

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		13/11/2014	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		30/10/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Gideon Whittingham				2014/5910/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
25-26 Red Lion Street London WC1R 4PS				Refer to Decision Notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a roof extension at 4th floor level to provide a 2 bedroom flat and associated reconfiguration of existing extract duct to the rear.							
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	28	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:		A site notice was displayed from 03/10/2014 and a public notice was published in the Ham & High from 09/10/2014. To date, no letters of representation have not been received.					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		The Bloomsbury CAAC was notified of this application. A response has yet to be received.					

Site Description

The buildings of Nos.25, 26, 27, have been identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area in the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

The application site contains 2 x 4 four storey plus basement, mid terrace buildings located on the east side of Red Lion Street, near its junction with Princeton Street. The basement and ground floor to Nos.25 and 26 are in use as a restaurant (Class A3). The upper floors are in residential use (C3). The

immediate area surrounding the application site is characterised by a mix of restaurants, commercial and residential uses.

The site is located within Bloomsbury Conservation Area and Archaeological Priority Area.

Relevant History

2013/3640/P (Refused 09/01/2014) Roof extension at 4th floor level to provide 2no. 1 bedroom flats and associated reconfiguration of existing extract duct to the rear.

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its form, bulk and terminating height would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building, the terrace of which it forms part and of this part of the Bloomsbury conservation area, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

2. The proposed development, by reason of inadequate floorspace would result in sub-standard residential accommodation and be harmful to the amenities of future occupiers, contrary to policies CS5 (managing the impact of growth and development) and CS6 (providing quality homes) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (securing high quality design) and DP26 (managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Policies.

3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure car-free housing units, would fail to promote more sustainable and efficient forms of transport, contrary to policy CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policies DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport), DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking) and DP19 (Managing the impact of parking) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure the submission and implementation of a Construction Management Plan, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to traffic disruption and dangerous situations for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users and would be detrimental to the amenities of the area generally, contrary to policies CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development), CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policies DP20 (Movement of goods and materials), DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network) and DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

This decision is addressed in Section 'assessment' of this report. The conclusions reached are material to assessment of the current application.

2010/5145/P (Granted 29/11/2010) Erection of single storey rear extension to existing restaurant (Class A3).

PSX0204503 (Granted 08/07/2002) Alterations at rear including single storey extension in connection with existing restaurant,

PSX0204504 (Granted 19/08/2002) Installation of kitchen extract flue located on the rear elevation.

PS9904623 (Granted 28/10/1999) Change of use of part basement and ground of no.25 from retail

use, and amalgamation with existing restaurant use at basement and ground of no.26 to form a food and drink (A3)unit with associated shopfront alterations,

Relevant policies

National and Regional Policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 (Distribution of growth)

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS6 (Providing quality homes)

CS9 (Achieving a successful Central London)

CS10 (Supporting community facilities and services)

CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy)

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

DP5 (Homes of different sizes)

DP6 (Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing)

DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport)

DP18 (Parking Standards and limiting the availability of car-parking)

DP19 (Managing the impact of parking)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

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

Bloomsbury conservation area appraisal and management strategy (2011)

Camden Planning Guidance 2013:

CPG1 Design – paragraphs 4.6, 4.7

CPG2 Housing- Chapter 4 and 5;

CPG3 Sustainability – Chapter 4;

CPG6 Amenity – Chapter 6;

CPG7 Transport – Chapter 5

Assessment

1. Background

1.1 Permission was refused (ref:2013/3640/P) for a roof extension at 4th floor level to provide 2 x 1 bedroom flats and associated reconfiguration of existing extract duct to the rear.

1.2 The substantive reasons for refusal, namely reasons 1 & 2, relate to the increase in height, the detailed design of the roof extension and the quality of residential accommodation provided.

1.3 This application essentially seeks to overcome all reasons for refusal, by way of a revised roof formation, the provision of 1 rather than 2 residential units and willingness to enter the relevant legal agreements as per previous.

Proposal:

2.1 The current application proposes:

- The erection of an additional storey located at 4th floor level covering both the main buildings (nos.25 and 26) and rear extension (No.26) for the provision of 1 x 2 bedroom flat of 75sqm.
- The elevational alterations at 4th floor level would include:
 - The increase in height of the existing front roof pitch (measured from parapet) from 4.7m to 5.7m (No.26) and 3.6m to 4.6m (No.25).
 - The pitched extension (37 degrees at front – 70 degrees at rear) would comprise 5 flush rooflights and cladding matching that of the existing front pitch. The rear elevation would feature 5 dormers.
 - The replacement of an existing kitchen extract flue located on the rear elevation.

