

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 7th September 2009. For further information see

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

Delegated Report Members Briefing		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	11/09/2009
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	19/08/2009
Officer John Sheehy			Application Number 2009/2970/P	
Application Address 36 Parkway London NW1 7AH			Drawing Numbers Refer to draft decision	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal				
Erection of a mansard roof to provide an additional floor and a first floor rear extension both in connection with the extension of the existing maisonette from one to three bedrooms.				
Recommendation:	Grant conditional permission			
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice				
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	11	No. of responses No. electronic	2 1	No. of objections	1
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Site notice displayed from 29th July to 19th August.</p> <p>Objection received from 34 Parkway (freehold owners) “We object to the planning application on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed rear extension will create a serious loss of light to the two rear rooms of the 1st floor of our property. 2. In the event that access to the 1st floor flat roof of our property was needed for the construction work, we could not allow this as it would result in unacceptable inconvenience to our tenant's dental practice as well as possible damage to our property. 3. The construction would cause severe traffic problems. This, together with the scaffolding, dirt and general disruption will inhibit footfall, potentially causing severe loss of trade to our tenants and affecting the reversionary value of our property.” <p>Drivers & Norris Planning consultants (representing ground floor commercial occupier), comment: “the information on the Council website indicates that the proposed land use is as C3 Dwellinghouse. This is incorrect as the ground floor is a hairdressing salon and will remain as same.”</p>					
CAAC comments:	<p>Camden Town CAAC, comment: “We object to the width of the rear window on the first floor rear extension, especially in the context of its visibility from the school playground and also because the windows of the adjoining houses are all vertical and narrower. We do not object to the mansard extension (which we presume is a mansard as we would object to it if it is to be an extra storey). We suggest it should have the same profile and height as no. 38 Parkway to maintain the roofscape.”</p>					
Site Description						
<p>A 3-storey terraced building on the northern side of Parkway. The building is 1 bay wide. It has a flat roof and a hard-landscaped rear garden area. The ground floor commercial unit is currently occupied by a hairdresser, and the upper floors contain a one-bedroom maisonette.</p> <p>The site is located in Camden Town Conservation Area but is not identified as “positive building” in the Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy.</p>						
Relevant History						
<p>June 2009 Ref. 2009/1493/P - erection of an additional floor at roof level and a 2-storey rear extension, at first and second floor levels, in connection with the creation of a 2-bed maisonette and a 1-bed flat. Withdrawn by applicant on officers advice.</p>						

Relevant policies

Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 General design principles

B3 Alterations and extensions

B7 Conservation Areas

T12 Works affecting highways

Camden Planning Guidance 2006, inc. advice in British Research Establishment guidelines

Camden Town Conservation Area Statement

Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy

Assessment

Proposal: erection of a mansard roof extension and erection of a 1st floor rear extension to create additional living accommodation. The mansard roof would increase the overall height of the building by 1.4m.

Withdrawn application

The applicant withdrew a previous version of this scheme which consisted of 2 additional floors to the existing single storey rear extension rather than one as is currently proposed: the rear elevation came up to the eaves level and as such was contrary to CPG. Furthermore, the dormer windows within the mansard roof, which were not lined up with the windows on the façade below, were considered to be excessively bulky and to have poor detailed design. The application was withdrawn on officers' advice.

Assessment

The principal considerations material to the assessment of this application are design and amenity.

Design

The mansard roof extension is considered to be acceptable for the following reasons:

- The base of the mansard roof would be set back behind the front parapet by 0.3m and the height of the roof would match the height and proportions of the existing mansard roof at no. 38 Parkway, though this property is at a higher level. Due to its size, location and form, the proposed roof extension is considered to be subordinate to the host building and would not result in an excessively bulky or obtrusive extension;
- A single dormer window is proposed on each pitch. The proposed dormer windows are appropriately scaled and are positioned in line with the windows of the front and rear elevations. The proposed dormers comply with CPG in terms of clearance from the ridge and side of the roof at front and rear;
- The design of the dormers is in keeping with the age and architectural style of the host building and utilises traditional materials such as lead and timber framed windows. These traditional materials will assist in integrating the proposed development with the host building and the surrounding Conservation Area;
- Many properties on Parkway of a similar the age and architectural style to the host building, including the nearby nos. 38 and 44 have been extended to include mansard roof extensions. The proposal

would continue the pattern of development in the surrounding area.

The first floor rear extension is considered acceptable for the following reasons:

- The additional floor to the existing rear extension would have minimal impact on the overall bulk and appearance of the house and would not harm the character of the Conservation Area given its secluded position at the rear of the property.
- The detailed design with new timber-framed windows and the use of facing brick is also considered to be acceptable.
- Both adjacent properties have had large full-width rear extensions erected (3-storey at no. 34 Parkway and 2-storey at no. 38 Parkway). The proposal, whilst smaller in scale, would continue the established pattern of development.

Amenity

Council records indicate that the upper floors of the neighbouring property, no. 34 Parkway, are in use as a dentist's premises.

There may be a slight reduction in access to sunlight and daylight of the first floor window on the rear elevation of no. 34 Parkway as a result of the proposal. However, this window already has poor access to sunlight and daylight being located on the northern side of the building and beside an existing extension at no. 34 Parkway. The loss of daylight to this window is not considered to be sufficiently extreme as to constitute a reason for refusal based on the BRE guidelines.

The dentist's premises also contain 2 first floor side windows. It is noted that these windows overlook space and benefit from light from another property (the application site) and could be termed 'bad neighbour' windows. Whilst the proposal may result in a slight reduction to the access to sunlight and daylight to the rear first floor side windows, again the loss of daylight to these windows is not considered to be sufficiently extreme as to constitute a reason for refusal based on the BRE guidelines.

There would be no reduction in sunlight or daylight windows to any nearby residential premises.

A condition has been attached to the decision notice to ensure that the flat roof of the rear extension is used for maintenance purposes only and is not used as a roof terrace, in order to safeguard the privacy of neighbours.

The application would not result in loss of privacy, or, outlook or other disturbance to neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is therefore considered to be consistent with Policy SD6.

Other issues

Objectors to the proposal state that the construction work would cause disruption to neighbouring occupiers. However, the impact of construction noise and disturbance on nearby residents is not a material planning consideration and is not covered by planning legislation but is subject to control under Environmental Health legislation, namely the Control of Pollution Act 1974 which sets out the approved hours of construction for works that can be heard at the boundary of a site. As this issue is not a material planning consideration it cannot be used to justify refusal of a planning application or the imposition of conditions on a planning permission limiting the hours of construction. An informative is attached to the decision notice informing the applicant of the permitted hours of construction and demolition.

Camden's Transport Planning Officers have commented on this application and have raised no objection. In

particular, they note that:

- There is no car free requirement, as no additional units of accommodation are being created
- Although the site is located within the Camden Town town centre, it is of a sufficient distance from the busier, more congested areas of Camden Town. There are single yellow lines on Parkway outside the site where construction vehicles can stop. In addition, Parkway is a one way street; therefore there is sufficient carriageway width for vehicles to pass stopped vehicles. Given all of these points and the fact that the construction works proposed are only of a small scale, a Construction Management Plan would not be necessary.

Recommendation: Grant conditional permission