

<b>Delegated Report</b> <b>(Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	08/12/2010
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	01/12/2010
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Elizabeth Beaumont			2010/5400/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
57 Brecknock Road London N7 0BX			Please 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 a three storey side extension with balconies on the front and rear elevations, following the demolition of existing single storey garage building and studio, to create 2 x 2 bedroom flats and 1 x 1 bedroom (Class C3).				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant planning permission subject to a S106 on carcapped flats and footway works		
<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>66</b>	No. of responses	<b>03</b>	No. of objections	<b>03</b>
			No. electronic	<b>01</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p><b>55 Charlton Court</b> – objects for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The last time there was building work at 57 to a boundary wall the building site was damaged. It is vital that this wall is not compromised. Also at the time a lot of rubble came over the fence which destroyed plants. This was later taken away at the public expense. Can the residents of Charlton Court be assured that any damage to the grounds will be acted on immediately? (See below)</li> <li>Concerns the noise from construction. Residents were already disturbed by the constructed on Charlton Kings Road. (See below)</li> <li>The consultation letter was dated 10/11/10 but was not received until till the 19/11/10 and one neighbour only received her comments on the 20/11/10. We would expect that a letter of this kind would be posted on the day or that it is dated on the day after. Please can this delay be investigated? It would only be fair that neighbours be granted a further 5 days to consider the application. (See below)</li> </ul> <p><b>14 Charlton Court</b> – objects for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is getting impossible for people to park at Charlton Estate (Refer to 7-7.8).</li> <li>It will increase environmental conditions, noise pollution which is already reducing the quality of life for the community.</li> </ul> <p><b>Flat 16, Charlton Court</b> – objects for the following reason; (see below)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns with the issues of building debris. It should not be beyond the planning department's capabilities to ensure that no rubble is left within the boundaries of Charlton Court.</li> <li>They will presumably be making regular checks for building regulation reasons. Alternatively, will the Council advise the owners of no 57 that every effort should be made to ensure that building debris does not find its way onto Charlton Court grounds and that any which does must be removed from site at their expense</li> </ul> <p><i>Officer's comments – Damage from any construction is not a planning consideration but a civil matter. An informative would be attached to any decision notice regarding noise from demolition and construction works. Letters to the neighbouring building were sent out on the 10/11/10 allowing comment until the 01/12/10, All letters are sent out via Royal Mail 2<sup>nd</sup> Class standard so any delay rests with Royal Mail rather than LB Camden; however a site notice was also erected outside the property from 20/10/10 to 10/11/10. The issue of building debris and its storage cannot be controlled by planning,g however the applicant has been advised of residents' concerns and to ensure that the storage of building materials/debris does not affect the residents of Charlton Court.</i></p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>	N/A					
<b>Site Description</b>						
The site is located on the west side of Brecknock Road close to the junction with Leighton Road. The site comprises a semi-detached property part of a pair of two storey properties with lower ground floor level and loft conversion subdivided into flats. The property has been extended to the side to form a garage and studio unit at ground floor level. The building is not listed or located within a conservation area. The adjoining property has been extensively altered. The pair adjoins a large Council owned postwar 4 storey decked-access block of flats to the north.						
<b>Relevant History</b>						
07/06/1995 – <b>p.p. refused (9003296)</b> for the Erection of a three storey detached single family dwelling house on land to the side of the existing building.						
13/10/1999 – <b>p.p. granted (PE9900552)</b> for Change of use from a single dwelling to 2 two bedroom maisonettes and erection of a two storey side extension, installation of dormer windows in the front and side elevations and minor alterations to the fenestration.						

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

#### Core Strategies

CS1 (Distribution of growth), 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) CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces & encouraging biodiversity) and CS16 (Improving Camden's health and well-being)

#### Development Policies

DP2 (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing), DP5 (Housing size mix), DP6 (Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes), DP17 (walking and cycling), DP18 (Parking standards and 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), DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours), DP32 (Air quality and Camden's Clear Zone).

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

1.1 Permission is sought for the following;

- Erection of a three storey side flat roofed extension with a curved frontage, balconies on the front elevation at second floor level and on the rear elevation, following the demolition of existing single storey garage building and studio.
- Creation of a 2 x 2 bedroom flats on the ground floor and first floor and 1 x 1 bedroom flat at second floor level.

### 2. Principle of development

2.1 The existing building comprises 1 x 2 bedroom maisonette on the lower ground and ground floor, 1 x 3 bedroom maisonette on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and a studio unit on the ground floor extension. The proposal would create 3 additional units (2 x 2 bedroom units and 1 x 1 bedroom unit) following the loss of a studio unit. The creation of additional residential accommodation with a mix of unit sizes is in accordance with policy.

### 3. Residential Standards

3.1 The proposed floorspace of the 2 x 2 bedroom (3 persons) and the 1 x 1 bedroom (2 persons) unit would both be above the minimum floorspace as specified in Camden Planning Guidance 2006. The units would be double aspect, with adequate ventilation, daylight/sunlight, acceptable layouts and access to amenity space. It is considered that the proposed units would have an acceptable standard of residential accommodation.

3.2 Sufficient space has been provided for the storage of waste and recycling material for the new residential units.

### 4. Lifetime Homes

4.1 The proposal has been designed to incorporate a number of the Lifetime Home criteria. However as the access to a number of the units is through the existing building, the provision of a stair/life/through floor lift has not been achieved. As all the other criteria have been met, this is considered acceptable.

