

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	18/03/2016
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	31/03/2016
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Gideon Whittingham			2016/0321/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
6 Coptic Street London WC1A 1NH			Design and Access Statement Revision B dated January 2016, prepared by HUT, E001, E009, E010, E011, E012, E013, E014, E030, E031, E040, E050, E051, 002, 009 Rev A, 010 Rev A, 011 Rev A, 012 Rev A, 013 Rev A, 014 Rev B, 015 Rev B, 030 Rev B, 031 Rev B, 040 Rev B, 041, Daylight and Sunlight Study - 6 Coptic Street, dated 18 May 2016, prepared by Right of Light Consulting, Letter prepared by prepared by Right of Light Consulting dated 22 March 2016, Planning statement prepared by Savills, Heritage statement, dated January 2016 prepared by Turley Associates.	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of two storey rear extension and mansard roof extension with associated fenestration alterations				
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Conditional Planning Permission		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	20	No. of responses	05	No. of objections	05
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 02/03/2016 (expiring on 23/03/2016) and a public notice was displayed in the local press (Ham & High) from 03/03/2016 (Expiring on 24/03/2016).</p> <p>The objections from the occupiers of No.3 Stedham Place/No.5 Coptic Street, Flat 10 1 Little Russell Street, Flat 12 1 Little Russell Street, Flat 13 1 Little Russell Street can be summarised as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>A roof extension will have an adverse effect upon the architectural integrity of the building and its setting, the character and appearance of the area or the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.</i> 2. <i>Two story extension will direct impact my privacy and the only outside space</i> 3. <i>Vehicles associated with the construction will adversely affect not only local residents and pedestrians, but also local businesses</i> 4. <i>Noise generated both by building work</i> 5. <i>Accuracy of sunlight report</i> <p>Officer comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See section - Design/Townscape 2. See section - Amenity 3. See section - Transport 4. See section - Amenity 5. See section - Amenity 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>The South Bloomsbury Tenants and Residents Association:</p> <p><i>“As the local residence committee we are strongly opposed to the application for the increase in height and change from a traditional valley gutter to a mansard roof. We feel that this will have a great effect on the character of this core conservation area in Bloomsbury.”</i></p>					

Site Description

The application site is located at the west side of Coptic Street, on the junction with Little Russell Street. The site can also be accessed to the south via New Oxford Street and the west (rear) via Stedham Place.

The application building is 4 storey (plus basement), comprising office accommodation (Class B1a).

The buildings along the west side of Coptic street are predominantly residential in use (Class C3). Whilst Nos. 7, 8 and 9 are wholly residential, only the third floor level of No.5 and upper floor levels of No.10 are residential, their lower levels are commercial in use being either offices (B1a) or as a restaurant (Class A3).

On the east side of Coptic Street, Nos.24, 25, 27 and 29 are in residential use, with the lower floor level of No.24 in use as a restaurant (Class A3). On the junction with Little Russell Street, directly facing the application building is the purpose built residential block of No.1 Little Russell Street.

To the rear, Nos. 1, 3 and 2-5 Stedham Place are in office use (Class B1a), whilst the upper floor level of No.3 Stedham Place/No.5 Coptic Street is in residential use. To the north of the application site, Stedham Chambers is a purpose built residential building.

The application building is not listed, nor the adjacent/adjoining buildings, but it has been identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

The application building falls within the Museum Street local area of Central London and Archaeological Priority Area.

Relevant History

6 Coptic Street:

2013/5970/P - Erection of two storey rear extension and mansard roof extension. Refused 08/04/2014

8800404 - Rear extension (fronting Stedham Place) at first and second floors levels for office use. The extension was full width and depth of the property. Appeal dismissed 19/04/2016.

