

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		29/08/2012	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		06/08/2012	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Sam Fowler				2012/2791/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
38 Pandora Road London NW6 1TR				Refer to draft decision notice.			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of 2 storey rear extension, extensions at roof level to rear/side, installation of 4 rooflights on front roofslope, all in connection with conversion of building from 7-bed HMO to 1 x 4 bed self contained residential dwelling (Class C3) and 6-bed HMO (Sui Generis).							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	10	No. of responses No. electronic	02 00	No. of objections	01
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>In the objection received, concern was raised primarily over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will increase the crowding in the area, • Reduce greenery and the quality of the air • Impinge on privacy of neighbours. • Detrimental impacts to highway safety. • Public services would be affected 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		Not applicable, site is not located within a Conservation Area.					
Site Description							
The application site is a residential end-terrace building located on the western side of Pandora Road. The site is currently used as a House of Multiple Occupation. The surrounding area is characterised by residential style developments. The building has a large two storey rear extension, semi-detached in style and mirrored on the property to the south (no. 43), and of which occupies over half the width of the property.							

Relevant History

There is no relevant history for this site.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

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

CS18 – Dealing with our waste and encouraging recycling

CS19 - Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy

Development Policies

DP2 – Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing

DP5- Homes of different sizes

DP6 – Lifetimes homes and wheelchair homes

DP16 – The transport implications of development

DP17 – Walking, cycling and public transport

DP18 – Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

DP29 – Improving Access

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG 1 – Design (Section 5)

CPG 2 – Housing (Section 4)

CPG 6 – Amenity (Section 6 and Section 7)

Assessment

Proposal

This applicant is seeking planning permission for:

- Construction of a 3 storey rear extension
- Extensions to the roof at the side and rear level, creating a second floor.
- The installation of 4 rooflights within the front roofslope
- Following construction, conversion of building from HMO to 1 x self contained 4 bed residential dwelling, and no. 1 x 6 bedroom House of Multiple Occupancy (Sui Generis).

Land Use

The property is currently a HMO. The proposals seek to convert part of the property to private residential use as a self-contained dwelling.

Policy DP9 states:

“The Council will resist development that involves the net loss or self-containment of bedsit rooms or of other housing with shared facilities unless either:

m) it can be demonstrated that the accommodation is incapable of meeting the relevant standards for houses in multiple occupation, or otherwise genuinely incapable of use as housing with shared facilities; or

n) adequate replacement housing with shared facilities will be provided that satisfies criteria d), e), f) and g) above; or

*o) the development provides student housing that satisfies criteria d) to j) above; or
p) the development provides self-contained social rented homes.”*

It is noted that as a result of the development, two large bedrooms would be lost with a single replacement at front roof level. At ground floor a kitchen would be lost and there is a significant reduction in the sizes of the bedrooms within the structure.

The issue of the loss of a bedroom has not been addressed in the application, nor has the overall erosion to the residential amenity of the occupiers due to the reduction in bedroom sizes, the loss of a kitchen, and loss of access to the rear garden.

The property has been a licensed HMO for the past 5 years. The Council's regulatory team have advised that the accommodation is capable of continuing in use as a HMO. There has been no demonstration of adequate replacement of space, or justification of the changes proposed, nor of mitigating circumstances relating to the standard of accommodation. The net loss of non-self-contained floorspace is therefore contrary to DP9, and is refused on that basis.

The proposed ground floor extension would result in a loss of outlook to the rear bedroom of the HMO and would serve to undermine the amenity provided within the HMO. Any acceptable rear extension would need to take account of the impact on the occupants of the HMO room.

The proposed development would create a HMO that fails to replicate the standard of living, facilities, and size, as currently provided on site. The development would therefore cause the erosion of private residential amenity to the occupiers of the HMO. More fundamentally it would result in the loss of shared accommodation without adequate replacement and for this reason, it should be refused.

New self-contained residential

In general the principle of the creation of new residential accommodation complies with policies CS1 and DP2. However more detailed consideration needs to be given to design, the neighbourhood residential amenity, standard of accommodation, the Lifetime Homes standards, the mix of units, and transport.

Design and Appearance

There are separate design elements as well as character and appearance concerns in regards to the application. Each is assessed individually below.

Ground floor extension

The ground floor rear extension would infill the space between the side of the dwelling and the flank boundary to the north, as well as wrap around to extend out beyond the deepest rear wall. From a design perspective, this is considered to be unacceptable due to the excessive scale and mass that would be created as part of the development. It would extend significantly past the rear wall of the attached neighbour at no. 40 Pandora Road, and there are no similar style developments within the surrounding area. It would therefore, on its own, appear out of keeping within the street scene.

