<b>Delegated Report</b>			Analysis sheet		t	Expiry	Date:	06/03/2	007	
			N/A / attached			Consultation Expiry Date:		13/02/2007		
Officer					Application Nu					
Thomas Smith					2007/0151/P					
Application Address					Drawing Numbers					
18-22 Inverness Street London NW1 7HJ					See decision					
PO 3/4	Area Tea	m Signature C&UD			Authorised Officer Signature					
Proposal(s)										
Erection of a 3-storey dwelling to the rear of the site, erection of an extension at rear first and second floor levels and erection of a roof extension to facilitate the conversion of the upper floors from $4 \times 1$ -bed flats to $3 \times 2$ -bed flats and $1 \times 2$ -bed flats and other external alterations at the rear.										
Recommendation(s):		Refuse								
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission								
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice								
Informatives:										
Consultations	S									
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	20		. of responses . electronic	00 00	No. of c	objections	00	
		None		INU		00				
Summary of consultation responses:										
		None								
CAAC/Local gro comments: *Please Specify	oups*									

# Site Description

This application relates to a 3-storey plus basement terraced property on the northern side of Inverness Street with an authorised use as restaurant at ground floor and basement levels and 4 flats above.

The building dates from the 1950's probably replacing a bomb damaged building as the rest of the terrace is mid-Victorian. The building extends almost to the rear of the site fronting onto Early Mews with later extensions and store rooms. It extends marginally deeper at the rear than the neighbouring properties at first and second floor levels.

The property is located within the Camden Town Centre and the properties on the opposite side of Inverness Street are within the Camden Town Conservation Area although the application site itself is outside.

#### **Relevant History**

Planning application 2006/4666/P for erection of a 3-storey dwelling to the rear of the site, erection of an extension at rear first and second floor levels in association with the conversion from bedsitting units to self contained flats and erection of a roof extension to create a 2-bed flat and other external alterations at the rear was **withdrawn** in December 2006.

Planning application PE9900755 for erection of an additional storey in the form of a mansard roof extension to provide a self-contained flat was **refused** in November 1999 for the following reason:

The proposed additional storey, if permitted would be of an excessive scale and inappropriate design that, by virtue of the prominence of the roof line, would have an adverse affect on the integrity of the terrace and the character and appearance of the surrounding townscape. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies EN1, EN16, EN16(new), EN57 and EN42 of the emerging Unitary Development Plan.

A subsequent appeal was **dismissed**.

Planning application P9602660 for erection of an additional storey to provide a new self-contained flat and alterations to the front elevation was **refused** in November 1996 for the following reasons:

It is considered that the total floorspace of the building, following the proposed extension, would be excessive in relation to the site and the character of the area generally.

The proposed roof extension would disrupt a consistent parapet line and have a detrimental effect on the townscape of the area.

A subsequent appeal was dismissed.

#### **Relevant policies**

SD2, SD6, SD7, SD8, SD9, H1, H7, H8, B1, B3, B7, T3, T7, T8, T9, R3

## **Camden Planning Guidance 2006**

Roofs and terraces Extensions, alterations and conservatories Residential development standards Parking stress

# Assessment

#### Proposal

This application proposes the following:

- Erection of a 2-storey plus basement dwelling to the rear of the site;
- Erection of rear extensions at ground, first, second and floor levels;
- Erection of a predominantly glazed roof extension setback from the front elevation by approx 1.95m.
- Conversion from 4 x 1-bed flats to 2x1-bed and 3x2-bed on the upper floors of the main building.

#### Assessment

#### Land use

Policy H1 states that housing is the priority use in the UDP and therefore the proposed new residential floorspace is considered to be acceptable in principle subject to compliance with other policies within the UDP. The application property is not particularly suited to family accommodation and therefore the proposed mix of unit sizes is considered to be acceptable.

# <u>Design</u>

# Roof extension

Two previous applications for roof extensions have been refused and dismissed at appeal on the basis that they would disrupt the consistent parapet line on this terrace.

It is acknowledged that the roof extension is set back and would be less prominent than the previously resisted proposals. However, the extension would be partially visible from the opposite side of Inverness Street, particularly in longer views and from Early Mews would still interrupt a roofline that is largely unimpaired by extensions and as such is contrary to policies B1, B3, B7 and Camden Planning Guidance.

