

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	26/03/2015
		N/A /		Consultation Expiry Date:	04/03/2015
Officer			Application Number(s)		
James Clark			2015/0471/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
69 Torriano Avenue London NW3 2SG			See Draft Decision Notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s) Erection of a single storey mansard roof extension and fenestration alterations for associated conversion from 2 x 2 beds to provide 1 x studio, 2 x 1 bedroom flats and 1 x 2 bedroom Maisonette.					
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions and a section 106 Legal Agreement			
Application Type:		Full Planning Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	15	No. of responses	3	No. of objections	15
			No. Electronic	12		
Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice was displayed from 02/04/2015 (expiring 23/04/2015)					
	Fifteen Objection received;					
	No 10 Torriano Cottages, Torriano Avenue					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">I am objecting to the above on grounds of overdevelopment and am particularly concerned that the privacy of Davis Cottages kitchen, dining area would be adversely affected as the proposed development's building and balconies would look directly down onto this area of Davis cottages through its roof light. As well as causing lack of privacy there would be noise and overshadowing implications. A secondary concern is the probable parking problems which would be caused by the development.					
	No 7 Torriano Cottages, Torriano Avenue					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">We suggest that the above planning application is overdevelopment of this site. The proposed building would have a negative impact on the neighbouring properties, Davis Cottage in particular, yet reducing availability of family sized accommodation in the area. The additional stories and balconies all look directly over the neighbouring homes causing overshadowing, lack of privacy and noise, particularly for Davis Cottage and 31 Torriano Cottages. The addition of extra single person living accommodation would also have further impact on the parking problem within the area.					
	No 126 Leighton Road					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">We object to this application. We see it as an over development generating noise, loss of privacy & parking pressures					
	No 12 Torriano Cottages					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">We object most strongly to this application on the grounds that it represents overdevelopment in an area of high density housing. The area does not need single dwelling accommodation and refurbishment would be preferable. It would put extra pressure on limited car parking and the extra floor would be a precedence for other such schemes and therefore have a negative effect on this unique part of Kentish Town					
	No 1 Torriano Gardens					

- I wish to object to this proposed enlargement and extension on the following grounds. The extra stories will overlook my property and be visible from all my windows, affecting my privacy. We would be overlooked directly. The addition of balconies will generate noise, and further directly affect my privacy. I also object to the density and overcrowding of our environment in this conservation area. Is this property listed as being in a conservation area? My property certainly is. With regards to parking situations, we understand that no parking permits are available for these properties, so that would cause an issue resulting in possible parking in our private road. This higher elevation will most certainly cause overshadowing to the sunlight in my property.

No 23 Torriano Cottages

- I am objecting as a neighbour in close proximity to the proposed development - Has the potential for further impact on parking pressure in the area - Loss of mix in flat size within the area/ loss of family size accommodation (usually considered negative for a neighbourhood)

Addition of three new storeys on top of the existing two-storey rear extension behind Davis Cottage - This is a substantial change, creating a five storey facade, with balconies, approximately 2 meters behind the rear facade of Davis Cottage. All the proposed living rooms are on this side of the building and the balconies look directly down into the kitchen/dining area of Davis Cottage through its roof light. The implications of this for neighbouring properties, Davis Cottage in particular, are potential:

- loss of privacy/ overlooking
- noise
- overshadowing

Generally the development of nearly all the site (except for the 2 meter wide back yard behind Davis Cottage) over the full height of five storeys could reasonably be seen as overdevelopment.

No 5 Torriano Cottages

- This proposed development would be intrusive. It would put new balconies overlooking Torriano Cottages, reducing privacy and exposing neighbours to noise. It would add to pressure of parking and is just too big for this small site.

No 9 Torriano Cottages

- This is a substantial change to this building that will impact adversely on those living in Torriano Cottages. It will directly overlook Davis Cottage at the rear and likely to cause increased noise and loss of privacy. It will also overlook a significant section of the Cottages from the higher storeys. With the creation of 5 separate flats, it could reasonably be viewed as over development in this special area of

Camden.

No 32 Torriano Cottages

- As a neighbour I am writing to object to the application on the following grounds:

The creation of 5 single-bed flats (in place of the exiting 2 flats which include one large family size unit): reduction in provision of homes of different sizes.

