

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	22/10/2015
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	01/10/2015
Officer			Application Number(s)	
James Clark			2015/4920/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
7-8 Jeffrey's Place London NW1 9PP			Refer to Decision Notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of a single storey roof extension to create a two bedroom flat				
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	30	No. of responses	30	No. of objections	30
			No. electronic	27		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 09/09/2015 (expiring 30/09/2015) and a press notice was published on 10/09/2015 expiring 01/10/2015.</p> <p>32 comments or objections have been received at the time of writing the report.</p> <p>List of addresses objecting to the proposed development at 7-8 Jeffrey's Place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nos.1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 21 Ivor Street - 3b, 3c, 6, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20c, 20 Jeffrey's Place - No 4, 6, 12, 16, 19, 20, 22 Jeffrey's Street - - Nos. 6, 10 Prowse Place <p>The summary of the main themes and issues are outlined below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Over development - Out of Character - Overlooking - Rubbish constraints - Greedy - Contrary to Conservation area policies - Creating an imbalanced built environment - Direct Sunlight loss on opposite buildings on Jeffrey's place, creating shadow - Loss of outlook & Views - Existing three storey building is overly dominant - Increased Noise - Parking pressure - Sedum roof is not practical 					
South Kentish Town CAAC	<p>South Kentish Town CAAC have objected, a summary are of their objection is provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design statements notes Camden officers considered the proposed extension acceptable at the pre-application stage. We disagree. • The design statement does not describe the conservation area. Camden's planning guidance has heightened salience within a conservation area. Preserving heritage is a material planning interest. • 7/8 Jeffrey's Place was a factory used as part of the works of Hilger scientific instruments. It is ok plain brick, since painted, and a flat roof. 					

It is clearly different from surrounding properties: those directly adjacent are two-storey, and have lower floor heights. The building already stands out from the urban grain: there are no grounds for accepting an additional penthouse suite of new height and style.

- The existing building already forms a significant presence on the skyline. The proposed roof extension will create excessive visual impact. This impact is to all neighbours as well as from the street from several sides.
- Harm to amenity in terms of visual intrusion of neighbourhood, increase overshadowing and outlook on premises opposite, no sunlight or daylight assessment has been made.
- Prior approval for change of use from B1 to C3 was given through national legislation. But Camden has now approved an Article 4 exemption. Housing targets are already being met across the Borough there are no pressing social grounds for the development.

**John Green
Chair, Jeffrey's Street
Conservation Area
Advisory Committee**

Jeffrey's Street CAAC have raised objection a summary of which is provided below:

- This proposal adds a further storey to an already large building. The new addition if approved would be higher than the neighbouring viaduct and considerably higher than any other domestic building in the conservation area - this challenge to the railway buildings is wholly inappropriate and -will neither preserve or enhance the conservation area character, it will distort it.
- It will set a precedent for further taller development within the conservation area.
- The submitted drawings are highly economical with the truth - there is no indication of the setting of this building and the proposed roof top extension to the neighbouring houses in either Jeffrey's Place. Ivor Street and Prowse Place. It is clear to us that the omission is deliberate as it would show just how dominating this proposal would be over the neighbouring streets and just how much overlooking of neighbouring properties there would be - particularly to the rear of Ivor Street and into the first floor living rooms of the town houses opposite.
- The applicant has failed to provide the development in the context of the nearest window on adjoining properties or provide details of proposed materials and measurements of means of enclosure around the terrace and any privacy screens. So you can't make an assessment of the proposed roof extension.
- There has been no daylight and sunlight report.
- We think the proposed perimeter sedum roof or wild flower roof as shown on the architects drawings and referred to in the D&A Statement isn't viable as a barrier to potential use of the perimeter as a terrace or balcony - these types of roofs need regular maintenance which will create opportunities for overlooking into neighbouring properties. It is also felt that no amount of written conditions will prevent the occupants at some time in the future using it as a balcony. If greening the roof is desired then it would be better to completely omit the proposed roof top terrace and cover the whole roof in sedums.
- Strongly object to this proposal, strikes at the very heart of the conservation area and at the principles upon which it was created. Above all it fails the key test of all conservation areas that the proposed development shows that it both preserves and enhances this conservation area. We recommend that it is recommended for refusal permission and/or sent to the full planning committee for debate.

