Delegated Report	Analysis she	Analysis sheet N/A / attached		02/06/2006 19/05/2006	
(Members' Briefing)	N/A / attache				
Officer			Expiry Date: n Number(s)		
Grant Leggett		2006/1691/	P		
Application Address		Drawing N	umbers		
81, 81A and 81B Bayham Street Camden Town London NW1 0AG		Site Location Plan; PAN/101 A; 102A; 103A; 104A; 105A; 106A; 107B; 108A; 109; 110A; 111A; 112A; Land Registry.			
PO 3/4 Area Team Signatu	re C&UD	Authorised	d Officer Signature	Date:	
Proposal(s)					
Construction of 2 additional floors ar residential flats (1 x 3-bed, 4 x 1-bed		•			
Recommendation(s): Grant P	anning Permissi	on subject to a	a s.106 agreement (car	r-free)	

Full Planning Permission

Application Type:

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Pefer to Draft De	ocision	Notice				
Informatives:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice						
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	21	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	03	
Summary of consultation responses:	neighbour Response: It is planning cons The exten establishe building as Response: The would be unresterrace warran The development of the development of the groun Pratt Street Response: The development of the groun Pratt Street Response: The groun Response: The groun Pratt Street Response: The groun Response: The	ing rest is not applications to disconsisted the effect easonal and ace at the position over the could ace at the position over the estimate of the estimate o	ppropriate to consider on. In the rear would protrude building line, and fails to be be citing daylight and sunlight on the non-residential ble to refuse the development of the potentially affected by noise and no.83 Bayham Street. It is turbance is minor. Interestance is minor. Interestance light to that proper Street could not possible a different block to the point adylight or sunlight. It is existing. It applies the property is in an interestance is minor.	e unread respect that to a state terrace of the coment of	asonably beyond the ct the form of the existing terrace used for dining is not unreasonable. On the grounds that the adows at 1st, 2nd and 3rd ooking from the existing windows is such that the foliutions could be problems. Windows at the rear of everlooked by the proposed development. Similar to the neighbour at no.	ing J. It e d floor ng ne 12A osed ilarly,	
CAAC/Local groups' comments:	Camaon Town Or	J. O. T.	10 100ponoo.				

Site Description

The application relates to a two-storey building on the west side of Bayham Street. The building is occupied by a restaurant.

The site is within the Camden Town Conservation Area and Camden Town Major Centre.

Relevant History

1989: Planning permission **granted** for change of use of ground floor premises into a restaurant including alterations to the front elevation.

1990: Planning permission **granted** for the erection of a 2-storey rear extension in connection with continued use as a restaurant at ground floor level and the use of the first floor for office purposes within Class B1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987.

1991: Planning permission **refused** for erection of rear and side ground floor extensions to restaurant rear and side first floor extensions and addition of second floor for use within B1 Use Class (as defined by the Town & Country Use Classes Order 1987).

2001: Planning permission **granted** for change of use of the first floor from office (class B1) to a two bedroom self-contained unit (class C3).

May 2005: Application for planning permission **withdrawn** for construction of two additional floors to create 2 x 2-bedroom self-contained flats including extending the side access stairway and minor alterations.

The application was withdrawn on officer advice.

April 2006: Planning permission **refused** for construction of 2 additional floors and conversion of existing first floor flat to create 5 x self-contained residential flats (1 x 3-bed, 4 x 1-bed) including extending the side access stairway and minor alterations.

The application was recommended for approval and Members did not raise any objection to this recommendation. However it was ultimately refused because the s.106 agreement for car-free housing was not signed.

The current application represents a revision to the withdrawn scheme and is a resubmission of the scheme refused because the s.106 was not signed.

Relevant Policies

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. However it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2000

RE2 - Residential amenity and environment

EN1 – General environmental protection and improvement

EN13 – Design of new development

EN19 - Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

EN22 - Extensions to existing buildings

EN24 - Roof alterations and extensions

EN31 – Character and appearance of Conservation Areas

HG8 – Increasing the amount of residential accommodation

HG15 – Ensuring the provision of a range of housing

TR16 – Car-free housing developments

TR17 – Residential parking standards

Revised Deposit Draft as amended by the Proposed Modifications agreed by the Council's Executive on 11th January 2006

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

- H1 New housing
- H8 Mix of units
- B1 General design principles
- B3 Alterations and extension
- B7 Conservation areas
- T8 Car-free housing and car-capped housing

Supplementary Planning Guidance 2002

2.3 – Internal arrangements

Assessment

Permission is sought to add two additional storeys to a building (including a mansard storey) to create two additional two-bedroom flats.

Residential use

The existing building contains 1 x two-bedroom flat. The proposed development would provide 4 x one-bedroom and 1 x three-bedroom flats. The creation of four new dwellings at the expense of a two-bed flat is generally welcomed, subject to the provisions of other relevant policies. The proposed units are of a sufficient size in relation to SPG and would provide adequate lighting and visual privacy.

Urban design

The principle of the additional floors is acceptable, as there is a similar building next door which has a second floor and mansard third floor. The proposed development would serve to mitigate the effect of the existing stand-alone mansard roof at no. 83 by softening the roofscape. The upper floors of no.81 would be set flush with the existing façade of 81A and 83 rather than protruding from the front façade as does the existing ground and first floors, which is welcomed.

The new upper floors would extend the building significantly to the rear such that they protrude 1.8m further than the existing upper floors of the neighbouring no.83. However this protrusion would unduly affect the appearance of the rear of the terrace, and given it would not be visible in the public realm it would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The development includes windows in the side elevation, which is acceptable as they are of an appropriate design. One of the side windows top the mansard floor has an awkward relationship to the mansard, but the visual harm it causes would not warrant refusal of the application. A condition should be imposed requiring the windows of the new extensions to be formed from timber, to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Residential amenity

The development would not significantly affect daylight, sunlight, outlook or privacy to any neighbouring residential building. The rear windows of the neighbouring 19 Pratt Street (which face the side of the development) are non-habitable and therefore not sensitive to light or privacy issues.

The rear extension would introduce a new flank wall that abuts the existing second floor terrace of the neighbouring restaurant, used for dining. The outlook from the terrace would therefore be affected. The effects on the amenity of the non-residential terrace caused by the proposed rear extension are not so significant as to warrant refusal of the application. It would be unreasonable to refuse permission for the development in order to preserve the amenity of a commercial terrace.

There is also concern that habitable room windows in the rear elevation of the new extension would be sensitive to noise created on the terrace. The potential for noise nuisance to be created is recognised, but it would be unreasonable to refuse permission because of this issue. Any tenant or purchaser of the flat would be aware that the flat is above a restaurant, with another restaurant next door with a terrace. Internal solutions such as double-glazing could be implemented to overcome any noise issues.

Parking

The application is recommended for approval subject to a s.106 agreement for car-free housing. The

development would therefore not result in any adverse effects on parking.						
Recommendation						
Planning permission should be granted subject to conditions and a s.106 agreement for car-free housing.						

Disclaimer

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