. These are summarised as follows:</p> <p><u>Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in keeping with the architecture of the rest of the street and is aesthetically incongruous to the neighbouring listed buildings, The original plot was small in the first place and therefore further addition to the property is not welcome, <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daylight affected by the extra floor to neighbouring residential properties, Levels of privacy will be affected to properties at the rear on upper floors which have had no privacy concerns before, The level of noise when construction begins will also cause a problem for those who work night shifts The flats immediately to the rear of the proposal at 163 Royal College Street have living rooms and a bedroom in these flats adjacent to the rear elevation. Detriment to the garden and kitchen area of the garden flat as sunlight will be blocked. <p><u>Structural problems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighbouring property has been directly affected by the building of 1a, drainage problems and railings have moved and now at an angle as a result of settlement in the ground post works, Fear that future work to the property will cause more structural issues 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	The Regent's Canal CAAC has not objected to this application.					
Site Description						
<p>The property is a two storey detached property located on the north east side of Lyme Street, immediately behind 165-167 Royal College Street. The property was built in the mid 2000's and is a modern development.</p> <p>The property is not listed but does lie adjacent to listed buildings on both sides of Lyme Street (1-10, 24-29 and 31-37) and Royal College Street (165-181) immediately to the rear. The property lies within the Regent's Canal Conservation Area (2008), but is not considered to make a positive contribution.</p>						

Relevant History

8802597 - Change of use and works of conversion and extension from a light industrial workshop to a residential (1 bedroom) unit – refused - 10/01/1989

8903106 - The erection of a part one and part two storey workshop building – granted - 18/05/1989

PEX0100537 - Variation of the part-implemented planning permission dated 7th June 1989 comprising the change of use of the ground floor and previously approved first floor addition from office to a single dwelling unit, the addition of 3 rooflights and new glazed doors in the rear elevation – granted - 10/12/2001

2012/1525/P - Erection of mansard roof extension with terrace to front elevation, replacement of window and door at ground floor level and windows at first floor level to front elevation, replacement of door at ground floor level and installation of 3x windows at first floor level to rear elevation of single dwelling house (Class C3) – Withdrawn – 1/5/2012

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden's Planning Guidance 2011

Regent's Canal Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

Proposal

The proposal seeks to erect a roof extension with terrace to the front of the new roof level, along with window and door alterations on the front and rear elevations.

This proposal is a re-submission of a previous identical application (Ref: 2012/1525/P) for the same proposal which lacked any information on the impact of sunlight and daylight on neighbouring properties and was therefore withdrawn.

Design

The site lies within the Regent's Canal Conservation Area and falls under Sub-Area two (Kentish Town Bridge to Gray's Inn Bridge) which backs onto this part of the canal as it snakes its way through the heart of Camden Town. The character of Lyme Street is not described in any detail, but from viewing the street, the adjacent terrace to the application site are Grade II listed, semi detached mid-19th century villa's with rusticated quoins and painted render walls over two storeys with shallow hipped roofs and central chimney stacks between each pair.

The terrace opposite comprises a former factory with 12 paired worker's houses built in the mid-19th century. These are built in London stocks in a classical style over 4 storeys with pitched roofs in pairs with linking side extensions over three floors.

At the rear of the site the Royal College Street properties are Grade II listed and formed over 3 storeys and which form a terrace which runs at an oblique angle tapering to the rear of the site where the rear gardens measure between 7.5m-3.5m deep with the application site.

Camden's Design Guidance CPG: 1, gives general principle advice regarding roof extensions and alterations (p33-34) and states that (para 5.8) additional storeys are likely to be unacceptable where

there is likely to be an adverse affect on the skyline, the appearance of the building on the street scene, and in particular where;

- *Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions;*
- *Buildings already higher than neighbouring properties where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural composition;*

Furthermore, the CPG goes on to discuss balconies and terraces (p 39, para 5.23-5.24) and states that potential problems include, overlooking, privacy, daylight, noise, light spillage and security. Whether, the design of these can be acceptable is dependant on whether the design complements the elevation on which it is located.

The Regent's Canal Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement states (p44):

- *The roof forms of historic canal-side buildings are visible in views and vistas along the canal and also contribute to the canal's character. Roof extensions which fundamentally alter the roof form of buildings where visible from the canal will not normally be permitted, although each proposal will be considered on its own merits.*

Existing

The proposal seeks to build out the mansard to increase the floor volume and add an additional floor to the existing two storey building in the form of a roof extension. The existing building is on the plot of a former garage and has a steep tile hung mansard pitch at the rear. The existing structure is brick built in yellow London stocks with painted timber windows, and two glazed brick windows at rear ground floor level ensuring a certain level of privacy. Upper floor windows in the mansard slope are timber framed velux windows.

At the rear the existing building sits parallel to the properties on Royal College Street which runs at 45 degrees to Lyme Street where the front elevation projects forward of the main building line from the rest of the street by approximately 2.6m. When viewed from the south and east this is very evident as it screens the terrace beyond and sits forward of the established building line along the street.

At the rear, the rear elevation is between 3.5m and 7.5m from the rear of Royal College Street properties.

Proposed

The proposal seeks to build out the existing mansard at the rear and add further brick courses to increase the height of the brick structure by 0.4m (front elevation), and then add a further 1.8m glass and timber roof extension, i.e. 2.2m overall at the front. The rear elevation will be increased by a similar margin.

A terrace is proposed at the front at roof level to be set back by 1m from the front elevation of the lower levels, and is proposed to have a glazed screen. The roof at the rear is set back from the rear elevation by 0.8m.