This proposal will lead to the loss of a family size unit in an area immediately adjacent to an infants and primary school. It will have a negative impact on the community by reducing the mix of property sizes within the neighbourhood, running counter to the Council's policy of promoting homes of different sizes and adding to "the overrepresentation of small dwellings in Camden's existing homes" (DP5).

Creation of additional pressure on parking.

Additional dwelling numbers will increase the existing pressure on local parking arrangements.

Over development of the site.

The proposals develop the site to a height of 5 storeys across the entire plot area except an approx. 2m wide strip at the rear, with the new rear façade only 2m away from the adjacent dwelling. The upwardly extended rear extension completely obscures any view of the original rear façade of the dwelling, does not respect the scale of the existing building and is contrary to the Council's policy the "extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation" (DP24).

Impact on Neighbours.

The addition of 3 new storeys to the rear extension is a substantial change which has a significant impact on neighbours. The extension contains living rooms with balconies. This arrangement reverses the conventional terrace arrangement with bedrooms on the quieter rear façade and creates problems of loss of privacy, overlooking and noise at the rear of dwellings on Torriano Cottages. The new 5 storey façade is only 2m behind the rear façade of Davis Cottage. The proposed balconies will look, from this distance, directly down into the rooflight of the kitchen/diner of this dwelling - a primary living space for which the rooflight is the only source of daylight. Loss of privacy, noise intrusion and overshadowing would have a severe impact on this dwelling due to the proximity and scale of the proposed development.

No 22 Torriano Cottages

- As a resident of Torriano Cottages, I strongly object to this application, particularly the addition of three new storeys on top of the existing two-storey rear extension behind Davis Cottage in Torriano Cottages which will create a five storey façade, with balconies, just 2

metres behind the rear façade of Davis Cottage. All the proposed living rooms are on this side of the building and the balconies look directly down into the kitchen/dining area of Davis Cottage through its roof light. If approved, these changes will lead to: (1) loss of privacy/overlooking, (2) noise, and (3) overshadowing for neighbouring properties and Davis Cottage in particular.

More generally, the creation of five single-bed flats in the place of two existing flats would result in the loss of mix in flat size/family accommodation within the area and could add to parking pressure in the area.

No 1 Torriano Cottages

I am opposed to this development:

- This is a substantial change, which creates a five storey facade, with overhanging balconies only 2 meters behind Davies Cottage in Torriano Cottages. All the living rooms would look down to Davies Cottage and the balconies would give a direct view into Davies Cottage. This leads to loss of privacy, noise and overshadowing.
- 2. There would be a loss of family sized accommodation in the area which would be detrimental to the current mix of families, and single units.
- 3. There would be further detrimental impact on road use and parking in the area.
- 4. There would be more rubbish and mess on Torriano Avenue.

I feel that the proposed development which is over 5 storeys is overdevelopment.

My husband Peter Davies shares these views.

No 3 Torriano Cottages

- I am writing to object to this planning application. It will lead to increased pressure on parking. The addition of three new storeys on top of the rear extension would have a serious impact on people living on the side of Torriano Cottages that backs onto 69 Torriano Avenue. It would lead to a loss of privacy and increased noise, which can already be a problem. In total it is an overdevelopment and should be rejected.

No 18 Apsley Road, Oxford

- I write to object to planning application 2015/0471/P, the addition of three flats to 69 Torriano Avenue, NW5 2SG. I am not a local resident but my elderly mother lives in Davis Cottage, Torriano Cottages. Her house will be very substantially affected by the planned development and I am concerned that as an elderly woman living alone, her interest may not be fully considered. I would like to draw your attention to the following points.

1. Although the proposed addition of a one floor to 69 Torriano

Avenue looks reasonable from the front elevation shown in the application, the rear elevation will tower over my mother's house, dominating her property and depriving her of both reasonable levels of natural light and privacy.

2. This is a clear case of over development. It is important to understand that the development not only adds a floor, but also extends floors to the rear, almost completely filling the garden and the gap between the houses. This is made worse by the plans including balconies for each of the flats; these will directly overlook my mother's house, and people standing on them will be able to see directly into the skylights of my mother's kitchen, the room in which she primarily lives, and her work room.

3. The extremely close proximity of five dwellings will also cause a real potential for noise nuisance. In summary, the proposed project is certainly a case of unreasonable over-development, and it will substantially harm my mother's living conditions. I am concerned that this may not be obvious from the rather superficial plans that have been submitted. It is particularly striking that no drawing addresses directly the relationship between the proposed work and the house most directly affected by it.

Flat B, 71-73 Torriano Avenue

- I would like to object to this proposed planning application. I've looked at the proposed plans carefully, including the plan drawings. We live on the second (top) floor of the building directly neighbouring number 69 to the north. By extending the building backwards (west-south-west) and adding a 3rd floor above our own building height, on both the existing building and on the rearwards extension, there would be a large new bulk of building next to and above ours. This would have the effect of blocking considerable amounts of light, especially as all the new bulk is on the south side of our flat. Furthermore, it would make our building feel quite hemmed in. I imagine the situation would only be worse for occupants on the 1st and ground floors in our building.

I can understand extending the building backwards up to the existing height of the building (2nd floor), or adding a 3rd floor to the existing building on its own, but by doing both it creates too much bulk to the detriment of our light, and will seem to loom over the neighbouring building too much. We would not object to either of these extensions (rearwards OR upwards) happening on their own, it is just the conjunction of the two.

I trust you'll take our views into account when judging this application. We appreciate that there's a need for more housing in London, but in our view this would be too much extension for one property to the detriment of those already living next door.

No 31 Torriano Cottage

- I am writing to you on behalf of my client Mr Owens is in the process of purchasing No 31 Torriano Cottage. My Client has become aware of the above application and wish to make comment on the proposed development, hence the late representation. I attach comments on a separate page in order for the personal information to remain confidential and not publish on the Camden website.

Officer Comment:

The majority of the responses discuss a number of key themes shown below,

- *Overlooking and privacy concerns*
- *Increased parking demand*
- *Balconies overlooking properties and creating noise*
- *Reduction in large family accommodation*
- *Precedent for the location*

The concerns above are based on the initially submitted plans which have been subsequently amended to reduce and resolve the concerns above but also to accord with Camden planning policy.

The revised plans remove the proposed first, second & third floor rear extensions on the building and the balconies on the rear elevation. The proposed 5 x 1 bedroom flats have also been revised to 1 x studio, 2 x 1 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom flats. The Mansard roof extension proposed on the third floor remains but has been modified in design and mass to accord with policy guidance in CPG1.

The revised plan includes the insertion of a window on the second floor rear elevation adjacent an existing window. The window is not considered to harm the existing overlooking conditions on Davies Cottage located to the rear. The mansard roof extension is positioned on the third floor, with angled windows that reduce the overlooking of amenity space directly to the rear of adjacent dwellings and Davis Cottage. The parking issues will be dealt with through a section 106 legal agreement creating a car free development removing parking permit rights from the 4no dwellings proposed.

The application has been significantly amended resulting in the removal of the rear extension sections and redesigning the mansard roof extension to accord with guidance in CPG1. The amendments greatly reduce the mass of the extension and mitigated the majority of the objections received from neighbouring and local occupants. The amendments have been posted on the Council website (24/04 and 12/05) receiving no further comments. Considering the amendments agreed with the applicant re-notification was not considered necessary.

Site Description

The application site is a three storey terraced building divided into 2 x 2 bedroom dwellings with a basement level extending the entire footprint of the building. The site is located on the south side of Torriano Avenue on the boundary with a sub section of the Kentish Town Conservation Area (within 5 metres). The site has a small rear garden and a light well at the front of the property.

Relevant History

Ref - PE9700366R169 – Granted September 1997

Change of use of the lower ground and ground floors from restaurant (A3 use) to a two bedroom self-contained flat, and the erection of railings at the front; and alterations to fenestration at rear.

Ref - 8903050 – Granted January 1989

Continued use for A3 purposes and the retention of a ventilation duct at the rear.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

The London Plan March 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

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

DP5 (Homes of different sizes)

DP6 (Lifetime homes and Wheelchair homes)

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

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

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

Camden Planning Guidance 2011/2013

CPG1 Design

CPG2 Housing

CPG6 Amenity

CPG7 Transport

Conservation Area Statement

Adjacent Kentish Town Conservation Area (Within 10 metres)

Assessment

1. Proposal:

1.1. The erection of a mansard roof extension covering the entire roof area of the three storey building, insertion of a window on the second storey rear elevation and alterations to the size of windows on the first and second floor rear elevation.

2. Design & Appearance:

2.1. The design of the Mansard is a traditional “True” Mansard design recommended in CPG1 of the Camden design guidance, para 5.14 figure 5 including the 70 degree angle at the bottom corners of the mansard and the front and rear dormer elements set 500mm below the ridgeline. The mansard is set in by 0.4m and 0.2m at the front and rear roof edge respectively. The mansard would enhance the building and mirror the existing mansards in the surrounding location both the adjacent buildings and the dwellings opposite have mansard roofs of similar design. The presence of mansard roofs in the immediate location is considered to provide a precedent and acceptance that mansard roofs are an established part of the character of the location. Guidance in CPG 1 para 5.7 confirms the continuation of a pattern of development that would help to re-unite a group of buildings and townscape would likely be considered to be acceptable.

2.2 The site is not within the Kentish Town Conservation Area and not assessed using the Kentish Town Conservation Area appraisal. However the site warrants assessment under Policy DP26 considering the location of the site on the boundary of the Conservation Area and its impact on the setting of the Conservation Area. On Balance, the erection of the proposed mansard and subsequent increase in height is not considered to overpower or overwhelm the setting of the Conservation Area resulting in no discernible harm.

2.3 The proposed second floor window would be 2.3sq.m in area & 1.8m in width. The other windows on the second and first floors would be altered to the same dimensions. The previous windows were 1.8sq.m in area and 1.2m in width. The increased size is not considered to harm the amenities. The alterations to the rear fenestration are not considered to result in windows that appear out of character. The existing rear fenestration is a mix of different styles, the proposed changes would bring a uniformity to the dwelling that is currently missing.

2.4 Samples of the materials are to be submitted to the Council secured by Condition to regulate the quality of the roof extension appearance.

3. Neighbouring Amenity:

3.1. The height of the proposed mansard extension set behind the existing low parapet walls would not harm the existing amenity conditions to immediate neighbours. The outlook and line of sight from the rear windows of the proposed mansard would not be at an angle that would be considered to result in harm to the privacy of dwellings on Torriano cottages, especially Davies Cottage directly to the rear. The increased height of the dwelling is not considered to result in overshadowing or detrimental impacts to the outlook from dwellings on Torriano Cottages, meeting guidance in CPG5.

3.2 The insertion of an additional window on the second floor rear elevation adjacent an existing window is not considered to alter or increase the harm to the existing privacy and amenity conditions of Davies Cottages or other dwellings located to the rear of the site.

4. Housing:

4.1 The mansard extension would result in the re-configuration of the building from a 2 x 2 bedroom

maisonette to a 2 x 1 bedroom flats, 1 x Studio & 1 x 2 bedroom maisonette. Policy DP5 (Homes of different sizes) seeks to ensure that all residential development contributes to meeting the priorities set out in the dwelling size priorities table, including the conversion of existing residential and non-residential floor space. The proposed change in the dwelling mix removes a 2 x 1 bedroom unit from the building which is a high priority within the borough. The addition of 3 x 1 person accommodation increases the number of units however 1 bedroom or studio flats are a low priority in the borough. The loss of a 2 x bedroom unit is partly mitigated by the improved layout of the proposed units. On balance the increase in the number of units accords with Policy DP2 (Making Full use of Camden's Capacity for housing) and is not considered grounds for refusal.

4.2 A lifetimes homes statement has been submitted with the application meeting the 16 point criteria and the size and layout of the dwellings accord with the London plan.

5. Parking implications:

5.1 The proposed development increases the number of units from two to four. Policy DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking) considers limiting the supply of car parking as a key factor to address congestion in the borough. The increase in the number of units could potentially increase on street parking demand, therefore the development would be expected to be a Car free development secured by legal agreement s106, according with Policy DP18. The area of Kentish Town is a site targeted for car free development, as stated in Policy DP18 and also has a PTAL Level of 5 that further strengthens the case for a car free development. The approval of the application is subject to the receipt of a signed s106 agreement.

6. Community Infrastructure Levy:

6.1 The proposal represents an increase of 2 units and an increase in the floor space of approximately 28sq.m. The development is therefore liable for the Camden CIL payment Zone B tariff of £500 per square meter, payable on commencement of the development

Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions and a section 106 legal agreement