#### DISCLAIMER

# Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 25<sup>th</sup> February 2008. For further information see

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

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analy shee		Expi Date		24/07/2007		
	'9/	N/A		Consult Expiry D		10/07/20	007	
Ot	App	Application Number(s)						
Matthew Durling			2007/1203/P	2007/1203/P				
Applicati	Drawing Num	Drawing Numbers						
13 Adamson Road London NW3 3HU			See decision r	notice.				
	a Team Inature	C&UI	D Authori	sed Off	icer S	ignatu	re	
Proposal(s)								
Erection of a mansard roof extension, in connection with the creation of one additional self-contained studio unit at roof level.								
Recommendation(s): Grant subject to S106 le			legal agreement	al agreement				
Application Type:	Full Plann	ing Permiss	sion					
Conditions: Informatives:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice							
Consultations								
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	58	No. of responses No. Electronic	03 00	No. of ob	jections	03	
Summary of consultation responses:	<ul> <li>Site notice displayed from 19/06/2007 to 10/07/2007.</li> <li>Adjoining occupiers/owners</li> <li>5 letters of objection received, as summarised below: <ul> <li>No objection to redeveloping the mansard, however object to addition of 5 studios to the property;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>							
•	Officer response: the development would involve the net increase of one studio unit, which is considered acceptable. See assessment.   Consider building not capable of accommodating more residential units safely and							

	appropriately; Officer response: the proposed development complies with relevant Environmental Health			
	standards and is considered to be acceptable. See assessment.			
	• Concern regarding additional cars and parking; Officer response: The additional unit will be designated as car-free by a S.106 agreement.			
	See assessment.			
	Consider existing refuse arrangements are inadequate;			
	Officer response: it is recommended that further details of proposed refuse storage areas are required by condition. See assessment.			
	<ul> <li>Concern about reduction in housing stock available to families which these and other alterations would cause;</li> </ul>			
	Officer response: this application is for the replacement of three existing studio units and the creation of one additional studio unit. None of this accommodation is particularly suited for family occupation.			
	<ul> <li>Concern regarding state of repair of existing building;</li> </ul>			
	Officer response: this is not a material planning consideration.			
	Consider proposal primarily to increase rental income;			
	Officer response: this is not a material planning consideration.			
	• Concern that drains and waste disposal facilities are insufficient; Officer response: this is not a material planning consideration. The development will			
	however have to comply with relevant Building Regulations.			
	Belsize CAAC: raises 'no objection' to the proposal.			
CAAC/Local groups comments:	Belsize Residents Association: raises objections to the proposal, as summarised below:			
	<ul> <li>Does not consider adjacent mansard forms a precedent for</li> </ul>			
	development that would be damaging to the streetscene;			
	Officer response: the proposed mansard is considered acceptable in			
	principle and in terms of detailed design.			
	<ul> <li>Proposal neither preserves or enhances the appearance or character of the Conservation Area;</li> </ul>			
	Officer response: the proposed development would not cause demonstrable			
	harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. See			
	assessment.			
Site Description				
A substantial semi-deta	ched villa comprising lower ground floor, 3-storeys and attic level. The building			
is located on the west side of Adamson Road. Although it is not listed, the building is located within				
	n Area. As existing, the roof comprises a shallow pitch with an ornate curved			
	arged in 1978) and a large box dormer to the rear. As existing, the property			
contains 3 self-contained units at lower ground floor, 12 self-contained units at ground, first and				
	her 3 self-contained units at attic level.			
<b>Relevant History</b>				
20/44/4000 Diaman	normalization provided (ref. D)//0000052DD) for prostion of a managed reaf			

30/11/1998: Planning permission granted (ref. PW9802053R2) for erection of a mansard roof extension, to accommodate a total of 5 non-self contained bedsit rooms within the roofspace.
17/05/1978: Planning permission granted (ref. 25701) for enlargement of front dormer window.
18/05/1976: Planning permission granted (ref. 22280) for the continued use of the basement as 3 self-contained dwelling units. (17/06/1977: Appeal ALLOWED).

#### Relevant policies

# London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006)

S1/S2 Sustainable development

- SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours
- B1 General design principles
- B3 Alterations and extensions
- B7 Conservation areas
- H1 New housing
- H8 Mix of units
- T3 Pedestrians and cycling
- T8 Car-free housing
- T9 Impact of parking

# Camden Planning Guidance (2006)

# Belsize Conservation Area Statement

# Assessment

# **Proposal:**

Permission is sought for the erection of a mansard roof extension in connection with the creation of an additional self-contained studio unit to provide a total of 4 self-contained studio units at roof level.