2.2 The previous application (**2013/3640/P**) proposed:

- The erection of an additional storey located at 4th floor level covering both the main buildings (nos.25 and 26) and rear extension (No.26) for the provision of 2 x 1 bed self-contained flats of 37sqm and 45sqm.
- The elevational alterations at 4th floor level would include:
 - The increase in height of the existing front roof pitch (measured from parapet) from 4.7 to 5.9m (No.26) and 3.6m to 4.8m (No.25), comprising 5 flush rooflights and cladding matching that of the existing front pitch.
 - The vertical increase in height of the rear elevation, rear extension and party walls by 3m of brick facing, matching that of the existing building. The rear elevation would feature 6 windows aligning with those at lower level.
- The replacement of an existing kitchen extract flue located on the rear elevation

2.3 The proposal therefore continues to increase the terminating height of the building, albeit less 0.2m, forming a mansard style extension, rather than a vertical extension.

2.4 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Design related issues/townscape
- Provision and quality of residential accommodation
- Adjacent residential amenity
- Transport, access and parking

3.Design related issues/townscape

3.1 With particular regard of this consent and assessment of local streetscape, the officer report (2013/3640/P) noted:

'Red Lion Street is characterised by a mix of land uses set along a relatively narrow street with continuous building frontages that provide a good sense of enclosure and subsequently are of a noticeably urban character. The street comprises 18th and early 19th century brick townhouses, 3 to 4 storeys in height, often with shops at ground-floor level. However other building types exist, particularly larger residential developments from the mid 19th century, reflecting the variety of uses within the streets.

The application site is located on the east side of Red Lion Street, 1 of 4 small scale terraced buildings (Nos.24, 25, 26, 27), each consistent with 4 storeys, a relative parapet height and two windows wide. Either side of this small terrace are the larger 6 storey building on the junction with Princeton Street and the 5 storey development of No.21-23 Red Lion Street.

In the early part of the 19th century, the small scale terrace was characterised by valley roofs. Whilst No.27 remains unaltered by later extensions, Nos.25 and 26 have subsequently been in-filled with a flat top extension to the rear and No.24 with a mansard extension. As a result, the terminating height of No.25 and 26 is somewhat higher by 1-2m than No.24 and 27.

With particular regard to roof extensions, the Bloomsbury conservation area appraisal and management strategy states: 'The Conservation Area retains many diverse historic rooflines which it is important to preserve. Fundamental changes to the roofline, insensitive alterations, poor materials, intrusive dormers, or inappropriate windows can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will not be acceptable. Of particular interest are butterfly roof forms, parapets, chimneystacks and pots and expressed party walls.

In consideration of CPG 1 (design), a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances where there is likely to be an adverse affect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding streetscene:

- *Buildings are part of a group where differing heights add visual interest and where a roof extension would detract from this variety of form;*
- *Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.*
- *The building is designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level;'*

3.2 In assessment of the increase in height the officer report (2013/3640/P) noted:

'Given that Nos. 25 and 26 already rise above the neighbouring terraced buildings of Nos. 24 and 27, any further extension at roof level should be mindful of its relative roofline relationship. In this instance however, the increase of 1m to the roofline would further exacerbate its height disparity to the adverse affect of this small terrace.

With particular regard to scale, the height of No.25 and 26, from pavement to parapet is 11m and 10m respectively. The height of the roof pitch from parapet to ridge would be 4.8m (No.25) and 5.9m (No.26). As a result, the roof extension would not only represent an uncharacteristic double height roof extension, top heavy and out of proportion to the main buildings. Although the roof extension would pitch away from the front elevation, its terminating height and newly formed party walls would be the subject of clear and direct views along Red Lion Street and the junction with Princeton Street, adding a sense of bulk to the already top heavy roof extension. As a result, the positive contribution the small scale terraced buildings make to the Conservation Area would be unacceptably diminished

It is acknowledged that vertical element of the roof extension at the rear would not be seen from the street in the adjacent roads. However, none of the relevant policies suggest that alterations which would result in the adverse effects described above should necessarily be approved because of the absence of such viewpoints. Furthermore, they would be subject to clear and direct views from the rears of properties on Princeton Street. In this case the absence of street level views does not prevent the rear of the terrace being part of the fabric of the Conservation Area.