7 Coptic Street:

2014/1564/P - Change of valley roof form and creation of roof terrace, including roof access window, and installation of two air-conditioning units to chimney wall at roof level. Non Determination – would have Refused, Appeal Dismissed 14th August 2014

Relevant policies

National and Regional Policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2016

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 Distribution of growth

CS3 Other highly accessible areas

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS7 Promoting Camden's centres and shops

CS8 Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy

CS9 Achieving a successful Central London

CS11 Promoting sustainable and efficient travel

CS13 Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards
CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
CS17 Making Camden a safer place
CS18 Dealing with our waste and encouraging recycling
CS19 Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy

DP13 Employment sites and premises
DP16 The transport implications of development
DP17 Walking, cycling and public transport
DP18 Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking
DP19 Managing the impact of parking
DP20 Movement of goods and materials
DP21 Development connecting to the highway network
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
DP29 Improving access
DP32 Air quality and Camden's Clear Zone

Camden Planning Guidance 2015

CPG1 – Sections 4, 5, 10 & 11
CPG8 – Sections 4, 5, 10 & 11

Camden Planning Guidance 2013

CPG5 – Section 7

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG6 – Sections 2, 4, 6, 7, 8
CPG7 – Sections 3, 4, 5, 6 & 9

Bloomsbury Conservation Area Statement/Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy (2011) - Pages 51-63 and 116-123 (inclusive).

Assessment

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Planning authorities are not bound to accept the recommendations of their officers and this was exemplified at Development Control Committee (DCC) on the 3rd April 2014 and application ref: 2013/5970/P which was subsequently refused.

1.2 Application ref: 2013/5970/P sought:

- Replacement of main valley roof with slate clad mansard roof comprising 2 lead cheeked dormer windows to the front pitch and 1 lead cheeked dormer window to the rear roof pitch.
- The erection of a 2 storey brick faced half width rear extension at 1st up to 2nd floor level. The extension measures 3.5m wide and 3.2m deep to align with the existing rear extension at no. 5 Coptic Street. The rear elevation of the extension would feature 2 timber framed sash windows.

1.3 Although this was officer recommended for approval, the application was subsequently refused at DCC with 3 substantive reasons:

Reason for refusal 1: The proposed rear extension, by reason of its bulk, mass and terminating height would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building and of this part of the Bloomsbury conservation area, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

Reason for refusal 2: The proposed roof extension, by reason of its design, form, bulk, location in a pair of buildings unimpaired by later additions and removal of original roof form would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building, the pair of buildings of which it forms part and of this part of the Bloomsbury conservation area, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

Reason for refusal 3: The proposed rear closet wing extension by reason of its height and location would result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers by virtue of the impact on sunlight, daylight and sense of enclosure to the adjoining roof terrace and windows at 5 and 7 Coptic Street, contrary to policy CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and Policy DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

2. CURRENT PROPOSAL

2.1 This application seeks:

- Replacement of main valley roof with slate clad mansard roof comprising 2 lead cheeked dormer windows to the front pitch and 2 lead cheeked dormer window to the rear roof pitch.
- The erection of a 2 storey brick faced half width rear extension at 1st up to 2nd floor level. The extension measures 3m wide and 3.5m deep (albeit with a chamfered edge) alongside the existing rear extension at no. 5 Coptic Street. The rear elevation of the extension would feature 2 timber framed sash windows on the flank and rear elevations.

2.2 The conclusions reached by ref: 8800404 (see RELEVANT HISTORY), ref: 2013/5970/P and the minutes of the Development Control Committee on the 3rd April 2014 are therefore material to assessment of the current application, whilst acknowledging some variances occur between the 2013

and 2016 applications, namely the form of the rear extension and the detailed design of the mansard roof.

2.3 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- **Design/Townscape**
- **Amenity**
- **Transport**
- **Land Use**

3. Design/Townscape

3.1 Coptic Street is a narrow street with significant enclosure provided by the predominantly four-storey buildings along it. The view north is terminated by the British Museum. Building forms and materials vary along the street.

Roof extension

3.2 Located on the west side of Coptic Street, the application building is 1 of 6 four storey brick building with stuccoed ground floor Victorian residential houses (Nos.5-10 cons) bounded to the north by the taller Stedham Chambers and 44-50 New Oxford Street to south.

3.3 Upon a site streetscape assessment, it is clear Nos.5-10 (cons), by virtue of their terminating height, fenestration pattern/alignment and prevailing development to the rear can be separated into 2 distinct groups.

3.4 With regard to terminating height, the parapet line of Nos. 7-10 (cons) is no less than 1m above that of its smaller neighbours at Nos.5 and 6, thereby enjoying an additional internal storey. As a result, the fenestration pattern of Nos. 7-10 is far more elongated, with a significant vertical emphasis, whilst Nos.5 and 6 are lesser so.

3.5 Upon an aerial assessment, a distinct divide in this group of 6 buildings is evident. Where Nos. 7-10 (cons) feature relatively similar (east-west) butterfly roofs, the adjacent Nos.5 and 6 feature 'M' shaped roofs (north-south), 1 full storey below.

3.6 The Bloomsbury conservation area appraisal and management strategy indicates that inappropriate extensions should be resisted, particularly where these interrupt the consistency of a uniform terrace or the prevailing scale and character of a block, or are overly prominent in the street.

3.7 In consideration of CPG 1 (design), a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances where there is likely to be an adverse affect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding streetscene:

- There is an unbroken run of valley roofs;
- 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 coordinated design;
- Buildings whose roof construction or form are unsuitable for roof additions such as shallow pitched roofs with eaves;
- Buildings are part of a group where differing heights add visual interest and where a roof extension would detract from this variety of form;
- Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.

3.8 The proposed mansard roof extension would sit within a 'group' that has an established roof form – one which terminates consistently at parapet level.

3.9 It is considered that the addition of an extension at 4th floor level, irrespective of its detailed design, projecting above parapet would unacceptably detract from the architectural quality of the host roofscape, the host building and group of which it forms a part. The proposal would introduce an additional floor which would be higher and inconsistent with the roofscape within its own grouping (Nos.5 and 6) or adjacent group (Nos. 7-10 (cons)). As a consequence, the contribution they make to the Conservation Area would be unacceptably diminished.

3.10 Within this context and in view of the previous decision (ref: 2013/5970/P), reason for refusal No.2 should therefore be upheld. The character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be preserved. This adverse impact is contrary to LDF Policies CS14, DP24 and DP25, which requires development to preserve and to take opportunities to enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

3.11 The proposal, in form and terminating height is unacceptable in this location and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. As a result the principle of a mansard roof extension of this form is contrary to the criteria set out in CPG1 and fails to meet LDF policies CS14, DP24 and DP25.

Rear extension

3.12 Stedham Place is accessed via New Oxford Street, via a controlled gate used solely by the occupier's properties of Stedham Place and Stedham Chambers. Comprising a single highway lane, this alley is used for additional seating for the restaurant at No.3 Stedham Place/No.5 Coptic Street. Whilst the rear elevation of Nos.7-10 (cons) Coptic Street is obstructed from public view by the 3 storey building of No.1 Stedham Place, no such obstruction is set in front of Nos.5 and 6 Coptic Street and these buildings are therefore visible from public view as are/would their existing/proposed extensions.

3.13 Both Nos. 5 & 6 have infilled the historic 'rear garden' of the properties with single storey full width (5.5m)/full depth (6.7m) extensions at ground floor level, abutting Stedham Place. Whilst the height of the single storey extension at No.5 is approximately 4m, No.6 is lower at 3.4m.

3.14 At first floor level, No.6 features a half landing extension 1.7m (w) x 1.8m (d) x 1.6m (h), No.5 however features a full width (5.5m), half depth (3.2m), 3.2m in height first floor extension.

3.15 The issue of a rear extension on this particular site was addressed in the appeal decision at No.6 in 1989 (ref:8800404) namely:

"The test is whether the proposal would preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation area. In my opinion, it fails the test since it represents an overdevelopment of the site and uses window details which are inappropriate to the mainly Georgian character of the terrace."

3.16 In consideration of CPG 1 (design), a rear extensions should be designed to:

- be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
- respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;
- respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space;
- not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure;
- allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden; and
- retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity, including that of neighbouring properties, proportionate to that of the surrounding area.

3.17 In most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged.

3.18 The proposal, irrespective of the chamfer element, would result in a substantial built element projecting from the rear of the host building, thus disrupting the current simplicity of the building's rear elevation that is an intrinsic characteristic of the wider estate. Whilst the rear of the host building has already had some alterations that may not add positively to the character and appearance of it, the proposed extension, albeit using matching materials, would nevertheless appear bulky and out of character with the host building. The adjacent properties rear extension, by virtue of its width and terminating height is also acknowledged as bulky and out of character with the host building and would not be used or indicative of what should be followed in this case. Whilst it is accepted that this element of the proposal would affect only the rear of the property, it would be largely unnoticed in the majority of public views and the effect on the townscape would not be as apparent as a change to the front of the property.

3.19 However, the significance of the Conservation Area derives from the buildings and layout as a whole, regardless of whether particular elements are open to significant public view. Its significance does not therefore rely only on the elements that can readily be seen. Consequently, the proposal would result in a diminishing effect on the character of the Conservation Area.

3.20 Within this context and in view of the previous decision (ref: 2013/5970/P), reason for refusal No.1 should therefore be upheld. The character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be preserved. This adverse impact is contrary to LDF Policies CS14, DP24 and DP25, which requires development to preserve and to take opportunities to enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

Amenity

3.21 Policy DP26 sets out how the Council will protect the quality of life of building occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity.

3.22 The issue of amenity was addressed in the appeal decision at No.6 in 1989 (ref: 8800404) namely:

"The proposal would, in my view, have a serious effect on the light reaching the premises either side, No.7 Coptic Street and 3 Stedham Place."

3.23 The issue amenity was also addressed in the appeal decision at Development Control Committee on the 3rd April 2014:

'Members expressed concern regarding the loss of daylight/sunlight to neighbouring properties and noted that the application failed a number of daylight/sunlight tests. They felt that it had a significant impact on neighbouring properties'.

3.24 In light of these decisions, it must be assessed whether this proposal has overcome the above concerns and reason for refusal 3. The current application retains the same height as that previously refused, but features a reduced (chamfered) width.

3.25 It should be noted as part of this proposal, the applicant initially submitted a sunlight/daylight report (to be known as submission 1) to demonstrate compliance with the Council's standards and BRE guidelines in terms of any significant loss of day/sunlight. A subsequent sunlight/daylight report (to be known as submission 2) was provided upon officer query. The applicant's sunlight assessor indicated that the original 3D model related to submission 1 incorrectly placed the rear of 5 Coptic Street in relation to the proposed scheme at 6 Coptic Street. In the interests of context, the results of the sunlight/daylight report as part of ref: 2013/5970/P as well as submissions 1 and 2 shall be highlighted below for review.

3.26 The level of ambient daylight received by a window is quantified in terms of its Vertical Sky Component (VSC), which represents the amount of vertical skylight falling on a vertical window.

3.27 The BRE good practice guide outlines numerical guidelines that represent flexible targets for new developments in relation to the vertical sky component at nearby reference points. The document states that:

"If the vertical sky component, with the new development in place, is both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value, then the loss of light is likely to be noticeable."

3.28 The guidelines therefore require that either the VSC target or the degree of change in daylighting are met (i.e. if the 27% target is adhered to, there is no requirement under the BRE guidelines for the resultant VSC level to remain at 0.8 times the former VSC level).

3.29 VSC Results: Neighbouring Properties –5 Coptic Street:

Sunlight Report of Ref: 2013/5970/P:

Reference	Use	VSC (Before)	VSC (After)	VSC Loss	Ratio	BRE Guidance
Window 73	Habitable	12.4	12.4	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 74	Habitable	12.5	12.5	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 75	Habitable	11.8	11.8	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 76	Habitable	18.1	17.1	1.0	0.94	Pass
Window 77	Habitable	16.7	16.4	0.3	0.98	Pass
Window 78	Habitable	23.2	18.2	5.0	0.78	Fail
Window 79	Habitable	23.0	22.2	0.8	0.97	Pass
Window 80	Habitable	27.5	27.3	0.2	0.99	Pass

