

<b>Delegated Report</b> (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	02/11/2011
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	13/10/2011
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Fergus Freeney			2011/4349/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
1 Conway Street London W1T 6LR			See 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 single storey extension at third floor level over existing walkway to link two office buildings (Class B1).					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant Planning Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	12	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. electronic	01		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from the 14/09/2011 to the 5/10/2011 and a press notice published on 22/09/2011 – An objection has been received from the occupier of 7 Conway Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the extension would be unduly bulky and much larger than the previously approved scheme. <i>Please refer to section 2.1. Design</i></li> <li>- the extension would be higher than the roof line of the existing south western office building. <i>Please refer to section 2.1. Design</i></li> <li>- It would harm the setting of the adjoining listed buildings. <i>Please refer to paragraph 2.5.</i></li> <li>- It would block sun and light to the their basement living area and first floor terrace. <i>Please refer to section 2.6. Amenity</i></li> <li>- It would increase the visual intrusion into the houses on Conway Street which back onto Bromley Place. <i>Please refer to paragraph 2.4</i></li> </ul>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	Fitzroy Square CAAC – no comments received					

## Site Description

The application site is fronts the west side of Conway Street. It comprises a complex of office buildings ranging in height from 3 storeys to 5 storeys.

The site is located within the Fitzroy Square Conservation Area, and although it is not listed, there are a number of Grade II and II\* listed buildings surrounding the site of Maple Street and Conway Street.

## Relevant History

2007/1086/P - Erection of weatherproof enclosure over existing walkway at third floor level to link two office buildings. *Granted 08/06/2007*

## 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 Planning Guidance 2011

### Fitzroy Square Conservation Area Statement

## Assessment

### 1.0. Proposal:

1.1. The site comprises a 5-storey building fronting Conway Street, and at the rear within Bromley Place a 3 storey extension connecting to a 4 storey building. The proposal would see a mansard extension erected above the existing 3 storey element.

### 2.0. Assessment:

#### 2.1. Design

2.2. The extension would measure approximately 6.25m in length x 5.25m in width x 2.9m in height. It has been designed to match the mansard style extension which exists at the rear 4 storey building, using the same materials, windows and pitch.

2.3. Given the height of the surrounding buildings fronting Conway Street and Maple Street the proposed extension would not be visible from the public realm and would have no impact on the conservation area or listed buildings surrounding the site when viewed from street level.

2.4. Although it would be visible from within Bromley Place, which is a gated mews/yard area which cannot be accessed by the general public and contains general service yard facilities (Air-conditioning units, fire escapes etc), it is considered that a modest single storey mansard roof extension, which matches the design of a mansard on an adjoining building, would not have a significant impact on the appearance of this semi-private rear area.

2.5. It is not considered that the proposal would impact upon the character and setting of the listed buildings on Maple Street, the extension would be located behind these buildings and their rear elevations are not visible from the public realm.

#### 2.6. Amenity

2.7. It is not considered that the proposal would have a significant impact on the amenity of surrounding properties. It is noted that an objection has been received from occupiers of 7 Conway Street who are concerned that the extension would impact upon light levels in their basement area and first floor terrace which faces onto Bromley Place.

2.8. However, given the location of the extension at the southern most point within Bromley Place and the height of the surrounding buildings it is hard to demonstrate that there would be any significant impact on light levels at 7 Conway Street which is on the north side of Bromley Place. The extension would be tucked lower than the building fronting Conway Street, which given its height would block early morning sun from the rear of 7 Conway Street. Given that the extension is lower than surrounding buildings any loss of direct sunlight would be negligible. Furthermore, the extension is far enough away from the rear of 7 Conway Street (at least 16m) that there would be little or no impact on overall daylight levels.

2.9. At 50-54 Maple Street there are flats and maisonettes across all levels, the extension would be located above the 3 storey building which is behind these flats. Given that the rear of these properties have north facing windows and that they are located within a confined space, they do not benefit from direct sunlight, the extension would not make this issue any worse.

2.10 With regard to overall daylight levels, a method used to assess acceptable levels of daylight is to project a 25 degree line from the centre of existing windows. If none of the surrounding buildings project above this line then there is potential for good daylighting.

2.11. With regard to the residential units on Maple Street, it has been demonstrated that at present, a 25 degree line drawn from the centre of windows below 1<sup>st</sup> floor level (lower ground, ground and 1<sup>st</sup> floor levels) is intersected by the existing 3 storey building. The mansard extension would not make this situation any worse and would not intersect a 25 degree line drawn from the centre of windows above 1<sup>st</sup> floor level.

2.12. Given that the windows are north facing, are within a confined area and have limited daylight levels, it is hard to demonstrate that a modest mansard extension would significantly reduce daylight levels further, to the detriment of occupiers below 1<sup>st</sup> floor level. It should also be noted that the majority of flats and maisonettes within the buildings on Maple Street are likely to have some south facing windows at the front of the properties, thus further limiting any impact this proposal would have to the rear.

2.13. There is unlikely to be a significant impact on outlook from the residential units on Maple Street, given that to the rear they look out onto a small courtyard area and offices, the addition of a mansard extension would not degrade outlook further.

2.14. Similarly, it is hard to demonstrate that there would be a significant increase in overlooking into these properties from the extension, given that the existing office building has numerous windows which allow views directly onto the rear elevations of buildings on Maple Street.

### 3.0 Summary

3.1. The proposal is considered to broadly comply with LDF Policies DP24, DP25 and DP26 and Camden Planning Guidance.

3.2. It has been designed to match a mansard on an adjoining building, it would not be visible from the public realm nor would it have an impact on the rear elevations of surrounding listed buildings. It has been demonstrated that there would be negligible or no impact on sunlight/daylight levels at surrounding residential properties.

**Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission**

### **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 7<sup>th</sup> November 2011.**

**For further information see**

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