

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		11/06/2014	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		08/05/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Hugh Miller				2014/2449/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
139 Queens Crescent London NW5 4ED				See decision notice.			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of roof extension with 2 rooflights, to provide 1 x 1 bed and 1 x 2 bed flats, and associated rebuild of chimney stack and flue.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	13	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		At time of writing no responses were received.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments:		Not in CA.					

Site Description

The application relates to 139-141 Queen's Crescent, a three-storey end of terrace building situated on the north side of Queen's Crescent at its intersection with Gilden Crescent. The building is residential (Class C3) use, with a small post office (Class A1) at ground floor level, the majority of the ground floor having been converted from a post office (Class A1) to 2 x self-contained flats in or about 2001.

The building as a whole contains 8 self-contained flats as existing, including flats contained within an extension to the rear.

The site is within the Queen's Crescent Neighbourhood Centre. The building is not in a designated conservation area, neither is it listed.

Relevant History

March 2001: PP Granted - for the change of use of ground floor from retail use with store to retail use and 1 x one-bedroom flat and one two-bedroom flat, together with the installation of new windows and door openings on the Gilden Crescent frontage; ref. PEX0001084.

May 2006 - Conversion of existing three-bedroom self-contained residential flat (Class C3) at first floor level to 2 x 2 bedroom self-contained flats, alterations to provide new windows and doors, plus new entrance canopy at ground floor level. Application involves removal of existing (unauthorised) advertisement hoarding to flank wall of building; ref. 2006/1228/P

June 2007 – Withdrawn Application - Conversion of existing three-bedroom self-contained residential flat (Class C3) at first floor level to 1 x 3 bedroom and 1 x 1 bedroom self-contained flats including elevational alterations; ref. 2007/1868/P

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 - Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS6 (Providing quality homes)

CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)

CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

CS18 (Waste and recycling)

CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy)

DP2 (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing)

DP3 (Contributions to the supply of affordable housing)

DP5 (Housing size mix)

DP6 (Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes)

DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport)

DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking)

DP19 (Managing the impact of parking)

DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network)

DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

CPG 2011/2013

CPG1 - Sections 1- 5 (2013)

CPG2 (Housing): Section 4: Residential space standards, Section 5: Lifetimes Homes

CPG6 (Amenity)

CPG7 (Transport)

London Plan 2011

NPPF 2012

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

- ✓ Erection of roof extension with 2 rooflights, to provide 2 x self-contained flats (1 x 1 bed and 1 x 2 bed); and associated rebuild of chimney stack and flue.

2.0 Revised Proposal

2.1 The application was revised during the assessment of the proposal owing to concerns of design and residential space standards, namely introducing a setback recess to the roof extension by 100mm. As a result, the proposal would provide 2 x 1 bed flats. The revised proposal however failed adequately to take account Officer's comments in relation to the Council's Policies set out the Core Strategy.

2.2 For the purposes of this application, the originally submitted scheme, as per paragraph 1 will be assessed, comment will however be made to the revised scheme.

2.3 The key considerations are:

- a] the impact of the design on the appearance of the building and
- b] impact on residential amenity;
- c] residential standards.

These are addressed below in the context of planning policy and other material considerations.

3.0 Design

LDF policies & guidelines - Roof extension

3.1 The Council's LDP Policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) states "The Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider:

a) character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed; c) the quality of materials to be used.

3.2 Paragraph 24.7 states "Development should consider:

- the character and constraints of its site;
- the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development;
- the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape;
- the compatibility of materials, their quality, texture, tone and colour;
- the composition of elevations;
- the suitability of the proposed design to its intended use;
- its contribution to public realm, and its impact on views and vistas; and
- the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value.

3.3 Paragraph 24.12 states "In order to best preserve and enhance the positive elements of local

character within the borough, we need to recognise and understand the factors that create it. Designs for new buildings, and alterations and extensions, should respect the character and appearance of the local area and neighbouring buildings. Within areas of distinctive character, development should reinforce those elements which create the character. Where townscape is particularly uniform attention should be paid to responding closely to the prevailing scale, form and proportions and materials. In areas of low quality or where no pattern prevails, development should improve the quality of an area and give a stronger identity.

3.4 Paragraph 24.13 states “... Overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions. Extensions should therefore be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation unless, exceptionally, it is demonstrated that this is not appropriate given the specific circumstances of the building. Past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations and extensions”.

3.5 As noted in Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) 1 – Design, Paragraph 5.20, (*Other roof additions*)

“On some contemporary buildings a less traditional form of roof addition may be more appropriate. In such cases, proposals should still have regard for the following general principles:

- The visual prominence, scale and bulk of the extension;
- Use of high quality materials and details;
- Impact on adjoining properties both in terms of bulk and design and amenity of neighbours, e.g. loss of light due to additional height;
- Sympathetic design and relationship to the main building”.