The roof extension to the rear would, by virtue of their size and bulk, significantly envelope the rear façade of the building in a particularly unsympathetic manner. It is therefore concluded that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be preserved. This adverse impact is contrary to LDF Policies CS14, DP24 and DP25, which requires development to preserve and to take opportunities to enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.'

3.3 In assessment of the current application, the scheme again increases the terminating height of the roof, albeit in a pitched manner, rather than vertical as previous. It is again maintained that the roof level alteration and associated party wall alterations would be the subject of clear and direct views along Red Lion Street and the junction with Princeton Street. Irrespective of its pitched form, the associated increase of proportions to the main roof, particularly to the front, would again represent an uncharacteristic double height roof extension. To the rear, whilst the introduction of a mansard form would be seen as an improvement upon the previous submission, the increase in height and associated scale of the extension would still represent a top heavy addition, out of proportion to the parent building.

3.4 The associated increase in height, some 0.1-0.2m less than the previous application, would again exacerbate its height disparity to the adverse effect on this small terrace. The pitched form to the front and rear would neither represent a subtle nor suitable approach in this respect, thereby failing to overcome reason for refusal No.1 (2013/3640/P).

3.5 The proposal, in form and terminating height is unacceptable in this location and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. As a result the roof extension of this form is contrary to the criteria set out in CPG1 and fails to meet LDF policies CS14, DP24 and DP25, justifying a reason for refusal.

3.6 The replacement of the existing kitchen extract flue located on the rear elevation, modifying its arrangement is considered of no greater harm in design terms than the existing extract.

4. Provision and quality of residential accommodation

4.1 The submitted information suggests the proposal would provide 1 x 2 bedroom unit for residential accommodation of 75sqm.

4.2 The Council acknowledges that there is a need and/or demand for dwellings of every size, however Camden will focus and prioritise provision around the very high and high priority sizes. Set out in Policy CS6, the Dwelling Size Priorities Table identifies market homes with 1 bedroom of low priority, 3 and 4 bedroom units of medium priority and 2 bedroom units very high priority. The proposal would therefore provide a particular type of residential accommodation identified by the Council of very high priority.

4.3 In accordance with CPG 2 (Housing), 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.

4.4 The Council (in accordance with CPG2) will expect a 2 bedroom unit designed to accommodate 4 persons, by way of a double bedroom in excess of 11sqm, to meet or exceed 75sqm. The London Plan will expect a 2 bedroom unit designed to accommodate 4 persons to meet or exceed 70sqm. The unit would therefore comply with the minimum floorspace requirements for a 4 person unit, according to the CPG and London Plan standards.

4.5 Residential developments should maximise sunlight and daylight, both within the new development and to neighbouring properties whilst minimising overshadowing or blocking of light to adjoining properties. Maximising sunlight and daylight also helps to make a building energy efficient by reducing the need for electric light and meeting some of the heating requirements through solar gain. The Council expects that all developments receive adequate daylight and sunlight to support the activities taking place in that building. All habitable rooms should have access to natural daylight. Windows in rooms should be designed to take advantage of natural sunlight, safety and security, visual interest and ventilation. Developments should meet site layout requirements set out in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice (1991).

4.6 In this instance, the unit would comprise dual aspect accommodation which allows an adequate outlook.

4.7 In the absence of an assessment using 'Average Daylight Factor', which typically quantifies the level of daylight in a room (kitchen, living room and bedroom), to establish whether each habitable room will have a predominantly daylit appearance, it is however considered the levels of daylight to the proposed unit would be adequate.

4.8 The applicant has submitted a Lifetime Homes statement identifying design features which would maximise accessibility and the site/building's constraints. The proposal largely complies with the Lifetime Homes criteria; however the constraints of the site, in particular the inability to install a lift, provide a parking space in close proximity to the site and split levels restrict compliance with, inter alia, criteria Nos.1, 2, 8, 9 and 12. The units would be capable of complying with the remaining criteria.

4.9 All habitable rooms should have minimum headroom of 2.3 metres. The exceptions are habitable rooms in existing basements, which may have 2.1 metres headroom. In this instance the unit would comply, although marginal areas would be below this height due to the roof form at the front.