It is recognised that the extension has been designed to minimise its visibility but the resultant form of the double-width extension would be alien to and incongruous with both the host building, the terrace and the adjacent conservation area and is not considered to be appropriate.

## Rear extensions (first and second floors)

The proposed rear extensions at first and second floor levels would be 4.55m deep extending approx 6.6m beyond the rear elevations of the neighbouring properties and set in from the boundary wall by approx 0.8m on either side.

Camden Planning Guidance states that rear extensions should be subservient to the host building and extensions which are full width or higher than one full storey below eaves level will be strongly discouraged. The application proposes a double-width extension rising to eaves level which would be an excessively bulky an overly prominent addition which would not be subservient to the host building. It is recognised that the rear of the terrace is not particularly coherent with a number of insensitive extensions and alterations but these predate current policy and does not justify further inappropriate development which is contrary to policies B1, B3 and Camden Planning Guidance.

## New dwelling and ground floor rear extensions

The proposed new dwelling to the rear of the site fronting Early Mews would be similar in height to the other buildings on the Mews and is appropriate in terms of scale. The fenestration is rather domestic in appearance and a more robust industrial design would have been preferred in keeping with the other buildings on the mews. However, it is recognised that this dwellinghouse would help to tidy up this frontage and refusal on this ground would not be reasonable.

There would also be a reorganisation of the other ground floor rear extensions in order to accommodate adequate cooking areas / storage for the restaurant / bar use and these would help to rationalise this rather untidy area.

## Materials

The proposed materials would be brickwork to match existing with powder-coated metal framed windows which are considered to be acceptable although details of the windows (1:10) would need to be reserved by condition. A sedum roof is proposed to the dwellinghouse at the rear of the site which is welcomed.

# Residential Amenity

The nearest windows to the proposed extensions on either side serve stairwells with habitable room windows

being located further away. Whilst the proposed extensions would have some impact on light into and outlook from neighbouring residential properties, it is not considered that this impact would be so significant so as to warrant refusal.

The internal layouts are all reasonable and in compliance with the minimum standards suggested in Camden Planning Guidance which is acceptable.

A statement has been submitted setting out which Lifetime Homes standards can be complied with. This is rather limited but it is recognised that it is an existing building which restricts what measures can practicably be incorporated and refusal on this ground would be unreasonable. More information would be required for the new dwelling as all of the points have not been addressed. The gradient of the slope would also need to be indicated – further information on this should be requested in any resubmission.

The proposed basement level bedroom would be only served by a window located at ground floor level with a ledge cut into the ground floor room above to let the light from the window through to the basement. The glazed area of the window totals approximately 9% of the floor area of the bedroom which is less than the 10% recommended in Camden Planning Guidance. Due to the location of the window the level of daylighting in this room would be further restricted and there would be limited outlook.

In addition, the glazed area of the window serving the kitchenette / dining room totals only approximately 5% of the floor area of this room and in any case none of this should be counted as it would be obstructed by the 4.6m high store wall at a distance of 2.6m contrary to Camden Planning Guidance. This room would also experience limited daylighting and outlook. Consequently, it is considered that an inadequate standard of residential accommodation would be provided in the basement contrary to policy SD6 and Camden Planning Guidance.

Details of adequate sound insulation for the proposed dwellinghouse to the rear of the site would be required to ensure that future occupiers would not experience unacceptable noise disturbance from the adjoining restaurant / disco bar.

# Transport

No off street parking is provided and the proposed 2 additional units are likely to result in increased parking stress and congestion in the locality to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety. The site is located close to Camden Town underground station and a number of bus routes and as such the 2 additional units are suitable for designation as car-free in accordance with policies T7, T8 and T9. It is understood that the applicant is willing to enter into a S106 Agreement to secure this but as the application is being recommended for refusal then the Agreement will not be signed and this must form an additional reason for refusal.

## Cycle storage

Cycle storage for the flats in the main building would be provided at ground floor level inside the entrance which is acceptable.

# Recommendation

The following aspects of the proposed development are considered to be unacceptable: 1. Roof extension; 2. Rear extension; 3. Standard of residential accommodation at basement level; 4. Parking stress and congestion.

# <u>Disclaimer</u>

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613