3.6 The host building is one of a pair of 5 buildings, which is a 1950's end of terrace building with flat roof set behind a raised parapet. On the east side, it abuts a group of 4 Victorian buildings with mansard type roof extensions including dormer windows and rooflights. The host building replicates a distinctive chamfered elevation that is common to a few of the terrace groups; and it has a painted rendered finish over three floors that blend into the raised parapet at roof level. Opposite and to the west of the host buildings, are 3-storey buildings that over time have been extended by mansard roof extensions that varies in their detailed design, use of materials, roof slope/pitch and comprise mostly dormer windows that setback behind raised parapet. The roof extensions of these neighbouring buildings are not uniform and are prominent but they all setback from the roof parapet to demonstrate their later addition form at the roof level.

3.7 The proposed roof extension would be of modern design and except for the corner window, would project from the existing roof parapet creating contentious elevations on all sides of the building; the Queen's Crescent elevation (front) and Gilden Crescent elevation (side) and also at the rear. The extension includes a lead faced timber framed windows that setback from the chamfered corner and include painted steel rail. The materials comprise rendered fascia, timber framed windows, exposed brick within pc frames, new brick panels to match existing plus pc copings; and replacement chimney stack and flue in London stock brick.

3.8 The principle of a roof extension is considered acceptable, however, its detailed design, specifically the extensions contentious projections on the buildings principal elevations of Queen's Crescent and Gilden Crescent is not sympathetic to the appearance of the host building. It is considered that owing to the buildings location and visual prominence, the proposed roof extension should be setback behind the parapet sufficiently so that it minimises its visual prominence, scale and bulk whilst creating a clear separation between the existing and the new addition. It is considered that a suitable setback on these elevations would result in a subordinate extension which would be sympathetic to the host building, in keeping with the established practice in the streetscape and be in accordance with CPG1 - Design. It is considered however that the roof addition would be visibly dominant in both short and long views from the wider public realm and exposing an unwelcome structural interruption in an otherwise largely unaltered roofscape.

3.9 The applicant has provided examples locally and from other locations of buildings comprising coloured bricks + render finish (Athlone Street, Talacre Road, Malden Road) and other roof extensions (Camden Street) as justifications for the proposed design. It is acknowledged that the use of colour can provide the separation and contrast at the roof level; which can address an extensions scale, bulk and prominence. However, it is considered that in this instance, the use of colour would not address the concerns discussed above. Moreover, except for Camden Street, the examples, referred to would appear to be designed as whole new buildings rather than as later additions. However, as noted in LDF DP24, paragraph 24.13 these examples should not be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations and extensions.

3.10 The Camden Street photograph and the application site occupy a corner site and are both prominent within the streetscene. It is not clear when planning permission was granted, owing to there being no number to identify the building and to verify the planning history. Notwithstanding, it is not considered that this extension has set a precedent owing to changes in the Council's LDF policies (please refer to paragraph 24.13 of LDF DP24) and extension guidelines of the Supplementary Planning Guidance, the Camden Planning Guidance.

Revised roof extension

3.11 The applicant submitted amendments to the proposal, however, the roof extension setback, the principal concern of the proposed roof extension was limited to 100mm from the outer elevation of the building; in keeping with similar setbacks at locations such as at the east corner of Marsden St and west end of Athlone Street as referred to by the applicant. Other alterations to the elevations were as follows:-

- a thickening of the parapet coping for emphasis and termination
- a shadow gap along the upper side of the existing coping line for emphasis and separation
- removal of panels of exposed brick and their replacement with render
- colour render

3.12 Owing to the absence of a reasonable setback of the proposed extension as discussed above, it is considered that the proposal in both its original and revised format is considered unacceptable and not in keeping with LDF DP24 or CPG roof extension guidelines.

Rooflights: The proposed 2 number rooflights would be located behind and setback from the coping and not be visible from the public realm and is considered acceptable.

New self-contained flats/ Residential standards

3.13 The provision of additional residential units is a key aim of the Camden LDF. LDF policy CS6 state that the Council aims to minimise social polarisation and create mixed and inclusive communities by: **m]** seeking a diverse range of housing products in the market ... to provide a range of homes accessible across the spectrum of household incomes; **n]** seeking a range of self-contained homes of different sizes to meet the Council's identified dwelling-size priorities; **o]** seeking a variety of housing types suitable for different groups, including families;

3.14 The existing use of the upper floors of the building is in residential use comprising self-contained flats; approximately 8 in total. The proposed units would both have a separate access to the upper floors.

3.15 LDF DP5 states that Camden will seek to ensure that all residential development contributes to meeting the priorities set out in the Dwelling Size Priorities Table. The Dwelling Size Priorities Table indicates that market housing with 3 or 4 bedrooms is a 'medium' priority, whilst 1-bedroom market housing is a 'lower' priority. However, Para. 5.5 states "The Council acknowledges that there is a need and/ or demand for dwellings of every size shown in the Priorities Table.

3.16 The proposal would provide a particular type of residential accommodation identified by the Council of the highest (2 bed) and lowest (1 bed) priority. Given these would be new units and no existing accommodation would be lost as a result, this element is acceptable.

Revised scheme

3.17 The revised proposal would provide 2 x 1 bedroom flats, identified by the Council of the lowest (1 bed) priority. Given these would be new units and no existing accommodation would be lost as a result, this element is acceptable.

Residential development standards

3.18 Development Policy DP26 (h) states that we will require developments to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space.

3.19 The Council has set minimum space standards to ensure rooms are large enough to take on varying uses. Space standards relate to the occupancy of a home rather than number of bedrooms and the developer will be required to state the number of occupants each dwelling has been designed to accommodate. The occupancy of housing at the time of its first occupation is not a reliable prediction of future levels of occupancy over the lifetime of a home. The only sensible assessment of occupancy is therefore the designed level of occupancy.

3.20 The plans show that the proposed units would be a net floor area of 48sqm (Flat1) and 36sqm (Flat 2).

3.21 The bedroom of Flat 1 could provide occupation for 2 persons (CPG minimum 48sqm) and therefore it is substandard. In addition no storage facilities are provided.

3.22 The proposed layout for Flat 2 shows a single and a double bedroom, which would indicate occupation for 3+persons (CPG minimum 61sqm) and therefore it is substandard. In addition no storage facilities are provided.

3.23 The precise layout of the existing units below is not provided and the layout and stacking of the habitable rooms may not mirror the existing units, which would not be in compliance with CPG. The CPG state however that "Although planning cannot control the precise internal layout of individual proposals, it is important to ensure that dwellings are capable of providing a suitable layout and adequate room sizes that reflect the use and type of accommodation. The Council will be flexible in the application of these guidelines in order to respond to site-specific circumstances". It is considered that in the proposed additional two self-contained flats are not in accordance with CPG guidelines and is considered unacceptable.

Revised floor layout

3.24 The plans show that the proposed units would have a net floor area of 45sqm (Flat1) and 39sqm (Flat 2), which are large 1person units. The sizes of the proposed bedrooms are 9.0m² and 9.2m² each. The sitting/kitchen/dining rooms have dimensions of 19sqm and 23sqm each and are in compliance with the CPG. It is considered that the revised additional 2 self-contained flats are in accordance with CPG guidelines and is considered acceptable in this instance.

3.25 The proposed residential properties will have good access to natural ventilation and natural daylight. They will also benefit from a good outlook and will not suffer from detrimental impacts of overlooking. Were the proposed extension considered acceptable, then no objections raised in terms of residential standards.

Lifetime homes and sustainability

3.26 Under LDF Development Policy DP6, all new housing should be built to Lifetime Homes

standards. The applicant has submitted a Lifetime Homes assessment which addresses some of the 16 points of the criteria. The constraints of this new extension scheme are such that not all of the criteria can be met, but the measures proposed are considered acceptable in this instance.

3.27 On the basis of the above, the revised self-contained flats are in compliance with CPG standards and are considered acceptable; notwithstanding the unacceptable roof extension.

4.0 Amenity impact on neighbouring occupiers

4.1 The host building is end of terrace including views over a wide area and there would be no additional harm through loss of privacy or overlooking from the proposed flats and is considered acceptable.

4.2 The proposal would not give rise to issues such as the loss of sunlight/daylight or adding to the sense of enclosure. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not have any significant impact on existing residential amenity. The proposal is considered satisfactory and is in accordance with DP26 and CPG6.

5.0 Transport

5.1 The property currently comprises retail use at ground floor and residential use above. Policies CS11 and DP17 support cycle provision. Camden's parking standards for cycles states that one storage or parking space is required per residential unit. The proposal is for 2 new residential flats and therefore 2 cycle storage/parking spaces are required.

5.2 In this instance, the footprint of the building would remain, as would the uses at lower level which do not form part of this application. It is therefore considered overly onerous to insist that cycle parking be included in line with Camden's parking standards, namely a secure and covered space with level access to the highway. This policy requirement, in view of the current constraints, can therefore be waived in this instance.

5.3 The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level of (PTAL) of 3b (moderate) and is within a Controlled Parking Zone. The site is within the 'Clear Zone Region'. The proposal is for the provision of new self-contained flats and it is therefore considered that in accordance with policy the units should be designated as car-free through a S106 planning obligation. However, owing to the unacceptable roof extension this will form a reason for refusal.

5.4 In terms of highway connections, it has been identified that work would be required to the footway/highway as a result of the development. A highways contribution is considered to meet our DP21 policy to repair any construction damage following development, secured by a Section 106 planning obligation. However, in the absence of an acceptable scheme, the lack of a s106 for these highways works form another reason for refusal of the application.

Mayor's CIL

Were the proposal considered acceptable then it would have been liable for the Mayor of London's CIL. In this instance CIL payment will not be secured on behalf of the Mayor.

Conclusion

1. *Design:* The proposed roof extension owing to its inappropriate detailed design is not in compliance with LDF DP24 and is considered unacceptable for the reasons discussed above.

2. *Land use:* There is no objection in principle to the additional self-contained flats. However, the proposed flats fail to comply with CPG residential standards and are unacceptable.

3. *Amenity:* The proposed extension and self-contained flats would not have any negative amenity impact on residential occupiers and is acceptable.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission