

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	13/04/2012
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	22/03/2012
<b>Officer</b>		<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Ben Le Mare		2012/0728/P		
<b>Application Address</b>		<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
2 Antrim Grove London NW3 4XR		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 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.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission		
<b>Application Type:</b>	Full Planning Permission			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>13</b>	No. of responses	<b>02</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>A site notice was displayed outside the property between 24/02/2012 and 16/03/2012 and a press notice was published in the Ham &amp; High on 01/03/2012.</p> <p>An objection has been received from a resident of 2 Antrim Grove who is concerned that proposed development might endanger the structural stability of the building. This is not however not a planning consideration.</p> <p>Support has been received from an occupier of a neighbouring property, subject to the development meeting the following conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the proposed extension is set back from the existing vertical wall line on all 4 sides and that it is no higher than the existing floors of the building.</li> <li>- the new extension is similar in terms of its visual massing to most of the other penthouses on the top of block of flats along Haverstock Hill.</li> <li>- the proposal will not result in an intrusion on neighbours in terms of light and privacy.</li> </ul>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>	<p>Belsize CAAC have <b>objected</b> towards the proposal for the following reasons: <i>'This building is prominently sited and the proposed penthouse would be highly visible from three sides. The style and treatment of the penthouse is unsympathetic and the increase in height would spoil the proportions and results in the building becoming too dominant.'</i></p> <p>Belsize Residents Association have <b>objected</b> towards the proposal on the following grounds: <i>'This is an unattractive addition to an already unattractive building.'</i></p> <p><i>We would not, in principle, be opposed to 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>Unfortunately the references have not been followed faithfully, as such, the proposal is virtually a full sized extension with minimal setting in from the existing structure.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, 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 already clumsy and clearly visible – the addition would worsen this.</i></p> <p><i>It would also appear from the amount of glass walls to the extension that there will be an increase in overlooking and light pollution which would both be invasive and unattractive for neighbouring occupants. For these reasons we think that this is an unwelcome addition to a prominent location in a conservation area.'</i></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

## 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 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.

### 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 6<sup>th</sup> 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. 100m<sup>2</sup> and therefore comfortably exceeds the minimum standards for a 2-bedroom / 4 person dwelling. In addition, the proposed double bedrooms measures 11.5m<sup>2</sup> and 15m<sup>2</sup> 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. The provision of an on-site car parking space is not supported in sustainable transport terms, notwithstanding it being cited as a Lifetime Homes measure.

#### 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 proposed 6<sup>th</sup> floor extension measures approx. 3.1m (h) x 17.8m (l) x 9.1m (w) and is set in at either side and rear of the building by between 0.9m and 0.6m. The proposal is set back from the front of the building by 2.5m to allow for the creation of two terraces. Around the perimeter of the building's original roof a 1m high glass balustrade is proposed.

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 bricked exterior, wide inset balconies on the front elevation and flat walls on the side and rear elevations. Despite the building not being of architectural merit each floor level is of uniform proportion. The proposed roof extension would by reason of its height and bulk appear as an incongruous and unduly prominent addition which would detract from the style, character and appearance of the existing apartment building.

In detailed design terms the application proposes large areas of glazing, a 1m high glass balustrade and powder coated aluminium. The choice of materials in this instance is considered to be inappropriate as it would not be sympathetic to the main building and enhance the visual prominence of the proposed extension which would detract from its character and appearance in the street scene, causing harm to the character of the conservation area.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would add unacceptable bulk to the main building which would appear visually dominant and intrusive in the street scene. The addition proposed by this application would be harmful to the appearance of the main building, its setting in relation to neighbouring properties and its character and appearance in the street scene.

The proposal is considered unacceptable in terms of its design and impact on the character of the conservation area for the reasons mentioned above and does not 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 s proposed on the front of the 6<sup>th</sup> 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

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 6<sup>th</sup> floor extension. Whilst there will be some overlooking from the balcony proposed at the front there are balconies on the lower floors so the existing situation would not be made materially worse.

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 large areas of fenestration around the south west corner of the extension, the full length of which would be visible through the glass balustrade around the edge of the existing roof. Whilst not sited as a reason for refusing the application, the Council has concerns that resulting lightspill

during in the evening and at night could potentially harm the amenity of the occupiers No.4 Antrim Grove.

### Transport

The application proposes the creation of an additional parking space in the existing car park under the building which would be used by the future occupiers of the proposed penthouse flat. This provision is considered to be unacceptable as it would fail to strengthen or encourage the use of more sustainable ways to travel, particularly given that the site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 6a (excellent). If the application were being recommended for approval the unit would be secured as car free through a Section 106 Agreement. In the absence of such an agreement this should form a reason for refusal.

Policy DP18 requires 1 cycle storage/parking space to be provided for each new residential unit of accommodation. Whilst this has not been demonstrated on the proposed plans, the size of the application site would comfortably facilitate its provision.

### CIL

If the development were to be granted approval then it 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 have been around £5,000 (approx. 100m<sup>2</sup> x £50).

### Conclusion

The proposed roof extension is not considered to be respectful of the integrity of the main apartment block and would result in a visually intrusive feature in the street scene, causing unacceptable harm to its character and appearance and that of the conservation area by means of its height, bulk, lack of set-back and use of materials. The proposals would therefore be contrary to 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

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***