Finally, all windows and doors on the property are proposed to be replaced with aluminium framed windows and doors on both the front and rear elevations.

Bulk

The main issue in considering this application is the bulk that is added to the property and how this relates to other neighbouring properties. The original property measured 5.56m in height to roof parapet from the pavement, whereas neighbouring properties along the street measure 6.08m to eaves level. The existing building was therefore subservient to these in terms of height, because the

neighbouring properties also have shallow pitched hipped roofs.

The existing building sits forward of the neighbouring front building line and the building sits immediately adjacent to the pavement, whereas the neighbouring semi-detached row of listed buildings have front gardens measuring 2.6m deep. Therefore, two storey property is already apparent when walking along the road because it sits forward of the established building line. Therefore, the proposed increase in brick built height by 0.4m and a further 1.8m of timber and glass roof adds a further 2.2m of height to the building. Although the terrace is set back at the front, the additional bulk is still very much apparent and when viewed from the south east completely hides the adjacent listed building.

Furthermore, due to the proximity of the proposal to the neighbouring properties at the rear, objections have raised the point that there would be a loss of sunlight and daylight to their properties. This will be addressed below in the amenity section.

The additional part storey and roof extension fall into neither category directly mentioned by Camden's Design Guidance (as above) because the existing roof is not part of an established terrace because it is a new build detached property, nor is it higher than existing roofs.

The additional floor is considered to add significantly to the bulk of the property, and the set backs at the front and rear the extension help to retain the balance the architectural composition. However, the location of the original building on the street means that any further extension to the height would mean that it visually competes with the listed terrace adjacent.

Listed Buildings

The site lies adjacent to and backs onto several Grade II listed buildings. The adjacent group is made up of semi-detached two storey houses with shallow pitched roofs, and at the rear there are three storey properties with roof parapets.

The established height of properties along this side of the street is two storey with shallow pitched roofs. Although the proposed roof extension would still be below the overall height of both the Royal College Street properties at the rear and the adjacent roof pitches along Lyme Street, the increase in height adds sufficient bulk to the original building that the new parapet would sit just below eaves level with the additional roof projecting above them.

When viewed from the south east, longer views already prove that the existing building hides the listed terrace behind, and therefore the further addition of bulk is considered to be excessive and out of keeping with the general building height line for the street and therefore is considered to harm the setting of the adjacent two storey listed buildings.

Materials

The materials proposed are powder coated aluminium windows; timber and glazed roof and matching yellow London stock bricks. These are all considered to both preserve and enhance the look of the property within the Conservation Area and therefore are acceptable.

Therefore, it is considered that the additional bulk is considered excessive and harmful to the character and appearance of the Regent's Canal CA and competes with the adjacent listed terrace to its detriment and therefore the proposal is considered contrary with policies DP24 and DP25.

Amenity

Sunlight/daylight

A sunlight / daylight study has been submitted with the application in the form of a Waldram Diagram which is centred on the ground floor window of the garden flat at the rear of the site which is an accepted BRE study into Sunlight and daylight. The results show that existing window receives

approximately 24% Vertical Sky Component (VSC), whereas 27% is the ideal. The proposed roof extension reduces this to 21.7%, i.e. a 2.3% increase in obstruction to this window, which is within the tolerable limits set out by the test. As long as a reduction is within 0.8 of the original value, no significant loss will occur. The 2.3% equates to 0.9% of the original figure and inside this figure of significance.

The extra height of the property would cast more shadow and block sunlight against the properties on Royal College Street with the increase in height, due to the orientation of the site and path of the sun. However, the VSC tests have shown that no harm is considered to be caused by the proposal to neighbouring residential properties through loss of sunlight and daylight because the results of the tests fall within tolerable limits.

Privacy / Overlooking

The increase in height and the introduction of a glazed and timber roof structure would suggest that there is a potential for increased overlooking between habitable room windows and an impact on privacy. The rear rooms in the neighbouring properties are a mix of kitchens, bedrooms, bathrooms and living rooms.

The applicants understand that the facing windows between the rear elevation and neighbouring building to the rear are all within 8m and in some cases less than 5m and therefore all of the rear elevation windows (replaced and new) will be fitted with prismatic glazing.

This glazing has a series of horizontal prisms on the inside of the glass which will allow views out at some angles and not others and therefore dramatically reduces direct overlooking concerns. The Council has approved this elsewhere in the Borough, and therefore, despite the facing windows being less than 18m, the fitting of prismatic glazing would reduce over looking to an acceptable level.

Sense of enclosure/outlook

As stated above, the rear of the Royal College Street properties are close to the rear of the site and there are ground floor kitchens and lower ground floor bedrooms in the property immediately to the rear of 1a Lyme Street. The orientation of the site and the impact of the existing two storey building are already considered to cause a sense of enclosure to these neighbouring habitable rooms. Therefore, it is considered that the increased height of the property will exacerbate this sense of enclosure to the detriment of some habitable rooms of neighbouring residential properties.

Overall, some amenity concerns raised have been mitigated by the applicant but others have not, namely an increased sense of enclosure and therefore, the proposal is not considered to comply with policy DP26.

Summary

Despite amenity concerns being addressed by the applicant, the Council's main concern is the bulk of the extension on the roof of the property, which is exacerbated by the location of the building on the street and it being set forward of the established building line. The harm considered to be caused to the property, the setting of the adjacent listed terrace and the street scene is not acceptable and the proposal is contrary to policies DP24 and DP25 of Camden's LDF 2010.

Furthermore, the increased sense of enclosure by increasing the height of the building in close proximity to neighbouring residential habitable room windows is considered unacceptable and contrary to Policy DP26 of Camden's LDF 2010.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444