# Revision:

One of the 2 additional self-contained units originally proposed has been removed from the application. **Assessment:** 

The main issues requiring assessment include the design of the proposed roof extension and in particular its impact on the appearance of the building, streetscene and Conservation Area and the standard of residential amenity of the proposed units, plus the impact of the development on on-street parking. **Design** 

The application property matches Nos. 1-15 and 8-10 in its architectural style; however this building and No.1 are the only buildings to retain their original roof profile and dormer window to the front. There is an existing unsympathetic roof extension to the rear of the subject building. All other buildings have various bulky roof extensions approved in the 1970s and 80s, in the form of mansards (at Nos. 9, 11, 15 and 8) or large box dormers (at Nos. 3, 5, 7 and 10). No. 11 to the east of the application site has a large mansard set back behind a roof terrace. No.15, which forms a semi-detached pair with No.13, has a mansard roof extension (granted in 1987) with dormer windows at front and rear. This mansard roof extension was not built in strict accordance with the approved drawings in that it has a shallower roofslope, however notwithstanding this, the roof extension as built is considered to be preferable to Nos. 8 and 9 in terms of its visual appearance. It should also be noted that this development was approved with the recommendation of English Heritage at the time.

The proposed roof extension to the subject property would match that to No.15 in terms of form, roof pitch and window positions with the exception that the original curved window to the front of the subject property would be retained. Materials would also match those at No.15, with traditional slates and timber sash windows to match existing. Notwithstanding the applicant's undertaking to match the design and form of the adjacent roof extension, the Council cannot guarantee that the drawings are wholly accurate in this regard. On this basis it is recommended that a similar condition be attached to that attached to the permission granted in 1987 requiring the development to match that exactly of

No.15 in terms of angle of roof slope, design and position of windows (with the exception of the existing front window which is to be retained).

Given the lack of consistency or homogeneity in the local area, it is considered that the loss of the original roof form and erection of a mansard roof extension at No.13 could be accommodated without harm to the streetscape or the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The mansard roof extension would match the extension to No.15 and would form a symmetrical pair with it. This is consistent with planning guidance which states that roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where there are a variety of additions or alterations to roofs which create an established pattern and where further development of a similar form would not cause additional harm and would help to reunite a group of buildings and townscape.

# Lawful use and amenity

Planning permission was granted in 1998 for the creation of two additional bedsits to the building, which at that time comprised a number of non-self contained units. The whole building has since been unlawfully self-contained to comprise a total of 18 units. The applicant has submitted invoices detailing works to the top floor flats, including the installation of kitchens and bathroom facilities dated 15 November 2002. In the absence of any information to the contrary, and on the balance of probability it is considered that the top floor accommodation was self-contained over 4 years ago and is therefore lawful. On this basis, the replacement of the existing self-contained units and creation of one additional self-contained unit is considered acceptable in principle.

The existing roof level layout will be reconfigured to create an additional studio unit resulting in a total of four selfcontained units at this level. Although the floor areas of three of the units do not meet minimum recommended space standards the proposal does not result in a worsening of the existing situation. The additional self-contained studio would have a total floor area of  $35m^2$  and exceed the minimum floor space area as recommended in Camden Planning Guidance. All units would benefit from adequate levels of daylight and outlook.

Although there is an existing refuse store to the front of the property, it is clearly inadequate to store the quantity of waste generated by each of the dwellings in the property. The addition of a further dwelling to this building would exacerbate the existing situation and it is therefore recommended that further details of the proposed refuse storage area be required by condition.

# Parking

The site is within close walking distance of Swiss Cottage Underground Station (Northern Line). The site also has excellent access to bus routes along Finchley Road and College Crescent. The site therefore has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 5 (very good). In addition, this area is located within the CA-B (Belsize) Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), which allows parking by permit only Monday – Friday 09:00 – 18.30 and Saturday 09.30 – 13.30. This section of Adamson Road also suffers from some parking stress. The CA-B CPZ has a ratio of parking permits to car parks of 1.13, meaning there are more permits issued than there are parking spaces available. It is therefore recommended that the scheme be car-capped, such that the additional residential unit be designated car-free and will not be entitled to a residents parking permit. The car-free status of the new residential unit will need to be established by a S106 legal agreement.

**Recommendation:** Grant subject to a legal agreement.