Sunlight Report of Submission 1:

Reference	Use	VSC (Before)	VSC (After)	VSC Loss	Ratio	BRE Guidance
Window 73	Habitable	12.4	12.4	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 74	Habitable	12.5	12.5	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 75	Habitable	11.8	11.8	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 76	Habitable	18.1	16.6	1.5	0.92	Pass
Window 77	Habitable	16.7	16.3	0.4	0.98	Pass
Window 78	Habitable	23.2	20.1	3.1	0.87	Pass
Window 79	Habitable	23.0	22.9	0.1	1.0	Pass
Window 80	Habitable	27.5	27.4	0.1	1.0	Pass

Sunlight Report of Submission 2:

Reference	Use	VSC (Before)	VSC (After)	VSC Loss	Ratio	BRE Guidance
Window 73	Habitable	12.4	12.4	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 74	Habitable	12.5	12.5	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 75	Habitable	11.8	11.8	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 76	Habitable	17.7	17.7	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 77	Habitable	16.2	16.2	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 78	Habitable	23.2	20.1	3.1	0.87	Pass
Window 79	Habitable	23.0	22.9	0.1	1.0	Pass
Window 80	Habitable	27.5	27.4	0.1	1.0	Pass

3.30 Sunlight Results: Neighbouring Properties - 7 Coptic Street:

Sunlight Report of Ref: 2013/5970/P:

Reference	Use	VSC (Before)	VSC (After)	VSC Loss	Ratio	BRE Guidance
Window 1	Habitable	19.3	14.7	4.6	0.76	Fail
Window 2	Habitable	6.8	4.6	2.2	0.68	Fail
Window 3	Habitable	25.7	25.0	0.7	0.97	Pass
Window 4	Habitable	25.9	25.9	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 5	Habitable	29.6	29.6	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 6	Habitable	33.0	33.0	0.0	1.0	Pass

Report of Submission 1:

Reference	Use	VSC (Before)	VSC (After)	VSC Loss	Ratio	BRE Guidance
Window 1	Habitable	6.7	6.7	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 2	Habitable	6.8	5.6	1.2	0.82	Pass
Window 3	Habitable	25.7	25.5	0.2	0.99	Pass
Window 4	Habitable	25.9	25.9	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 5	Habitable	29.6	29.6	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 6	Habitable	33.0	33.0	0.0	1.0	Pass

Report of Submission 2:

Reference	Use	VSC (Before)	VSC (After)	VSC Loss	Ratio	BRE Guidance
Window 1	Habitable	6.7	6.7	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 2	Habitable	6.8	5.6	1.2	0.82	Pass
Window 3	Habitable	25.7	25.5	0.2	0.99	Pass
Window 4	Habitable	25.9	25.9	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 5	Habitable	29.6	29.6	0.0	1.0	Pass
Window 6	Habitable	33.0	33.0	0.0	1.0	Pass

3.31 The results of the sunlight assessment for the neighbouring properties demonstrate that the neighbouring windows of 5 and 7 Coptic Street will now experience VSC levels at the guide levels

3.32 Sunlight Hours Results: Neighbouring Properties – 5 Coptic Street

Sunlight Report of Ref: 2013/5970/P:

Reference	Use	Total Sunlight Hours	Winter Sunlight Hours								BRE Guidance
			Before	After	Loss	Ratio	Before	After	Loss	Ratio	
Window 73	Habitable	23	23	0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	Pass	
Window 74	Habitable	26	26	0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	Pass	
Window 75	Habitable	25	25	0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	Pass	
Window 76	Habitable	35	25	10	0.71	4	1	3	0.25	Fail	
Window 77	Habitable	38	34	4	0.89	7	5	2	0.71	Pass	
Window 78	Habitable	42	23	19	0.55	8	1	7	0.13	Fail	
Window 79	Habitable	41	37	4	0.9	8	4	4	0.5	Pass	
Window 80	Habitable	46	45	1	0.98	12	11	1	0.92	Pass	

Sunlight Report of Submission 1:

Reference	Use	Total Sunlight Hours	Winter Sunlight Hours								BRE Guidance
			Before	After	Loss	Ratio	Before	After	Loss	Ratio	
Window 73	Habitable	23	23	0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	Pass	
Window 74	Habitable	26	26	0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	Pass	
Window 75	Habitable	25	25	0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	Pass	
Window 76	Habitable	35	24	11	0.69	4	1	3	0.25	Fail	
Window 77	Habitable	38	34	4	0.89	7	5	2	0.71	Pass	
Window 78	Habitable	42	29	13	0.69	8	1	7	0.13	Fail	
Window 79	Habitable	41	40	1	0.98	8	7	1	0.88	Pass	
Window 80	Habitable	46	46	0	1.0	12	12	0	01.0	Pass	

Report of Submission 2:

Reference	Use	Total Sunlight Hours	Winter Sunlight Hours								BRE Guidance
			Before	After	Loss	Ratio	Before	After	Loss	Ratio	
Window 73	Habitable	23	23	0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	Pass	
Window 74	Habitable	26	26	0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	Pass	
Window 75	Habitable	25	25	0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	Pass	
Window 76	Habitable	31	31	0	1.0	2	2	0	1.0	Pass	
Window 77	Habitable	33	33	0	1.0	4	4	0	1.0	Pass	
Window 78	Habitable	42	29	13	0.69	8	1	7	0.13	Fail	
Window 79	Habitable	41	40	1	0.98	8	7	1	0.88	Pass	
Window 80	Habitable	46	46	0	1.0	12	12	0	1.0	Pass	

3.33 Sunlight Hours Results: Neighbouring Properties - 7 Coptic Street:

Sunlight Report of Ref: 2013/5970/P:

Reference	Use	Total Sunlight Hours	Winter Sunlight Hours							BRE Guidance
			Before	After	Loss	Ratio	Before	After	Loss	
Window 1	Habitable	3	3	0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	Pass
Window 2	Habitable	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	N/A
Window 3	Habitable	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	N/A
Window 4	Habitable	44	44	0	1.0	6	6	0	1.0	Pass
Window 5	Habitable	51	52	0	1.0	10	10	0	1.0	Pass
Window 6	Habitable	57	57	0	1.0	16	16	0	1.0	Pass

Sunlight Report of Submission 1:

Reference	Use	Total Sunlight Hours	Winter Sunlight Hours							BRE Guidance
			Before	After	Loss	Ratio	Before	After	Loss	
Window 1	Habitable	3	3	0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	Pass
Window 2	Habitable	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	N/A
Window 3	Habitable	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	N/A
Window 4	Habitable	44	44	0	1.0	6	6	0	1.0	Pass
Window 5	Habitable	51	51	0	1.0	10	10	0	1.0	Pass
Window 6	Habitable	57	57	0	1.0	16	16	0	1.0	Pass

Sunlight Report of Submission 2:

Reference	Use	Total Sunlight Hours	Winter Sunlight Hours							BRE Guidance
			Before	After	Loss	Ratio	Before	After	Loss	
Window 1	Habitable	3	3	0	1.0	0	0	0	1.0	Pass
Window 2	Habitable	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	N/A
Window 3	Habitable	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	N/A
Window 4	Habitable	44	44	0	1.0	6	6	0	1.0	Pass
Window 5	Habitable	51	51	0	1.0	10	10	0	1.0	Pass
Window 6	Habitable	57	57	0	1.0	16	16	0	1.0	Pass

*It should be noted the details of these windows were not provided.

3.34 The sunlight availability results indicate the windows of 5 Coptic Street will experience sunlight levels only below the guide levels.

3.35 Overshadowing of Gardens: Neighbouring Properties – 5 Coptic Street:

Report of Submission 1:

Reference	Total Area (m2)	Area receiving at least two hours of sunlight on 21st March			
		Before	After	Loss	Ratio
Garden 1	9.54	5.97 (63%)	3.82 (40%)	2.16 (23%)	0.63

Report of Submission 2:

Reference	Total Area (m2)	Area receiving at least two hours of sunlight on 21st March			
		Before	After	Loss	Ratio
Garden 1	16.51	12.43 (75%)	9.27 (56%)	3.16 (19%)	0.75

3.36 The overshadowing results indicate the garden (recognised by the Council to the rear) will experience a significant loss of sunlight.

3.37 In review of the submitted sunlight reports, the Council has noted the error of the original assessment and base figures ('before') between Ref: 2013/5970/P and later submissions, however, without independent verification, the Council maintains concern. The detrimental impact of the proposal remains to the adjacent properties and is highlighted in the most recent sunlight report in respect of sunlight hours.

Sense of enclosure

3.38 Given the site's arrangements and surrounding townscape, the detrimental impact of the proposal is limited primarily to the neighbouring properties of Nos.5 and 7 Coptic Street.

3.39 The first floor level flank window of No.7 Coptic Street, at a distance of of 8.5m, currently faces the flank wall of No.5 (aka 3) Coptic Street. The proposal would result in this gap narrowing to 5.7m away, when compared to the previous application which resulted in a gap of 5m. Although the rear extension would be reduced in width and feature a chamfer element, the height and essential massing would remain for all intense purposes, particularly when viewed from the residential windows of No.7 Coptic Street. In such close proximity to the adjacent windows, and irrespective of the fact that there may be a diminished loss of daylight or sunlight, the increase in height means that the proposed extension would have overbearing if not overwhelming visual impact, dominating the outlook from the adjacent property. The extension would therefore result in a significantly diminished outlook which would result in a harmful sense of enclosure.

Privacy

3.40 It is considered the proposal would not exert any greater loss to privacy levels than the existing arrangement. The relationship between the proposed mansard accommodation and those within No.1 Little Russell Street would already exist at lower levels across a public highway at approximately 10m.

3.41 With regard to the rear, other than the ground floor level, the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor level façades of No.6 Coptic Street currently sits approximately 14.5m from the front façade of Nos. 2-5 Stedham Place, currently in use as offices.

3.42 The proposal would introduce 4 openings on the rear elevation (2 at roof level and 2 at 1st and 2nd floor level) and 2 openings on the flank wall elevation of the rear extension, approximately 11.5m from the front façade of No.2-5 Stedham Place.

3.43 It is considered the rear elevation openings would not exert any greater loss to privacy levels than the existing arrangement. The relationship between the proposed mansard and rear extension accommodation and those with No.2-5 Stedham Place would already exist at lower levels across a highway, albeit of a marginally lesser distance of no greater detriment.

3.44 The key areas of adjacent residential accommodation, namely Nos.5 and 7 Coptic Street, would not be overlooked as a result of this development. No openings would be introduced facing Nos.5 Coptic Street and the 2 openings on the flank elevation facing 7 Coptic Street would be obscurely glazed and secured by way of condition. In this respect only, the proposal would not exert a materially harmful impact on the amenities of adjoining occupiers, in terms of privacy or overlooking.

3.45 Within this context, it is maintained that the proposed rear closet wing extension by reason of its height and location would result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers by virtue of the impact on sunlight, daylight and sense of enclosure to the adjoining roof terrace and windows at 5 and 7 Coptic Street and shall form a reason for refusal.

Transport

3.46 Given the nature and extent of works proposed, in addition to good access to all areas of the site, a Construction Management Plan, would not be required in this instance.

3.47 The proposal would not result in a significant intensification of use and associated traffic generation/ congestion.

Land Use

3.48 The provision of new and refurbished office floorspace is supported by Policy DP13.

Other Material Considerations

3.49 The proposal, by virtue of its location, extent of works to take place and surrounding context, would not exert any material harm upon local designated open spaces, biodiversity (wildlife, roosting bats, hedgerows) and wind velocity to Stedham Place.

CONCLUSION

The proposed roof and rear extensions, by reason of their bulk, mass and terminating height would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building; the pair of buildings of which it forms part and of this part of the Bloomsbury conservation area, and the rear extension would result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers.

Recommendation: Refuse Conditional Planning Permission