4.10 Whilst the proposal would provide a unit of very high priority with adequate access to daylight and outlook, thereby overcoming reason for refusal No.2, it is considered these elements are not exceptional so as to outweigh the roof alteration and reason for refusal No.1, which would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

5. Adjacent residential amenity

4.1 The proposal would result in the increase in height to both the front pitch and rear elevation to the main building and rear extension. As a result, the terminating height of the buildings would rise from 14.9m (No.26) and 14.3m (No.25) above pavement height to 15.3m.

5.1 Given the pitch of the building would rise away from the front elevation and thereby Nos.56-61, 55, 54 and 53 Red Lion Street, the proposal would not exert a materially harmful impact in terms of outlook, daylight and sunlight to those residential occupiers. To the rear, it is acknowledged the existing size, scale and arrangement of No.26 somewhat overshadows its smaller neighbour of No.27, diminishing both its access to sunlight and daylight. With this in mind however, given the extent to which the building would be increased in terms of height, pitch and size, the proposal would be of no greater detriment in this respect than the existing arrangement.

5.2 With particular regard to privacy, the proposal would introduce new windows at 4th floor level to both the front and rear elevation. The front windows, for all intense purposes would be rooflights

would not be capable of sightlines to properties on Red Lion Street and Princeton Street. The proposal would therefore be of no greater detriment to the privacy levels of the surrounding occupiers than the existing arrangement. To the rear, the insertion of 5 new dormers, including 1 on a flank elevation, by virtue of their position, location and proximity to adjacent windows would also be of no greater detriment to the privacy levels of the surrounding occupiers than the existing arrangement.

5.3 The applicant has submitted an acoustic report and background noise survey which includes calculations of predicted noise levels to support compliance with the Council's standards. The Council's Environmental Health officer has assessed the submitted acoustic report, and is satisfied the Council's required standards are capable of being met, subject to specific conditions regulating noise and vibration levels. As such no adverse amenity impacts are envisaged.

6. Transport, access and parking

6.1 In consideration of Policy DP18, the Council will expect development to be car free in areas such as central London and other areas with Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) which are highly accessible by public transport. 'Highly accessible areas' are considered to be areas with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4 and above.

6.2 The site has a PTAL of 6b, which indicates that it has an excellent level of accessibility by public transport. Within this context, in accordance with Policies DP18 and DP19, the new residential unit should therefore be made car-free, secured by a Section 106 planning obligation. Although the applicant has indicated willingness, in the absence of such a legal agreement a reason for refusal is again recommended in this regard (see reason for refusal No.3 - 2013/3640/P).

6.3 A development of this type would typically be required to provide a minimum of one cycle storage/parking space per new residential unit. Although the applicant has not included provision for the required amount of cycle storage/parking in the proposed design, given the lack of external space and commercial uses at basement and ground floor level, the constraints of the site indicate this requirement should be waived in this instance.

6.4 Policy DP21 seeks to protect the safety and operation of the highway network and for some development this may require control over how the development is implemented (including demolition and construction) through a Construction Management Statement (CMS) secured via a Section 106 Agreement. Issues related to traffic disruption and associated noise could also be controlled in this respect. The application site is not only located on a 'zebra' crossing with no parking permitted at any time, but also located within a CPZ. As a result, during the period of construction, vehicles would be displaced and likely require to park on the street. Pedestrian permeability and safety would also be impacted along this narrow pavement. Within this context and in accordance with Policy DP21, the development should therefore be secured by a Section 106 planning obligation. Although the applicant has indicated willingness, in the absence of such a legal agreement a reason for refusal is again recommended (see reason for refusal No.4 - 2013/3640/P).

7. Other Material Considerations

7.1 In accordance with Policy DP 22 and CPG3, the Council will expect residential developments (except new build) providing more than 500 sqm of floorspace or 5 or more dwellings to achieve "excellent" in EcoHomes assessments. This requirement would not apply in this instance as the proposal would only provide one dwelling.

8. Community Infrastructure Levy

8.1 The proposal will be liable for the Mayor of London's CIL Based on the Mayor's CIL charging schedule and the information given on the plans the charge is likely to be £3,750 (75sqm x £50). This will be collected by Camden after the scheme is implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, submit a commencement notice and late payment, or and indexation in line with the construction costs index.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission

