

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	16/03/2015
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	12/02/2015
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Neil Luxton			2014/7841/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
97 Parkway London NW1 7PP			01-01; 01-02; 01-03; 01-04; 01-05; E01 A		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
Extension to the 2nd and 3rd floors over the existing rear terrace.					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>18</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>One received from the residents of Flat 3 objecting on the grounds of loss of light to their bedroom and roof terrace. They also object on the grounds of loss of ventilation and air due to the extension restricting the same which is important given soil pipes and vents that already vent out onto the rear roof terraces. A further objection relates to the impact of construction on their amenity in terms of noise and dust and nuisance caused if scaffolding is required.</p> <p><b><i>Officer comment : the loss of light and outlook and overlooking issues are discussed below. In terms of the right to air and ventilation these are not material planning issues and with respect to construction, a planning condition and/or informative as well as the Council's Environmental Health team can address these.</i></b></p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p><b>Camden Town CAAC</b> were consulted on the proposal but no response has been received.</p>					

## Site Description

The site lies on the south-eastern flank of Parkway, which is in the Camden Town Conservation Area.

The application site is a mid-terrace three storey building with roof addition (mansard). The property is commercial at ground floor with residential above. It is not listed. To the north-east, no.95 is extended beyond the building line of 97 by 5m. To the south-west, no.99 is, like 97 unextended behind its mansard roof. Both nos 97 & 99 retain generous rear terraces accessed from doors in their mansard roofs.

## Relevant History

8700891 Erection of a part one/part two-storey rear extension comprising additional retail and replacement storage accommodation at ground-floor level and a bathroom and third bedroom at first-floor level and the self- containment of the residential accommodation by the formation of a new entrance door within the existing shop front

9003174 Erection of a ground floor extension for retail use and extensions at rear first floor and roof level for residential use granted 01/10/1990

9301513 Erection of a ground floor extension for retail use and extensions at rear first floor and roof levels associated with the formation of a first floor flat and a second/third floor maisonette granted 01/07/1994 granted 23/07/1987

## Relevant policies

### **National Planning Policy Framework.**

paragraphs 56-68

### **London Plan March 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011**

7.4 Local character

7.6 Architecture

7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology

### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

### LDF Development Policies

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (para 4.13)

CPG6 Amenity

Camden Town Conservation Area appraisal and management strategy 2007

## Assessment

### Proposal

The proposed extension would occupy the existing first floor roof terrace infilling the space almost entirely but leaving a terrace which will be accessible from the extension. The extension would be two storeys with the upper storey taking the form of a mansard roof. The extension height rises 2.29m to 4.35m and then to 4.88m and would project between 5m and 6.25m from the rear building line. It would be faced in matching materials.

### Design and conservation

Policy CS14 seeks to promote high quality places and conserve Camden's heritage. In this context it means a high quality of design that takes account of local circumstances and character and especially in regard to conservation areas. Policy DP24 secures the provision of high quality design. Policy DP25 seeks to conserving Camden's heritage and in this context it means the character of the Camden Town Conservation Area.

In terms of the host building, the roof has been extended already as have the lower levels with rear additions. However, currently the roof and the upper level (second floor) respect the building's original footprint and building lines. It is considered that the proposal would in removing the rear building line completely be detrimental to the host building's character as well as making the building far bulkier in profile.

CPG1 (Design) stipulates that extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof level will be strongly discouraged. Although no.95 is adjoining the site, and has been cited as a template for the proposal, it is not considered to set a precedent for this scheme. It predates the CPG which was adopted in 2011 and was a part of a fundamental redevelopment of a bigger site.

With regard to the detailed design, the rear dormer and windows at lower level have no relationships with the existing windows of the building and would aid in making the extension appear incongruous to the rear of the property and would be out of keeping with the parent building and terrace within which the property forms part of.

In terms of the terrace it is part of a run from nos 81-101 Parkway which in the Camden Town Conservation Area appraisal are identified as making a positive contribution. By changing the roof line and increasing the bulk of the building it would be detrimental to the character of the terrace which would be perceptible in both public and private views, thereby having a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

It is considered that the proposed extension is unacceptable as it would produce an overly dominant and over-bulky rear addition, which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the Camden Town Conservation Area. As such the proposal is contrary to the aims of CS14, DP24 and DP25 together with the guidance of CPG 1,

### Amenity

In terms of impact on neighbour amenity, the neighbour to the north-east at no.95, would not experience loss of light and outlook given the similar footprint of their building to the proposal's. The impact on no.95's privacy from the proposal would be limited and comprise a potential view of their existing second and first floor terraces from the proposed terrace. This overlooking is comparable to that already caused by the far larger terrace at no.97 and is in part resolved through a privacy screen along the common boundary, which can be conditioned. With respect to no.99 to the south-west, the effect on it from the proposal is comparable to that experienced by no.97 as a result of the

development of no.95's upper floors. No.99 has a pair of doors nearest to the new extension and these may serve a habitable room. The outlook and light to this room would be affected by the new extension. However, the off-set of the doors from the extension and the orientation of the plots relative to each other should reduce the impacts to an acceptable level. The neighbour has referred to their terrace and once again this would be affected in a similar fashion and this impact is considered acceptable. An officer site visit has demonstrated that the effect of no.95 on no.97 in terms of amenity and in particular light can be accepted and would ensure good light penetration. In terms of overlooking, the proposal would present no openings onto the neighbour or their windows and in terms of overlooking from terrace to terrace a privacy screen along the common boundary can address this secured through planning condition.

### Conclusion

To summarise, it is considered that the proposed development by virtue of its height, bulk, massing and detailed design would appear as an overly dominant and inappropriate addition which would cause harm to the integrity and composition of the host building and terrace to which it belongs and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Camden Town centre Conservation Area. Therefore the proposed works would fail to accord with Policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 and permission should be refused.

**Recommendation:** Refuse planning permission