

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		29/01/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		25/12/2015	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Carlos Martin				2015/6701/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
64 Charlotte Street & 32 Tottenham Street London W1T 4QD				Refer to draft decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of mansard roof extension to create new 3-bed residential unit.							
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	86	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		Press notice published from 11/02/2016 to 03/03/2016. Site notice displayed from 05/02/2016 to 26/02/2016. No objections received.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		Charlotte Street CAAC: No response.					

Site Description

The site comprises a 4 storey end of terraced property located on the corner of Charlotte Street and Tottenham Street. The site is located with Charlotte Street Conservation Area and is identified as a building which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The building albeit a prominent corner building forms part of a terrace.

Relevant History

2014/5073/P: Erection of mansard roof extension and green roof in association with the creation of a new 1 bedroom residential unit (class C3). Refused 11/11/2014. Subsequent appeal dismissed on 13/01/2015.

Reasons for refusal:

“The proposed roof extension in terms of setting, form and detailed design would appear incongruous as an overly large, disproportionate and incompatible addition detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building, the terraces to which it adjoins and the wider Charlotte Street Conservation Area”.

Reasons to dismiss appeal:

Due to their combined number, bulk and projection from the mansard roof, the proposed windows would be unduly prominent and would totally dominate the proposed mansard roof. They would appear as a discordant feature on the building and would fail to conform to the principle of diminishing proportions of the existing windows in the host and adjacent properties. (...) In this instance the benefits that would result from the scheme would be strongly outweighed by the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the CSCA, the host building, the adjoining terrace, which are non-designated heritage assets.

2014/5072/P: Replacement of existing butterfly roof with pitched and flat slate roof. Removal and reinstatement of chimney and dormer onto Tottenham Street as part of the works. Granted 23/12/2014.

2014/3932/P: Details pursuant to condition 2 (detailed design) of planning permission granted on appeal on 29/11/2013 (reference: 2012/3537/P & APP/X5210/A/13/2198369). Granted 15/07/2014.

2012/3537/P: Erection of extensions at first to third floor level, raising of cornice by 240mm, alterations to fenestration, shopfront and addition of railings and stairs to open front lightwell all in connection with change of use from offices (Class B1) and retail (A1) to retail (Class A1) at basement and ground floor level and residential on the first to third floors (1 x 3 bed, 2 x 2-bed and 3 x 1-bed) (Class C3)”. Refused on 22/04/2013. Appeal allowed on 29/11/2013.

PS9904367: Change of use of the basement and ground floor from use Class B1 (office) to use Class D1 (non-residential institution). Granted 21/06/1999.

P9601791: Alterations to windows on the upper floors comprising the replacement of the existing timber sashes with UPVC sashes. Refuse 02/08/1996.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2015

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

CS1 Distribution of growth

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS6 Providing quality homes

CS11 Promoting Sustainable and efficient travel

DP2 Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing

DP5 Homes of different sizes

DP6 Lifetimes Homes and Wheelchair Housing

DP16 The Transport implications of development

DP18 Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking

DP19 Managing the impact of parking

DP20 Movement of Goods and Materials

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

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 Design, chapters 3 (Heritage) & 5 (Roofs, terraces and balconies).

CGP2 Housing, chapters 4 (Residential development standards) & 5 (Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing).

CPG3 Sustainability, chapter 4 (Energy efficiency: existing buildings).

CPG6 Amenity, chapters 6 (Daylight and sunlight) & 7 (Overlooking, privacy and outlook).

CPG7 Transport, chapters 5 (Car free and car capped development) & 9 (Cycling facilities).

Charlotte Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2008

Fitzrovia Area Action Plan 2014

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of mansard roof extension to create a new 3-bed residential unit. The proposed mansard would be 2.5m high from cornice level and would feature 7 dormer windows fronting Tottenham Street and another 2 dormers fronting Charlotte Street. The mansard would be built with blue grey slates while the dormers would feature timber frame multipane sash windows. A small terrace would also be formed at the back of the mansard to provide the unit with an outdoor amenity space.

Considerations

2.0 Proposed Use

- 2.1 The residential unit proposed is a 3-bedroom unit. Although the dwelling size priorities table in DP5 states that there is medium demand for market 3-bedroom flats, an additional unit of an adequate size and configuration in an area containing a high PTAL rating in a Central London location is welcomed and considered appropriate in line with DP5.

