

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		01/11/2007	
				<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		19/10/2007	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Jenny Fisher				2007/4032/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
69 Goldhurst Terrace London NW6 3HA							
<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 rear extension, together with the change of use of non self-contained to self-contained residential accommodation.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	19	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	02
				No. electronic	02		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>Major concerns. Would extend well beyond the existing structure and obscure light to his property. Windows would overlook bedroom, reducing level of privacy.</p> <p>I letter of support on grounds that new owner promises larger room.</p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify							

### Site Description

Residential premises situated on the north side of Goldhurst Terrace. Comprise ground, first and second floors.

Occupant of a bed-sit on the ground floor and one on the first floor had their own washing and cooking facilities, but shared a toilet on the first floor. Remainder of the building comprises self-contained flats. The building is in a poor state of repair and undergoing refurbishment.

Located within the Swiss Cottage Conservation Area.

### Relevant History

03/10/1984 8401528 Planning permission for:

Erection of a single storey rear ground floor extension in conjunction with the formation of a self-contained bed-sitting room flat on the ground floor at the rear.

### Relevant policies

Replacement UDP 2006 S1/S2; SD6; H1; H6; H7; H8; B1; B3; B7

Camden Planning Guidance December 2006: access; conservation areas; daylight; extensions; lifetime homes; overlooking; res. develop. standards

Swiss Cottage Conservation Area Statement

## Assessment

### Main issues for consideration:

- accommodation existing and proposed;
- impact of rear extension proposed (visual and local amenity)

### Accommodation

#### Existing:

2<sup>nd</sup> fl s/c studio to rear (incl. Bathroom); 1 bedroom s/c flat to front.

1<sup>st</sup> fl. s/c studio (incl. sink and wc); 1 bedroom s/c flat.

Ground fl. flat to rear 1 room kitchen and bathroom. To the front 2 rooms, each has a door leading off the hall but no indication of where facilities are for these rooms.

#### Proposed:

2<sup>nd</sup> floor – two x 1 bedroom s/c flats. **Flat 4** 28m<sup>2</sup>, bedroom 5.4m<sup>2</sup> (incl. small area that could be cupboard or a shower room). **Flat 5** 36m<sup>2</sup>, bedroom 8m<sup>2</sup>

1<sup>st</sup> floor – two x 1 bedroom s/c flats. **Flat 3** 37.76m<sup>2</sup>, bedroom 6m<sup>2</sup>. **Flat 2** 26m<sup>2</sup>, bedroom 5.2m<sup>2</sup>

Ground floor – one x 2-bedroom s/c flat. **Flat 1** 82m<sup>2</sup>, bedroom 2 7.6m<sup>2</sup>, bedroom 1 9.8m<sup>2</sup>

An officer site visit 10/10/2007 revealed significant works in progress, therefore unable to confirm layout.

Protected tenant confirmed he occupies a ground floor bed-sit with washbasin and cooking facilities, shared a first floor toilet with another tenant in a first floor bed-sit. First floor tenant did not have protected tenancy therefore has had to vacate his room. Remainder of accommodation, was self-contained.

An accurate representation of the existing internal layout has not been provided by the applicant and the situation is therefore rather confused. Plans originally submitted (existing) show a studio flat (flat ) at first floor level with wc outside the flat. On the second floor flat 4 is also shown as a studio with toilet outside the room. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has identified 3 non-self-contained units of accommodation and recommends refusal of pp by reason of conflict with Council policy to resist loss of non self-contained accommodation.

Notwithstanding the confusion it is clear that there has been an element of non self-contained accommodation within the building. Replacement UDP policy H6 states that the Council will not grant planning permission for a change of use or conversion that would result in the loss of housing in multiple occupation of an acceptable standard, unless it is replaced by permanently available affordable housing. Refusal is recommended on the grounds that the proposal is contrary to H6.

### Standards

Minimum size for a 1 person flat 32m<sup>2</sup>. Flats 2 and 4 proposed fall below standard.

Minimum size for single bedrooms 6.5m<sup>2</sup>. Bedrooms to flats 2 and 4 proposed fall below standard. Marginally below standard for proposed flat 3.

Access The building has a level entrance threshold.

## Mix

Large unit at ground floor level acceptable, the remainder would all be one-bedroom units. Policy H8 (mix of units) states that all schemes for conversion should provide a good standard and quality of accommodation without deterioration in amenity for any existing tenant. It would appear that the existing tenant is likely to be made homeless. He has been promised a larger room; however all residential units proposed would be self-contained flats, non self-contained accommodation is not included in the scheme. This is a matter that could be decided under separate legislation concerning security of tenure. The scheme is contrary to H8 in planning terms because the policy seeks at least one large (3 bedroom) unit with a mix of smaller units. The large unit at ground floor level proposed complies with H8, however, it is considered that in this location at least one x two-bedroom unit would also be appropriate. The proposal is contrary to H8 by reason of failure to provide an acceptable mix of unit sizes.

Refusal is recommended on the grounds that substandard accommodation is proposed, and the mix of unit sizes is considered inappropriate, at least one x two-bedroom unit should be provided.

## Rear extension

The existing ground floor extension would be increased by 3m. (length) x 3.5m. (width) x 3m. (height).

First and second floor extensions would each be 4.5m (length) x 3.5m. (width) x 2.5m. (height).

Windows would be installed in place of doors within the flank wall facing the open space that would be retained at ground floor level between this property and No. 71. Three windows would be installed at first and second floors of the rear extension proposed within the same elevation facing No. 71.

The three-storey extension proposed would be contrary to B1 that seeks development that would improve the attractiveness of an area and not harm its appearance or amenity. It would be contrary to B3 that considers proposed extensions in relation to form, proportions and character of the building and it's setting. Extensions should be subordinate to the original building; proposed is an extension so huge it would dominate the rear of this and neighbouring properties. It would also fail to preserve the architectural integrity of the existing building. The proposed extension would harm the appearance of the building and character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to B7.

The proposed extension would fail to comply with Camden Planning Guidance. In most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring extensions, will be strongly discouraged.

## Overlooking

The flank wall of the proposed extension would be 2m. from the boundary with No. 71. Plot widths are quite narrow approx. 5m. It is considered that the installation of 6 new windows within the flank wall of the proposed extension (3 at 1<sup>st</sup> floor and 3 at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor level) would allow unreasonable overlooking neighbouring properties to the detriment of their privacy. They would overlook No. 71 and several premises beyond to the east.

## Daylight

Although an extremely large rear extension is proposed it is considered that it is unlikely to restrict light to neighbouring windows.

Summary: The application is recommended for refusal due to the excessively large rear extension proposed. It would be contrary to UDP policies B1, B3, B7 and SPG. It would be contrary to SD6 by reason of harm to visual privacy of adjoining occupiers to the east, and policy H6 as a consequence of the loss of non self-contained accommodation. The application is also recommended for refusal on the grounds that it fails to comply with H8 due to the lack of an appropriate mix of unit sizes and below standard accommodation proposed.