### 5. Design

5.1 The proposed side extension projects beyond the original front and rear elevations of the host building. However the neighbouring property has been extended to the front of the property which has brought the front building line forward to that of the pediment projection. It is therefore considered that the proposed building line of the new development, set marginally further forward than the projection is acceptable. Furthermore it matches the building line of the Council block to the north which projects forward thus the curved profile represents an appropriate transition in this gap site.

5.2 The extension also extends to the eaves level of the host building. Although the extension is higher than that which would be normally allowed by CPG advice, it is considered acceptable in bulk and location here, given the uniqueness of the site- the gap is not an important townscape feature; the pair of semi-detached houses here are a solitary pair between the road junction and a large Council block and do not form part of a unified terrace of any distinction; it is not in a conservation area; its neighbour has been extensively altered and extended in the past; the Council block to the north has no architectural merit and indeed alien to the streetscape. In the circumstances, an extension of this size and form is considered to be an appropriate way of infilling the gap and linking the 2 neighbouring properties in urban design terms.

5.3 To the rear the building line mimics that of the original garage extension. The ground floor of the new addition projects beyond the rear elevation of the host building and is line with the rear building line of the existing ground floor extension. It is therefore considered that the extension is appropriate in terms of its scale and bulk.

5.4 The architectural approach is contemporary with a curved frontage with punched openings and recessed balconies cut into the elevation. The facades are rendered with simple glazed designs for the fenestration punched into the elevations. The mass of the building is broken down to the rear with stepped levels from ground to second floor level with balconies located at first and second floor level. The proposed balustrades are glazed with obscure glazed screens. The roof will have a brown roof which is welcomed, details reserved by condition.

5.5 It is considered that the simple contemporary approach ensures that the new building would sit well alongside the original host building and the neighbouring estate. It is considered that the extension is acceptable in terms of its scale, bulk, and position on the plot and in its detailed design and would not detract from the character or appearance of the host building or the wider streetscene.

## 6. Amenity

### Overlooking/loss of privacy

6.1 The property located to the rear of the site, no. 193 Leighton Road has a number of windows on the side elevation and a rear garden that borders the edge of the application site. The proposal building includes terraces on the front and rear elevations. The proposed balconies on the front elevation would be acceptable as they are set sufficiently away from the properties on the opposite side of the street. The neighbouring building, known as Charlton Court, includes balconies on the rear elevation. These balconies currently partially overlook the rear garden of no. 193 Leighton Road. The existing windows on the rear elevation of nos. 57 and 55 currently overlook the garden and the side elevation of no. 193. It is therefore considered that given the location and number of the existing balconies and windows that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the levels of overlooking or privacy in comparison to the existing situation.

6.2 It is considered that the proposed terraces on the rear elevation of the extension would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the flats at no. 57 in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy, as they do not extend beyond the adjoining blank flank wall. The position of the first floor terrace towards the boundary with Charlton Court prevents any views back to the windows on the rear of the host building. Given the limited depth of the second floor terrace, any views would be oblique and would not be considered to detrimentally affect the amenity of any occupiers.

### Daylight/sunlight

6.3 The proposed extension would project no further than the rear elevation of the neighbouring housing block. There are no windows on the side elevation of the residential block. The windows on the front and rear elevation are set back due to the terraces. It is considered that given the position of the proposed building it would not have a detrimental impact on the levels of daylight/sunlight to neighbouring properties in comparison to the existing situation.

6.4 The proposed side addition will project beyond the existing rear closet wing. The windows on the ground and first floor of this wing may be slightly affected by the extension in terms of loss of sunlight and daylight. These windows however do not serve habitable rooms (WC and shower rooms) and as such the sunlight/daylight received cannot be protected.

## 7. Transport/Parking

### Off-street parking

7.1 The existing dwelling has an existing forecourt to its frontage with the capacity for two car parking spaces. The proposals are to retain these spaces in a smaller forecourt but which still meets CPG space standards. However given that the development is located in an area of good access to public transport there should be no further provision of off-street parking and no parking permits should be granted to this development. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level of (PTAL) of 4 (good) and is within a Controlled Parking Zone which is highly stressed. This is considered unacceptable in CPZ's that are highly stressed where overnight demand exceeds 90% and hence the new flats should be car-capped.

### Cycle parking

7.2 The proposal is for 5 residential units (4 1/2-bed and 1 3+ bed); therefore 6 cycle storage/parking spaces are required. The scheme was revised to include provision for the required amount of cycle storage/parking in the proposed design. A condition is recommended requiring the provision of the 6 spaces designed to the Council's design specifications and the ongoing retention of this facility.

### Construction Management Plan

7.3 Due to the scale and kind of this development and the likely method of construction, it is considered that a CMP is not required in order to mitigate any adverse impacts. Any occupation of the highway, such as for hoarding, skips or storage of materials, will require a licence from Highways Management and this, along with the existing on-street waiting and loading controls, should be sufficient to ensure the work is carried out in such a way as to not adversely affecting the safety or operation of the public highway.

7.4 In order to tie the development into the surrounding urban environment, a financial contribution should be required to repave the footway adjacent to the site and the vehicular crossover. This work will need to be secured through a Section 106 Agreement with the Council.

## 8. Recommendation

8.1 Grant planning permission subject to S106 requiring new flats to be car-capped and developer to pay for repaving the footway.

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 6<sup>th</sup> December 2010.**

**For further information see**

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