3.0 Design

3.1 External alterations proposed include the addition of a mansard roof extension to both Charlotte Street and Tottenham Street. Policy DP24 of the LDF states that the Council will consider whether any proposed extension would respect the character, setting, context, form and scale of neighbouring buildings. Policy DP25 states that the Council will only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The building is considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area. The main difference with the previously refused scheme (ref no. 2014/5073/P) is the extent of the mansard, which in the new proposal would occupy the entire roof whereas previously it was set just over 1.0m from the Tottenham Street front building line and well over 3m from the Charlotte Street front building line.

3.2 CPG1 (Design) states that a roof addition is likely to be unacceptable where the proposal would have an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene. A roof alteration is likely to be considered unacceptable when complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions. The application building is a prominent building on the corner of Charlotte Street and Tottenham Street. It is the same height as the adjoining buildings and visually forms part of the group from 64 to 72 Charlotte Street. Although No.70 has been altered by virtue of a flat roof mansard, these works are historic and would be considered differently by today's standards. Furthermore this particular property is a relatively narrow mid terrace property and not as prominent as the corner host property.

3.3 Being the corner property, the proposed mansard would wrap around and most of the roof and would be in fact seen on the larger street facing façade at Tottenham Street. The façade and roof onto Tottenham Street would be far more visible than the actual front façade onto Charlotte Street. Given the combination of this huge expanse of mansard roof coupled with the differing setbacks to Tottenham Street and Charlotte Street, a mansard roof would appear both odd and incongruous in the context of both the host building and the wider conservation area. Although it is clear that the proposal attempts to integrate within this envelope in as much as possible, (the 70 degree slope to both roofs, the alignment of window openings to those to first, second and third floor levels, and also the external materials applied), the principle of an extension of this form is not considered to be acceptable. The Inspector noted in the previous dismissed appeal that the *“combined number, bulk and projection from the mansard roof, the proposed windows would be unduly prominent and would totally dominate the proposed mansard roof. They would appear as a discordant feature on the building and would fail to conform to the principle of diminishing proportions of the existing windows in the host and adjacent properties”*. The number of proposed dormers has not been reduced nor have their size been significantly reduced either. The Inspector also noted that: *“It is acknowledged that due to its recessed position and modest height the proposed mansard extension would only be visible from limited viewpoints within Charlotte Street and Tottenham Street. However, in such views the proposed fenestration would appear bulky, incongruous and totally out of keeping with the host building and the roofs of the adjacent terraces. It would seriously detract from the character and appearance of the host building, the adjoining terraces and the street scene”*. Given that the new proposed mansard would not be recessed, the reasons to dismissed the appeal have only been exacerbated.

3.4 It is noted that No.69 Charlotte Street (diagonally across the junction from the host building) benefitted from an approval for mansard roof extension in recent times (2012/4646/P). In the case of No.69 Charlotte Street, the host building albeit similar in appearance to eaves/parapet level, differed in many respects to the current application building, namely in that it measures significantly smaller in overall size and street frontage and benefits from a higher eaves/parapet level. No.69 also differs in terms of stacking and fenestration to its adjoining buildings on both Charlotte Street and Tottenham Street, hence its impact on either adjoining building group is not detrimental, thereby facilitating its capability to host a mansard extension. Furthermore almost all properties on the adjoining group of building to Tottenham Street benefit from mansard roof

extensions already thereby ensuring an easier process of integration than that presented to the application building.

3.5 It is also noted that No.73-75 Charlotte Street directly across the road benefitted from an approval for demolition and staggered 5 to 6 storey rebuild in recent times(2012/2502/P) in association with a new mixed use development. In this instance a 1970's building was being demolished and the site re-constructed on, hence the circumstances surrounding the case differed greatly. Furthermore the 1970's neighbouring property at No.77 Charlotte Street measured an equal height thereby negating the impacts of the 5/6 storey construction.

3.6 The principle of a mansard roof extension at the application site is considered inappropriate on this occasion in terms of form and proportions is therefore contrary to policies DP24 and DP25 and also guidance CPG1 (Design). The Inspectors view with regards to the previous dismissed appeal would still be relevant when he concluded that: "*In this instance the benefits that would result from the scheme would be strongly outweighed by the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the CSCA, the host building, the adjoining terrace, which are non-designated heritage assets.*"

4.0 Amenity

4.1 Development Policy DP26 and DP28 seek to ensure that the amenities of occupiers and neighbouring occupiers are not unduly affected by loss of daylight/sunlight, sense of enclosure, noise and vibration, odour and fumes. The formation of a mansard roof extension and associated raising of the eaves would be unlikely to adversely impact on adjacent properties over and above the current situation or that of the approved works to form residential units to the first, second and third floors (2012/3457/P). Some overshadowing and a loss of light would occur as a result of the scheme; however this is unlikely to be over and above the current situation. Moreover in the context of the height of the existing roof and also the height of surrounding buildings in a dense central London context (9-storey tower block to other side of building, 13-15 storey tower block due east), any additional impacts generated as a result of the scheme are unlikely to be considered unacceptable. It is conceivable that should the design of the scheme have been considered acceptable, a daylight analysis may be sought to fully clarify impacts.

4.2 On assessment of privacy and overlooking impacts from the proposed new windows, any resultant effects endured would not be significantly greater than existing window openings on upper floors. The windows to the flank elevation although they look across the rear of neighbouring properties along this section of Charlotte Street, such is the distance, the relevant angles of the conterminous window to neighbouring window coupled with their modest size, overlooking and privacy impacts are unlikely to be considered unacceptable. Furthermore the windows are significantly elevated at fourth floor level, further rendering its impacts as being negligible.

4.3 In terms of the amenity of future prospective occupants, the National Space Standards provide general guidance on the floorspace and internal arrangements for all housing tenures. In addition, new build residential developments must comply with the access standards in Part M of the Building Regulations. This includes parts 1 (Visitable dwellings), part 2 (Accessible and adaptable dwellings) and M4 (3) wheelchair user dwellings. Development should provide high quality housing that provides secure, well-lit accommodation that has well-designed layouts and rooms. With regard to daylight all habitable rooms should have access to natural daylight.

4.4 Assessing the amenity of future prospective occupants, the unit would be of an adequate size (122 sqm > 108sqm) for a 3 bedroom unit. Furthermore the unit would also benefit from an adequate overall configuration meeting all internal space standards including ceiling height,

room size and utility space standards, and adequate daylight and outlook to all habitable rooms. Although it is acknowledged that daylight and outlook would be somewhat constrained by virtue of the presence of a 9-storey building to the other side of Charlotte Street, considering that other existing flats to lower floors of the host building and other buildings within the general area are also affected, the effects experienced in this instance would not be over and above the current situation.

- 4.5 In terms of attempting to satisfy the criteria of Building Regulations given the constraints of the existing building this is considered acceptable. The proposal includes a refuse/recycling store at ground floor level within the building, this is considered adequate size and location. On the whole it is considered that the residential floor space would be high quality. Overall the proposed unit is considered to be generally compliant in respect of DP6 and CPG2 offering reasonable living conditions to future occupants.

5.0 Transport

- 5.1 Policy DP18 seeks to encourage sustainable transport. Should the proposal have been considered acceptable in design terms, the council would have considered it necessary for the applicant to enter into a Section 106 agreement to make the unit car free, The car-free requirement would be in the interests of sustainable transport as the site has a PTAL score of 6b, which indicates that it is highly accessible by public transport and the site is located within a Controlled Parking Zone and the Clear Zone Region which is considered to suffer from parking stress.

- 5.2 DP21 seeks to protect the safety and operation of the highway network. For some development this may require control over how the development is implemented (including demolition and construction) through a Construction Management Plan (CMP) secured via S106. The CMP should include coordination of the works to take account of cumulative impacts relating to construction movements in the area. . Although this is unlikely to result in a large number of heavy construction vehicle movements to and from the site, the building is a corner plot with a pedestrian crossing located on Charlotte Street. The site is located within the Clear Zone Region which is a highly constrained area in regard to transport and there are a number of planned developments in the area which may also contribute to the level of cumulative construction traffic in the area. Due to the scale and kind of this development and the likely method of construction a CMP would be required, should permission be granted, in order to mitigate any adverse impacts. If permission were to be granted, a CMP would be secured by S106 agreement.

- 5.3 Planning application 2012/3537/P proposes a space for 10 cycle spaces to the rear of the retail unit accessible off Tottenham Street. As 7 cycle spaces were required in the previous application to satisfy cycle parking and use standards, the 10 spaces provided as indicated in the current set of proposed drawings would more than suffice to account for the additional unit

6.0 CIL

- 6.1 This proposal would be liable for the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the additional floorspace proposes new self-contained residential accommodation. This would be collected by Camden after the scheme is implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, submit a commencement notice and late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index.

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 The design of the proposed roof extension in terms of setting and form would appear incongruous as an overly large, disproportionate and incompatible addition to the host building, the terraces to which it adjoins and the wider Charlotte Street Conservation Area, contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage), DP24 (Design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Policies.

Recommendation: Refuse Permission.