

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		31/12/2014	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		4/12/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Nanayaa Ampoma				2014/6277/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
67 & 67A Camden High Street London NW1 7JL				See Decision Notice.			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of mansard roof extension to 67 and 67A Camden High Street to create 2 x 2-bedroom flats with associated roof terrace area. Installation of gate at ground floor level.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	14	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>The application was publicised in the Ham and High newspaper between 13/11/2014 and 04/12/2014. A Site Notice was also displayed at the site for 21 days between 7/11/2014 and 28/12/2014.</p> <p>Neighbouring properties were also notified via direct letters.</p> <p>No neighbour responses have been received.</p>					

<p>CAAC/Local comments: *Please Specify</p> <p>groups*</p>	<p>Camden Town Conservation Area Advisory Committee: Object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inaccuracies of drawings - existing plans submitted are incorrect as they show inconsistencies in window levels and perhaps height levels also. • Concerned that the development may set a precedent so the design should therefore be considered carefully. • The design of the proposed mansard makes the property appear top heavy. • The development would have a negative impact on the High Street and the Conservation Area. <p><i>Officer response: See section titled Design for officer reply. In response to comments on the inaccuracy of the plans amended existing plans were submitted.</i></p>
--	--

Site Description

The application site relates to a relatively large, mixed use property built over three floors. At ground floor the property is used for retail while on its upper floors it is used as residential flats.

The site falls within the Camden Town Conservation Area and contributes to the main High Street frontage. The property is not identified as a positive contributor to the Conservation Area.

Relevant History

2013/2760/P: Use of second floor level as mini cab office (Class B1a) – **Grant 14-06-2013**

P9601120: Use of the first and second floors as a mini cab control office and the erection of an antenna at roof level. As shown on Drawing Numbers: Ref No: 1a, 1B and 2 and letter dated 12/7/96.
- **Grant 04-10-1996**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan (2011)

Local Development Framework

Core Strategy (2011)

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS6 Providing quality homes

CS7 Promoting Camden's centres and shops

CS8 Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy

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

Development Policies (2011)

DP2 Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing

DP3 Contributions to the supply of affordable housing

DP6 Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes
DP16 The transport implications of development
DP17 Walking, cycling and public transport
DP18 Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking
DP19 Managing the impact of parking
DP20 Movement of goods
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
DP28 Noise and vibration

Supplementary Guidance

CPG 1 Design (2014) Chapters 2, 4 and 5
CPG 2 Housing (2013) Chapters 4 and 5
CPG 6 Amenity (2011) Chapters 6 and 7
CPG 7 Transport (2011) Chapters 4, 5 and 9
CPG 8 Planning obligations (2011) Chapter 10
Retrofitting Planning Guidance 2013

Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan

Assessment

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of an extension at roof level in order to create two self-contained flats with associated roof terrace at 67 Camden High Street. The development would involve the creation of a mansard extension slightly set back from the main frontage. The proposed flats would both have two bedrooms (one double room, one single).

Four PV panels at roof level are also being proposed.

At ground floor a new front gate is being proposed as a security measure for the proposed and existing flats.

Discussion

The main areas of consideration are:

- Principle of new residential accommodation
- Design
- Standard of Accommodation
- Amenity
- Transport

Principle of new residential accommodation

Housing is the priority of the LDF and the proposal would provide a total of two new residential units. The new residential dwellings are encouraged in order to provide additional housing in accordance with policies CS6 and DP2 of Camden's LDF.

Policy DP5 (Homes of different sizes) seeks to provide a range of unit sizes to meet demand across the borough. Policy DP5 includes a Dwelling Size Priority Table and the expectation is that any housing scheme will meet the priorities outlined in the table. The proposals include the creation of 2 x 2 bedroom flat units. The housing priority for 2-bedroom units is considered high priority, therefore the provision of 2-bedroom units would be considered acceptable.

Design

There is an existing mansard roof extension at number 65 Camden High Street (located to the east of the site) however the additional storey to this building is part of the design of the original building. Number 65 is an unusual and very distinctive three storey building as the centre of number 65 features a redbrick inset design with a front pitched roof detail. The application site demarks a row of successive terraces that run along the Camden High Street. Whilst these terraces appear to have been built at different periods, their overall architectural design is very similar. The main similarity being the materials used in the finish and the height of the terraces. This has been maintained up until the property at no.77 with no.75 being slightly higher. From no.77 onwards the properties are then stacked slightly higher at each site. Nevertheless, it is clear that the existing height and three storey nature of the properties, especially near the application site, have been deliberately designed and maintained.

Across from the site the character of the properties are very different and the height of the properties are varying. As a whole there is no particular consistency or distinctive architectural character along the street. Nevertheless, it is also clear that the application site together with the above stated cluster of properties forms part of their own particular architectural group. Officers are concerned that should permission be granted this would have a harmful effect on the composition of these properties and encourage further rooftop development that would also have a harmful impact on the terraces forever altering their character.

Therefore the development of a mansard roof is rejected in principle.

The proposed mansard extension would measure 2 metres in height and cover a total area of 150sq metres. Four PV panels at roof level are proposed. These would have a length of 2.9 metre and a width of 1.2 metres. They would be higher than the roofline and also protrude by 531mm. They would be visible to those flats behind the application site. Glare from the proposed solar panels may also be visible from across the street because of the wide angle being proposed. It is required that solar panels are placed in a position so as to reduce their impact on the appearance of the building. Roof level is normally preferred; however given that this is visible from above the angle should be reduced. Therefore the projection of 531mm is considered too great and this should be reduced to no more than between 200- 300mm.