Officer Comments

The objections received are broad and generally planning related. The majority of the issues raised will be covered in the main body of the report below and therefore it is not considered necessary to duplicate the arguments.

Site Description

The site is a three storey industrial building attached at either side to residential dwellings located in the middle of Jeffrey's Place, a narrow road off Jeffrey's Street. The building has been most recently used as B1(a), office accommodation, with permission recently being granted for change of use to C3 under prior approval in 2015. The building is within the Jeffrey's Street Conservation area and shares a boundary with Grade II listed terrace, Nos. 10, 9 & 8 Ivor Street.

Relevant History

7-8 Jeffrey's Place (application Site)

2015/0232/P - GPDO Prior Approval Class J Change of use B1 to C3 - Change of use from office use (Class B1) at ground, first and second floor levels to residential use (Class C3) to provide 6 x 2 bed flats – Granted March 2015

2014/6648/P - GPDO Prior Approval Class J Change of use B1 to C3 - Change of use from office use (Class B1) at ground, first and second floor levels to residential use (Class C3) to provide 6 x 2 bed flats – Granted March 2015 – Refused December 2014

2015/1486/P - External alterations to flats (approved under ref: 2015/0232/P) including replacement of all windows and doors and removal of existing roof lights to create two courtyards at rear – Granted June 2015

9501180 – Certificate of Lawfulness (Existing), Application for Certificate of Lawfulness for an existing use as Class B1 (business) – Granted October 1995

2 Ivor Street

2005/2301/P - Erection of an additional floor at roof level and the erection of a rear extension at second floor level over part of existing terrace – Granted August 2005

3 Ivor Street

2011/0569/P - Erection of a mansard roof extension to a dwelling house (Class C3) – Granted April 2011.

PEX0000243 - The erection of a roof extension and an enlarged single storey rear extension to a single dwelling house – Granted at Members briefing August 2000.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

The London Plan March 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy (2010)

CS1 (Distribution of Growth)

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS6 (Providing Quality homes)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies (2010)

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

DP5 (Homes of different sizes)

DP6 (Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes)

DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport)

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

DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)

DP23 (Water)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage)

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

DP28 (Noise & Vibration)

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (2015)

CPG2 Housing (2015)

CPG3 Sustainability (2015)

CPG6 Amenity (2011)

CPG7 Transport (2011)

Jeffrey's Street Conservation Area Statement (Adopted April 2003)

Assessment

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single storey roof extension creating a self-contained two bedroom unit.

The Main planning considerations are,

- Principle of land use
- Impact on the setting of listed building
- Design & Appearance
- Impact on the character of the Conservation area
- Impact on the Neighbouring amenity
- Standard of proposed residential accommodation
- Parking Implications

Principle of Land use

Core Strategy policy CS6 states that the Council seeks to maximise the supply of homes and minimise their loss, as housing is considered to be a priority land use of the Camden Local Development Framework. This is further supported by Development Policy DP2, which seeks to maximise the supply of additional housing within the borough.

The area is predominantly residential in character and therefore the provision of additional residential Accommodation is considered appropriate in this location. The provision of a two bedroom unit, which is categorised high priority in policy DP5 is welcomed. No objection is raised to the proposal in grounds of land use.

Conservation and Design

Policies CS14 of the Core Strategy and DP24 of the Development Policies states that the Council will

require all developments including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest design standards in terms of the character, siting, context, form and scale to the existing building and the general area. Policies CS5 (Core Strategy) and DP25 (Development Policies) states that the Council will only give permission to developments in Conservation Areas if they preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area.

The proposed roof extension is of flat roof form clad in aluminium, the window openings would be offset with the windows of the parent building. The proposed design attempts to reflect the utilitarian brick style of the host building, however it is considered to fail to relate to the integrity of the parent building. DP24 seeks to ensure development considers the character and proportions of the existing building. The existing building has a strong solid to void ratio with a distinct fenestration pattern, the parent building is symmetrical in its form and detailed design and retains the character of an industrial building.

When considering the proportions of the parent building, it follows a traditional hierarchy pattern with the ground floor appearing to have a higher floor to ceiling with the second floor having the lowest. This is appreciated by the window openings, with the ground floor windows measuring 2.2m in height, the first floor 1.9m and the second floor 1.5m. The proposed extension would protrude 2.3m above the parapet of the parent building, with windows measuring the same height of 2.3m. It is considered that the additional height at roof level has not taken into account the proportions of the parent building and would appear overly dominant at the roof level due to the additional bulk. It is acknowledged that the proposed extension would be set back, however given the view of the roof would be from either end of Jeffreys place the additional bulk would be apparent and is considered to cause harm to the character of the parent building.

Furthermore, the proposed extension would bear no relation to the character of the elevation below. The addition would not have a balanced and symmetrical form which is a key part of the integrity of the host building. In addition the window openings fail to relate to openings in the elevation below and appear unusually placed on the façade, thereby failing to appreciate the context of the parent building. It is therefore considered the proposed extension would be an incongruous addition to the roof.

Although the proposed material of aluminium would provide a contrast, it is considered in this instance to be an inappropriate contrast as it would not integrate well with the host building. It is noted that the roof to the opposite side of Jeffreys Place is clad in metal however this roof is not visible from the public realm with limited views from the private viewpoints.

Therefore with regard to impact on the parent building the proposed extension is not considered to pay regard to the proportions or character of the parent building and as such would fail to accord with the objectives of DP24.

In respect of the impact on the conservation area, the conservation area statement notes that No.7/8 is out of scale and character with the surrounding area, consisting of a tall, bulky three storey building with rendered facade and metal windows. The statement also notes that because of the varied design of roofs it will be necessary to assess proposals on an individual basis with regard to the design of the building, adjoining properties and the streetscape. Where the principal of an extension is acceptable they should respect the integrity of the existing roof form and existing original details should be precisely matched.

Jeffrey's Place is a small Mews flanked either side by three storey dwellings. The site of no 7-8 Jeffrey's Place has been identified in the Jeffrey's Street conservation area statement as a building out of scale with its surroundings, as noted above. Therefore any form of extension would have to respect the scale and context of neighbouring properties as outlined in DP24. The proposed

development would add additional bulk that would be visible from either end of Jeffrey's Place and from private views of properties within Jeffrey's Place and Ivor Street, resulting in a building which is not in keeping with the character of neighbouring buildings, therefore the development fails to accord with DP24 and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area, contrary to DP25.

With regard to the impact on the neighbouring listed buildings of Nos. 8-10 Ivor Street, *Section 25.15 of Policy DP25 of the Development Plan documents states that "the setting of a listed building is of great importance and should not be harmed by unsympathetic neighbouring development. While the setting of a listed building may be limited to its immediate surroundings, it often can extend some distance from it. The value of a listed building can be greatly diminished if unsympathetic development elsewhere harms its appearance to its harmonious relationship with its surroundings.*

The proposed extension is considered to result in harm to the setting of the Grade II listed buildings in Ivor Street by virtue of the additional height, bulk and massing. The proposed additional floor would be clearly visible over the roof line of the listed buildings. Currently the three listed houses when viewed from the street, have no perceivable built backdrop. The characterful historic stucco parapets of the front elevations stand out against the sky enhancing the modest scale of these buildings. It is considered that this proposal would adversely impact on the significance of these listed buildings, and the skyline of the neighbouring conservation area by introducing a considerably higher architectural element which would overwhelm and detract from the established architectural character, scale and proportions.

The proposed development, by reason of its height, bulk and massing, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Jeffrey's Street Conservation Area, contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage), DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework 2011.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Planning guidance CPG 6 focuses on amenity concerns, all developments are required to have some 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 of existing and future occupiers and 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 inseting of the elevations of the proposed roof extension from the roof perimeter by approximately 1.3m and height is considered to reduce direct overlooking of neighbouring properties garden and habitable rooms. The west facing elevation would be angled in from the roof perimeter forming a triangle spaced terrace. The terrace would be set in from the roof perimeter and the existing parapet wall would shield overlooking to no 8 & 10 Prowse Road. The formation of an exterior perimeter between the existing roof perimeter and the proposed elevations of the roof extension

would be converted to a sedum green garden and a planning condition applied preventing use as a balcony to safeguard the privacy of neighbouring properties.

The angles of downward views from the proposed windows on the extension are not considered to result in detrimental privacy concerns to the neighbouring properties especially residential dwellings opposite on Jeffrey's Place. Furthermore the existing first and second floors that are currently being converted to residential dwellings will result in greater privacy impacts to the dwellings on Jeffrey's Street. Therefore the minimum amenity harm that would potentially be caused by the resulting single storey roof extension is not considered to harm the likely privacy conditions upon completion of the residential dwellings on the first and second floors. The same premise upon amenity impact can be applied to the rear windows overlooking the dwellings on Ivor Street.

The direct sunlight received by the dwellings opposite the host building on Jeffrey's Place would be reduced as a result of the proposed extension. No's 18, 17 and 16 Jeffrey's Place would be most affected with some overshadowing over the top floor windows during the middle of the day. No sunlight daylight report has been submitted with the application, the lack of a report it is considered that insufficient information is available to make a fair and reasonable assessment of the impacts to sunlight and daylight upon the residential dwellings on Jeffrey's place. It is considered by the planning officer that reduced direct sunlight would be for a small period of the day but this was only assessed using a visual assessment alongside a plotted sunlight path. The sunlight and daylight to the surrounding buildings to the west, south and east would be unaffected by the proposed roof extension.

The noise levels produced by the addition of a two bedroom flat would unlikely result in any discernible increase in the cumulative noise levels to the surrounding location and therefore a noise report is not considered necessary, meeting policy DP28 of the 2010 adopted Development Plan document.

Standard of Residential Accommodation

Policy DP5 seeks to ensure that all residential development contributes to meeting the priorities set out in the Dwelling Size Priorities Table, including conversion of existing residential and non-residential floor space. The proposed space standards and internal height of the rooms meet national habitable standards and are considered acceptable to Camden planning policy and guidance.

The design and access statement confirms levels of energy efficiency matching equivalent Code for sustainable homes standard would meet sustainability targets covering the following

- CO2 reduction of 35% beyond part L of the building regulations
- Water efficiency 110 litres per day

The applicant has provided details relating to the lifetimes homes standards and how they could be achieved, but on balance considering the location of the proposed extension and dwelling at roof level it is not considered possible to meet the majority of the 16 point criteria in the lifetime homes.

The sedum green roof around the perimeter of the roof extension would be welcomed by Camden to maintain greater water retention and improve the green environment within Camden Council.

Parking implications

Policy DP18 states that the Council expects new developments in areas of high on-street parking stress to be either car free or car-capped in the event that they would add greater pressure to the highways. The reasons for this are to facilitate sustainability, help promote alternative, more

sustainable methods of transport and stop the development from creating additional parking stress and congestion

Due to the high PTAL rating (6a second highest) and the area being identified as suffering parking stress, the application, if recommended for approval, would be subject to a S106 agreement to ensure the development is car free. The applicant has stated that a signed car free s106 agreement would be submitted pending an approval but due to the legal terminology of the s106 legal contract a submission cannot be made at this stage.

Under policy CS11, cycle storage that is covered and secure should be provided at a ratio of 1 space per 1 bed and 2 spaces for a 2 bed unit. The Design and access statement confirms that 1 cycle parking space has been provided but the plans do not illustrate where on the floor plans it will be located. The cycle storage would be conditioned if the application is approved. However it is recognised that the site is very close to publically accessible bike hire and is well served by public transport.

Conclusion

The proposed roof extension is considered an unacceptable form of development that would cause harm to the integrity of the parent building, surrounding conservation area and setting of the neighbouring listed building's. Therefore the proposed is contrary to policy CS14 of the Core Strategy, policies DP24 and DP25 of the Development Plan documents.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission