

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		06/02/2015	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		14/01/2015	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Alex McDougall				2014/7670/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
127 Kentish Town Road London NW1 8PB				Refer to draft decision notice.			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of single storey second floor roof extension and single storey first floor rear extension comprising additional living space to existing first floor flat and replacement of front windows.							
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	12	No. of responses No. electronic	05 04	No. of objections	04
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>Site Notice 19/12/14 – 09/01/15. Press Notice: 24/12/14 – 14/01/15.</p> <p>The current occupant of the first floor flat supports the proposal. Objections were received from No. 4 Raglan Street, Nos. 1 & 2 Castle Place, and No. 5(First Floor Flat) Castle Road on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Principle</i> – The proposed roof extension would impact on an unbroken roof line (Officer Comment: Agreed. Please see Sections 2.1 – 2.5 below for more information). • <i>Amenity</i> – The proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of light and privacy to adjoining properties (Officer Comment: Please see Section 3 below for more information). • <i>Trees</i> – The trees in the rear garden have an unacceptable impact on adjoining properties (Officer Comment: Not relevant to the assessment of this application. The Applicant has agreed to discuss with adjoining occupiers.). 					
Kentish Town CAAC comments:		Object to the application on principle, the proposed roof extension would					

	impact on an unbroken roof line (Officer Comment: Agreed. Please see Sections 2.1 – 2.5 below for more information). It should be noted that the site is not located within the Kentish Town Conservation Area.
--	--

Kentish Town Road Action comments:	Object to the application on principle, the proposed roof extension would impact on an unbroken roof line (Officer Comment: Agreed. Please see Sections 2.1 – 2.5 below for more information).
---	---

Site Description

The site is occupied by a 2 storey mid-terrace building on the western side of Kentish Town Road, part of a terrace which runs from the junction with Castle Street and Royal College Street to the north, to the junction with Farrier Street to the south. The building has an existing single storey ground floor rear extension. The ground floor is currently in A1 use with a studio flat at first floor level.

The area is characterised by commercial uses at ground level with residential above. The site is not within a Conservation Area and is not listed, but is on Camden's local list. It is within the Kentish Town Centre, and falls within a secondary frontage.

Relevant History

127 Kentish Town Road (the application site)

2014/2719/P – Erection of first floor rear extension and mansard roof to create 2 bedroom maisonette. Refused 03/10/14. Reasons for refusal:

- 1. The height and detailed design of the proposed mansard roof extension would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the building, the terrace and the local area...*
- 2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to ensure that the mansard roof extension could only be constructed concurrently with roof extensions at the adjacent properties (119-127 Kentish Town Road) would result in the loss of a distinct and unbroken section roofline which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building, the terrace and the local area...*

2013/1649/P - Erection of first floor rear extension in connection with enlargement of existing flat, and additional storey to form second floor to provide an additional residential unit (Class C3). Refused 22/05/13. Reasons for refusal:

- 1. The proposed rear extension would result in the addition of excessive and overwhelming bulk to the detriment of the existing building and wider terrace...*
- 2. The detailing of the proposed additional storey, in particular the use of uPVC windows, gutters and downpipes would be to the detriment of the existing building and wider terrace...*
- 3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to ensure that the second storey extension is constructed concurrently with those elsewhere in this section of the terrace would result in disruption to a distinct and unbroken section of terrace.*
- 4. The proposed development would provide for low quality residential accommodation by virtue of the sub-standard size of the resulting self-contained unit, and related failure to provide necessary refuse and cycling storage.*

Nos. 119 – 125 (adjoining properties)

Similar applications to those above have been refused at these sites.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

National Planning Practice Guidance

London Plan 2011

London Housing SPG

Camden LDF Core Strategy 2010

CS3 Other highly accessible areas

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

CS19 Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy

Camden Development Policies 2010

DP5 Homes of different sizes

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

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

Camden Planning Guidance (updated 2013)

CPG1 Design

CPG2 Housing

CPG3 Sustainability

CPG 5 Town centres, retail and employment

CPG6 Amenity

CPG7 Transport

CPG8 Planning Obligations

Assessment

1. Detailed Description of Proposed Development

1.1. The proposal consists of the following elements:

- The erection of a single storey roof extension. The proposed extension would measure 7.3m (D) x 4.4m (W) x 3.0m (H), with a net increase in internal floor area of 27.8sqm. The extension would be built in brick (painted white on the front elevation), provide a slate pitched roof in keeping with the existing and includes timber sliding sash windows matching the alignment of the existing first floor windows. The extensions would provide additional living space to the existing first floor flat.
- The erection of a single storey first floor rear extension. The proposed extension would measure 3.6m (D) x 4.4m (W) x 3.0m (H) , with a net increase in internal floor area of 13.8sqm. The extension would be built in brick, have a flat roof, and a single timber sliding sash window to the rear. The extension would provide additional living space to the existing first floor flat.
- Replace the front uPVC windows at first floor level with timber sliding sash windows.

2. Principle of Development

Roof Extension

- 2.1. The building is part of a group on the Camden local list, *“119-131 Kentish Town Road: Terrace of 7 two and three storey houses on west side of Kentish Town Road, of early 19th century date, and formerly known as Providence Place. They replace 18th century timber houses on the same site and the irregular rear site boundary reflects the line of a tributary of the fleet. Whilst they have been much altered, and have lost original features such as 6 over 6 timber sash windows, they represent the historic origins and village character of Kentish Town which is rarely visible now, and as a group have historic and townscape interest”*.
- 2.2. A previous application (2014/2719/P) for a mansard roof extension was refused on two grounds. Firstly, the detailed design of the mansard was not in keeping with Camden Planning Guidance. Secondly, the Applicant would not enter into a legal agreement that would have required that all of the two storey buildings in the (then draft) local listing for the terrace be constructed at the same time. The legal agreement was considered necessary to ensure that the appearance of the interesting parade of buildings was protected and not eroded by piecemeal development.
- 2.3. During the course of assessment the local list was formally adopted. As such the protection afforded to the terrace has increased. As a result of their inclusion on the local list, the buildings can be treated as non-designated heritage assets and it is considered appropriate to re-evaluate the principle of a roof extension.
- 2.4. It is noted that local listing does not preclude alterations but implies a high standard of design. However, Camden Planning Guidance 1 states that roof extensions will not be considered acceptable *“where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension”* and *“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 co-ordinated design”*. As such the roof extension is considered to be unacceptable in principle. Notwithstanding a full assessment is carried out below.
- 2.5. It should be noted that concerns relating to the fragmented development of the block would be overcome if all 5 of the 2 storey buildings in the locally listed terrace were extended in the same way at the same time. The addition of a traditionally proportioned and detailed mansard roof, sitting behind the front parapet, would likely have support providing the five buildings were developed together. This design solution would ensure the modest scale of the two storey frontages would be maintained as would the consistent appearance of the group.

Rear Extension

- 1.1. A previous application (2014/2719/P) found a first floor rear extension to be acceptable in principle (even though the application was ultimately refused for the roof extension). As noted above the inclusion of the building on the local list requires reassessment of the principle of a rear extension.
- 1.2. Camden Planning Guidance states that extensions which are higher than one full storey below roof eaves or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections or extensions should be discouraged, as is currently proposed. However, the adjoining building to the north has a large projection at first floor level that would minimise the visual impact of a first floor rear extension in this location. As such a rear extension is considered to be acceptable in

principle subject to an assessment, below, of its design, amenity impacts, transport and sustainability.

Front Windows

1.3. The proposed changes to the front windows are considered to be acceptable in principle subject to the assessment below of their impact on design, amenity, and sustainability.

2. Design

Roof extension

2.1. The roof extension is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the building and the character of the area for the following reasons:

- Camden Planning Guidance 1 states that the mansard style is the preferred option for a roof extension to Georgian buildings (such as the subject building). Given that the local listing specifically states that the importance of this terrace is its small scale which displays the original character of Kentish Town, it is considered inappropriate to add a full additional storey which would obscure the original scale of the building.
- The front elevation of the proposed extension would be rendered and painted white. While this would be in keeping with colour of the rest of the building and terrace, the front elevations appear to be painted, and ideally would be returned to their original brick finish.

Rear extension

2.2. A previous application (2014/2719/P) originally included the first floor rear extension now proposed. However, during the course of assessment the design was revised to take account of concern raised from Council officers with regard to design and amenity impacts. A revised L-shaped rear extension, extending at most 3m from the existing first floor rear elevation and stepping back to 2m next to the boundary with 125 Kentish Town Road, was considered to be acceptable. Camden Planning Guidance states, "*in cases where a higher extension is appropriate, a smaller footprint will generally be preferable to compensate for any increase in visual mass and bulk*". In this case it is considered that the rear extension proposed would be overly bulky. Furthermore, LDF Policy DP25, which now applies as the building is locally listed, requires extra protection for items of heritage significance. As such the current proposal is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the locally listed building and the character of the area.

Replacement windows

2.3. It is noted that the proposal includes replacing the existing uPVC windows on the front elevation of the building, which detract from the appearance of the building, with more appropriate timber sliding sash windows. However, it is considered that the benefit from replacement windows would not overcome the reasons for refusal outlined above.

3. Amenity

Roof extension

3.1. The roof extension is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining and nearby properties for the following reasons:

- The adjoining property to the north is a three-storey building, deeper to the rear than the subject building, and as such the proposal would result in negligible overshadowing and loss of light to its rear.
- There are no windows to the front or the rear of the site within close and direct views of the proposed windows and as such would not result in loss of privacy or outlook.
- The proposal would result in only a negligible increase in sense of enclosure, primarily from the rear garden of the adjoining property to the north.

Rear extension

3.2. The rear extension is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining and nearby properties for the following reasons:

- The extension would match a similar extension to the north and be to the north of the adjoining properties to the south and as such would not result in unacceptable overshadowing or loss of light to adjoining properties.
- There are no side windows proposed and as such no impact on privacy.
- The proposal would result in a 3.6m wall within 0.9m of a rear window on the adjoining property to the south. While this would have the potential to result in a loss of outlook and sense of enclosure to this window, the adjoining first floor does not appear to be in residential use. As such the loss of outlook and sense of enclosure is not considered to be reason to refuse the application.

4. Transport

4.1. LDF policy DP18 states that, "*the Council will expect development to be car free in the Central London Area, the town centres of Camden Town, Finchley Road / Swiss Cottage, **Kentish Town**, Kilburn High Road and West Hampstead...*" (emphasis added). Furthermore, the site is located in the Camden Town North Controlled Parking Zone, which is currently oversaturated.

4.2. Given the flat is existing and the overall increase in floor space (41.6sqm) is not significant, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a material increase in the number of parking permits likely to be issued for the dwelling and as such a car-free agreement is not considered to be necessary.

5. Sustainability

5.1. LDF Policy DP22 requires developments to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures. The proposal would include new walls and windows with a higher degree of thermal insulation than the existing building and energy efficient lighting. Given the minor scale of the works this is considered to be a sufficient contribution to the sustainability of the building.

6. Recommendation

6.1. Refuse Planning Permission.