The extension would be set back from the frontage building line by 1.4 metres. There would be full height sliding doors which would access the balcony area. The proposed mansard would be clad in a light stone cladding in contrast to the existing brown brick appearance. The proposed windows would be finished in powder coated aluminium.

Policy CS14 and DP25 requires that all alterations respect and enhance the character of the area and location. The Council will only give permission to those developments that preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation area. This is further supported by policies CS5 of the Core Strategy and DP24 of the Development Policies which state that the Council will require all developments including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest design standard in terms of the character, sitting, context, provision of light, standards of accommodation form and scale to the existing building and the general area. Also, of a good light standard, space standard and general amenity.

The proposed finish is not in keeping with the existing property and would give the appearance of a completely separate building built on top of a traditional one. The proposal would also not relate to its neighbours in terms of the proposed window design or proportions. The proposed balcony design together with the sliding doors represent an incongruous addition to a High Street facade. While there is a variety of building designs on the High Street they are predominantly of a traditional style. The proposed mansard would be of an excessive size and would dominate of the property's front facade. Although it is set back at the front it nevertheless, represents a significant bulk at fourth floor level.

In addition, the proposal fails to comply with CPG 1(p.35) which provides guidance on roof alterations

and extensions. This states that roof extensions are likely to be unacceptable in circumstances where:

- there is likely to be an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene;
- Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a coordinated design;
- Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.

Officers consider that the property forms part of a short terrace and these properties have an unbroken roofline; none of these properties have been developed by way of roof extensions; the proposed roof extension is considered excessive in bulk and mass and would dominate the property; and is likely to have an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building and the Camden High Street scene at that part of the road. Therefore not only would the development disrupt the rooflines in the area, it would also not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the property or the Camden Town Conservation Area.

Standard of Accommodation

In line with policies CS5, CS6, CS14 of the Core Strategy and policies DP6 and DP26 of the Development Plans, supplementary guidance CPG 2 (section 4) provides details on the required residential development standards as highlighted in the London Plan for all new residential units. The London Plan requires that all double rooms meet the minimum of 12sq metres, all single rooms 8sq metres and all two bed units be of a minimum floor space of between 61-70sq metres.

The proposed two bedroom units would each have an internal floor space of 65sq metres, with double rooms of 12sq metres and single rooms of 10sq metres. Therefore the application would meet these standards.

In terms of daylight and sunlight to the proposed units would be dual aspect and there are windows being proposed in all rooms that are considered adequate. There will also be an adequate level of light from the proposed sliding doors at the front of the property looking towards the Camden High Street. In addition, policy DP6 requires all new housing developments comply with Lifetime Homes requirements as far as is reasonable. Given the site constraints it would be unreasonable to expect compliance of all 16 lifetime homes criteria. However details have been submitted which shows that the development will aim to meet some of the criteria. Therefore it is considered that reasonable consideration has been given to the Lifetime Homes criteria in accordance with policy DP6. Additionally, the development would be looking to meet Level 4 Code of Sustainable Homes.

Amenity

Under section 7 of supplementary planning guidance CPG 6 (Amenity), all developments are required to have regard for the amenity of existing and future occupants. Policies CS5 (Core Strategy) and DP26 (Development Policies) state that the council will protect the quality of life for existing and future occupiers, as well as neighbours by only granting permission for those developments that would not have a harmful effect on amenity. Such issues include visual privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, outlook, sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels.

The proposal would involve the creation of four high positioned clear glazed windows looking towards the front of the flats at Mary Terrace Road. There are existing windows on the lower floors looking towards these flats. The proposed windows would create new overlooking to the front of these flats. However there is a good distance of over 20 metres between the proposed windows and the nearest residential property at Fairfield. Therefore officers are not of the opinion that the proposed would not

lead to an unacceptable level of privacy for existing residential occupiers at the rear.

The proposed sliding doors would allow access onto the balcony and views onto the main High Road and across the site would be visible. However there would be loss of privacy or overlooking into neighbouring residential sites at this level.

Therefore the proposed roof extension would not give rise to any loss of light or privacy to neighbouring residential occupiers.

Transport

Policy DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking) states that the Council expects new developments in areas of high on-street parking stress to be either car free or car-capped. The reasons for this are to facilitate sustainability and to help promote alternative, more sustainable methods of transport and stop the development from creating additional parking stress and congestion. This is also in accordance with policies CS11 (Promoting sustainable and sufficient travel); CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy); DP18 (Parking standards and availability of car parking); and DP19 (Managing the impact of parking).

The Council as a Highway Authority has recognised that there are significant pressures on the current parking facilities throughout the borough, especially in dense residential areas close to Town Centres. In the interest of sustainable transport practices and in recognition of this, the Council has established highways policies that strongly discourage the use of private motor vehicles and aim to control any future unnecessary increase in off street parking.

The site is within the Camden Town North: Central Controlled Parking Zone (CA-Fn). All CPZ's are identified as suffering from a high level of parking stress with more than 100 permits issued for every 100 parking bays and overnight demand exceeding 90%. The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level of (PTAL) of 6b (Excellent).

Due to the high PTAL rating and the area being identified as suffering parking stress it is recommended that the applicant enters into a S106 agreement for the development to be car free.

Policy CS11 and DP17 requires provision of cycle storage spaces for new residential dwellings. As the proposed accommodation would be at fourth floor level and there is retail at ground floor level there is no suitable location for storage of bicycles.

Conclusion

The application is recommended for refusal on design grounds as it does not comply with the Camden LDF.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE