

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	16/07/2014	<b>Officer:</b>	David Peres Da Costa
<b>Application Address</b>		<b>Application Number(s)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Signature</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Signature</b>	
65 Gascony Avenue London NW6 4ND		2014/3144/P			
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
Conversion from single dwelling to 2x1 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom flats including rear dormer and front rooflights.					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant planning permission subject to s106 legal agreement			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full planning permission			
<b>Consultations</b>	<b>Date advertised</b>	<b>21 days elapsed</b>	<b>Date posted</b>	<b>21 days elapsed</b>	
<b>Press notice</b>	n/a		<b>Site notice</b>	n/a	
	<b>Date sent</b>	<b>21 days elapsed</b>	<b># Notified</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b># Objections</b>
<b>Adjoining Occupier letters</b>	22/5/14	12/6/14	16	-	-
<b>Consultation responses (including CAACs):</b>	No responses received.				
<b>Site Description</b>					
The application site is a mid-terrace 3-storey building that is located on the north side of Gascony Avenue close to the junction with Smyrna Road that runs to the south.					
The surrounding area is characterised by dwellings of similar style and character. The application site is not within a conservation area and the building is not listed.					
<b>Relevant History</b>					
2013/5528/P: Installation of rear dormer, fire escape stair from ground to third floor level on the rear elevation and rooflights in the front roof slope all in association with conversion of the building from single family dwelling to 2 x1 bedroom and 1 x 3 bedroom flats (Class C3). Refused 26/11/2013 Reason for refusal:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed rear dormer extension, by reason of its design, scale and bulk, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider terrace</li> <li>2. The proposed external staircase, by virtue of its siting, size and design would be an incongruous addition and would add visual clutter to the rear of the host building, failing to respect its character and integrity</li> <li>3. The proposed external stair would provide an increased opportunity to overlook the occupiers of nos. 63 and 67 Gascony Avenue to the detriment of their privacy</li> <li>4. The proposal, in the absence of a legal agreement for a car-free development, would be likely</li> </ol>					

to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area. The officer's report notes the following: However it would be set within 0.2m of eaves level and would increase its visibility and prominence within the roof slope. This together with the installation of a new door opening, which would cut through the eaves of the roof to provide access to the roof of the three storey closet wing at the rear, would further harmfully affect the integrity of the existing roof.

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 (Distribution of Growth)

CS5 (Managing the Impact of Growth and Development)

CS14 (Promoting High Quality Places and Conserving Our Heritage)

DP24 (Securing High Quality Design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the Impact of Development on Occupiers and Neighbours)

### Camden Planning Guidance

London Plan 2011

NPPF 2012

## Assessment

**Proposal:** Permission is sought to convert the property into 3 flats (2x1 bedroom and 1 x 3 bedroom) with a dormer roof extension. The extension would be 4.44m wide and 2.12m high. It would have 3 sash windows and the dormer would tile hung with slate.

A1-bed flat would be provided on each floor (ground and 1<sup>st</sup>), with a 2-bed maisonette at 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor (within the proposed roof extension).

Three conservation style roof lights would be installed in the front roof slope that each measure 0.8m by 0.9m and would be set back from the eaves by 1.6m.

## Background

Planning permission was previously refused (26/11/2013) for installation of rear dormer, fire escape stair from ground to third floor level on the rear elevation and rooflights in the front roof slope all in association with conversion of the building from single family dwelling to 2 x1 bedroom and 1 x 3 bedroom flats. There were 4 reasons for refusal. Two of these related to the design (fire escape stair and door at roof level). The third related to overlooking and loss of privacy that would result from the fire escape. The final reason was absence of a legal agreement to secure car free housing.

This proposal omits the fire escape stair and door at roof level providing access to the fire escape (from the landing between 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and roof level). Also a 2-bed flat (at 2<sup>nd</sup> and roof level) is proposed rather than a 3 bed flat. The previous assessment and refusal considered that the conversion from a single house to 3 flats was acceptable. The quality of accommodation and residential mix were also acceptable.

## Assessment:

### PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The existing building was used as bedsit HMO units. There is no planning history to determine that this use was authorised. The Council's Housing team have confirmed that the HMO licence for the property was revoked earlier this year and has reverted back to a single family dwelling.

The proposal is for change the use of the building to form three self-contained residential units. The

provision of new residential dwellings is supported in line with policies CS6 and DP2 provided they meet the recommended residential development standards and provide an acceptable mix of different size units in accordance with policy DP5. The previous application did not consider the potential loss of a HMO a reason for refusal. Specifically the officer noted that the authorised use of the property is considered to be a single residential dwelling. Consequently, it would be unreasonable to further consider this matter as part of this assessment.

## **QUALITY OF RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION**

### **Unit mix**

With regard to housing mix, Policy DP5 (Homes of different sizes) seeks to secure a range of unit sizes within developments, including large and small units, in order to address housing need in the Borough. The policy states that each development should contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities by containing a mix of large and small homes / units overall. This is in line with core policy CS6 (Providing quality homes) which aims to promote a variety of housing typologies and encourage self-contained units. According to the dwelling size priority table in Policy DP5 1 bedroom units are lower priority and 2-bed flats very high priority.

The proposal would introduce 2 x 1-bedroom units and 1 x 2-bedroom unit. Given the site constraints, it is considered that the loss of a large six bedroom family sized unit and creation of 2 x 1 bed units and 1 x 2 bed units would comply with the policy requirements of DP5.

### **Quality of accommodation**

#### Minimum space standards

With regard to the quality of the residential accommodation proposed, flat A on ground floor level would be 52.5sq. m, Flat B on 1st floor level 48 sq. m and Flat C on 2nd floor level 85.2 sq. m. The CPG2 (Housing) guidance requires 1 person units to be a minimum of 48 sq. m; a 2-person unit should be 48sq.m and a 4-person unit should be 75sq.m. The proposal therefore complies with the minimum space standards and is considered acceptable in this respect.

The new flats would be accessed via the existing front door at ground floor level. The existing entrance lobby would provide access to the new residential units.

#### Lifetime homes

The applicant has submitted a lifetime homes statement in support of the application. They have indicated the criteria that could be met and those which fail and why. Given that the proposal relates to a conversion scheme it would not be considered possible to fully accord with the principles of lifetime homes. Taking into consideration the physical constraints of the building and the fact that two of the three new flats would be located above ground floor level, it is acknowledged that it will not be possible to meet all elements of the lifetime homes standards. Therefore, there is justification for not meeting the requirements of policy DP6. The applicant would be encouraged to achieve as many features as possible and a condition would be attached to ensure this.

#### Waste/Recycling Storage

Bin storage is shown as being located in the front garden area at ground floor level. This is a similar arrangement to a number of other properties within the street and would therefore be considered acceptable.

Design:

### Rear dormer

A dormer is proposed within the rear elevation. Whilst it was noted during the site visit that other rear dormers exist at neighbouring dwellings including no. 75 (granted in 2003), no. 51 (granted in 2004), no. 85 (granted in 2004), and no. 3 (granted in 2010). The dormer granted at no. 85 appears wider than the current proposal. The dormer would be 500mm below the roof ridge and would be 0.91m from the eaves which complies with CPG1 (Design) guidance. It would also be set in an appropriately at the sides. Although the dormer is somewhat wide (4.44m), it would not be reasonable to seek a reduction in size given the previous officer's delegated report and the larger dormer previously allowed at no. 85.

It is proposed to insert three rooflights to the front roofslope. The rooflights would not be visible from the street and would not be considered to harm the appearance of the building.

### AMENITY

#### Future occupiers

The flats would have dual aspect with all flats have windows facing onto Gascony Avenue and to the rear towards the rear garden. The habitable rooms would each be served by at least one window and would be considered to have sufficient levels of daylight and sunlight as well as sufficient ventilation.

CPG2 (Housing) states that all new dwellings should provide access to some form of private outdoor amenity space, e.g. balconies, roof terraces or communal gardens.

It is acknowledged that in some instances, particularly in Central London Areas (CLA) where existing buildings are converted into residential accommodation, the provision of amenity space may be restricted. The ground floor flat would have access to the rear garden whilst the flats above would have no form of amenity. Given the site constraints, this arrangement is considered acceptable in this instance.

#### Impact on neighbouring amenity

The proposed dormer window would not be considered to result in any additional impact on neighbouring properties over and above the existing situation in terms of overlooking and overshadowing.

The proposal would intensify the use of the building however, not to a degree which would result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers. With sufficient sound / noise insulation as required by Building Regulations, such concerns can be overcome.

### HIGHWAY/PARKING ISSUES

#### Car free development

The site has public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 6a (excellent). Not making the development car free would increase demand for on-street parking which is considered unacceptable in CPZ's that are highly stressed. Two of the new residential units would be required to be car free and this will be secured by s106 legal agreement.

#### Cycle parking

Camden's Parking Standards (and those of the London Plan) for cycles, policy DP18, states that one storage or parking space is required per residential unit up to two bedroom. As a minimum, 3 spaces

would therefore be required. No provision has been made for cycle storage. However there is sufficient space within the flats themselves that would not discourage people from cycling if they were so inclined to do so.

#### CIL

The proposal would create approximately 32sq.m of internal floorspace in the loft. However it would result in the creation of two new units. As such, the proposal would trigger the requirement to contribute to the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The CIL would have been collected by Camden after the scheme had been implemented and could have been subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index. An informative will be added to the decision notice reminding the applicant of the CIL requirement.

**Recommendation:** Grant planning permission subject to s106