First floor

In regards to the first floor of the rear extension, this again would be considered to be excessive in terms of mass and scale. It is also noted that under 4.13 of the Camden Planning guidance 1 (CPG1) that: *“In most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged.”* The proposal fails to comply with this guidance. The development would subsume the character of the dwelling, and would be highly visible from the public realm. The rear elevation at this level would be a blank wall.

Second floor/roof level

In terms of the creation of a second floor and the roof extension element, this again is considered to be excessive, and not of a suitable design. Under CPG 1, it is stated that roof alterations and

additions will be considered unacceptable "...where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension". The proposed development would fail to comply with planning guidance. The rear elevation at second floor would be a combination of valley roofs and a vertical wall of brick, adjacent to the street.

Detailed design

The side elevation would see a proliferation of windows and a double door, in aluminium framing.

The detailed design approach shows little sensitivity to the host building. Walls, openings and roof elements are located to serve the functional needs of greatly increased internal space and give no obvious consideration of the development context. The drawings indicate an unexplained access point between the HMO and the newly created separate unit. The rear extension at ground floor would restrict the availability of a window to a ground floor bedroom within the HMO.

Overall the design details side and rear elements are incongruous, insensitive and unacceptable. They do not accord with the high standards of design expected by policy DP24.

Design summary

The proposals, for reasons of design, mass and scale, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the wider area. It is acknowledged that roof alterations were made to 46 Pandora Road, however this was carried out under permitted development rights, is considerably less visible from local public viewpoints and does not serve as a precedent for alterations of the nature and scale hereby proposed. It is also noted that the majority of 46 Pandora Road is original construction.

Neighbouring Residential amenity

As discussed above, the proposal would be creating a form of development that would be out of character with the building and the predominant form of the surrounding area. Under 4.10 of CPG1, it states that rear extension developments should be designed to *"not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure;"*

The majority of the proposed development would be sited well in relation to the neighbouring properties, and it is considered that the proposed development would not cause any undue harm to the residential amenity of any neighbouring occupiers. The development is concentrated around the northern side of the property, which abuts onto a public highway and is sited away from the nearest residential neighbours. All windows for the new rooms are sited along the flank elevation, looking out over the public highway, which also means that there would be no overlooking or loss of privacy.

Standard of accommodation

The new dwelling would have a Gross Internal Area upwards of 120sqm which is acceptable and would provide a satisfactory level of amenity for its occupiers.

Lifetime Homes

Policy DP6 requires all new housing developments to comply with Lifetime Homes criteria as far as reasonably possible. A Lifetime Homes assessment has been submitted with the application, and it has demonstrated an overall compliance with the 16 lifetime homes criteria. A condition would be added to any permission requiring compliance with the Lifetimes homes criteria.

Transport

DP18 requires development to sufficiently provide for the needs of cyclists, which are contained in Appendix 2 of the Development Policies document. Camden's Parking Standards for cycles states that one storage or parking space is required per residential unit. As the proposal would result in an additional unit, provision of two cycle parking is required. No details of cycle storage and parking are submitted with the application. In the absence of these details the proposal would be contrary to policies CS11, DP17 and DP18, however it is considered that there is sufficient space within the site

to accommodate the necessary parking and a condition would be attached to any decision to ensure that these details were provided.

The London Plan 2011 and Camden's LDF Development Policies (policy DP18) identify that car-free and car-capped development should be sought for in areas of high public transport accessibility. Given the highly accessible location of the application site the proposed unit should be car-free and this needs to be secured via section 106 agreement. In the absence of s106 for car free development the proposal would be contrary to policies CS11, CS19, DP18 and DP19.

No construction management plan is submitted with the application. Given the small scale of the excavation works proposed, it is not considered necessary to secure a Construction Management Plan (CMP) via S106 legal agreement.

Others

No details of refuse and recycle storage is submitted with the application. There is a scope for on-site provision for refuse and recycle storage therefore this could be rectified by way of a condition, should the application have been recommended for approval.

Should the application have been approved, the proposal would be liable for the Mayor of London's CIL as one unit of residential accommodation would be created.

Conclusion

The proposal would result in the construction of roof alterations and extensions to the building which would be incongruous, overbearing and insensitive to the host building and the wider area. The loss of shared accommodation floorspace without adequate replacement is not acceptable.

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