| Delegated Report (Refusal) | | Analysis sheet N/A / attached | | Expiry Date: | | 14/09/20 | 14/09/2016 | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|--|
| | | | | Consul Expiry | Date: | 07/09/2016 | | |
| Officer Robert Lester | | | Application Nu 2016/4038/P | Application Number(s) 2016/4038/P | | | | |
| Application Address | | | Drowing Numb | Drawing Numbers | | | | |
| Application Address 34 - 38 Eversholt Street | | | Drawing Numb | Drawing Numbers | | | | |
| London NW1 1DA | | | Refer to Decisio | Refer to Decision Notice | | | | |
| PO 3/4 Area Team Signature C&UD Authorised Officer Signature | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | | |
| Third floor extensions to existing building, including a mansard addition and flat roofed rear extension, to create 2 x 2 bed residential flats (C3) together with the reconfiguration of access steps and new cycle storage enclosures at ground floor level. | | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): Refuse Permission | | | | | | | | |
| Application Type: | Full Planning Permission | | | | | | | |
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | | ecision Notice | | | | | | |
| Informatives: | Note: to Decision Notice | | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | No. notified | 56 | No. of responses | 01 | No. of o | bjections | 01 | |
| | | | No. electronic | 00 | | | | |
| Summary of consultation responses: | One objection received from a neighbouring property at 10 Edith Neville Cottages: | | | | | | | |
| | Loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties. | | | | | | | |
| | Officer Response: See the amenity impact section within the main body of the report below | | | | | | | |
| CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify | N/A | | | | | | | |

Site Description

The site is located on the eastern side of Eversholt Street on the corner of Doric Way, close to Euston Station. It is currently occupied by a nightclub at ground and basement levels with 6 residential units on the first and second floors. The main entrance to the nightclub is on Eversholt Street with the residential units gaining access through an independent entrance on Doric Way. The units benefit from existing waste and cycle storage.

The property is not within a conservation area and is not subject to a statutory listing.

The building and adjacent terrace at 34-70 Eversholt Street are designated as locally listed buildings, defined in the Council's Local List as a terrace of early19th Century terraced houses with shops at ground floor. All are 3 storey with basement. In terms of size, proportions, materials and repetition this complete section of terrace is an important part of the townscape with a collective identity.

The host building has already been significantly extended with two storey extensions leading to addition floors.

Relevant History

CTP/L13/8/C/11084: Planning permission was granted on 28/07/1971 for the conversion of 34, 36 and 38 Eversholt Street to a basement and ground floor restaurant with two floors of residential accommodation above.

2009/5174/P: A planning application was withdrawn on 10/02/2010 for "The erection of a three storey side extension at first, second and third floor levels, erection of a roof extension on main building to create new third floor, installation of new roof terrace on eastern side at third floor level and minor alterations to western and southern elevations, in association with the conversion and extension of existing flats and office (Class B1) on upper floors and eastern part of ground floor, to provide 9 residential units (2 x 1-bed, 5 x 2 bed, 1 x 3-bed and 1 x 4-bed).

2010/2940/P: Planning permission was granted subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement on 21/12/2010 for the "Conversion of the upper floors and erection of two storey extension above existing nightclub to create 4 x 2 bed units and 2 x 1bed units (class C3) and change of use of the existing ancillary office space to 1 x 4 bed unit (class C3) and associated external alterations." This permission has been implemented.

2011/1283/P: Planning permission was granted on 09/05/2011 for "Alterations to entail retained mansard roof with creation of 2 x rear dormer windows at first floor level (as an amendment to planning permission ref: 2010/2940/P granted on 21/12/2010 for the conversion of the upper floors and erection of two storey extension to create 4 x 2 bed units and 2 x 1bed units and change of use of the existing ancillary office space to 1 x 4 bed unit (class C3))".

2015/4296/P. Planning permission was granted for a mansard roof extension to create a third floor to the building, to provide a 2 bedroom flat.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2016

Local Development Framework 2010

Set out below are the LDF policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against. However, it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals

against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

Core Strategy

CS1 (Distribution of growth)

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS6 (Providing quality homes)

CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)

CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

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

DP5 (Homes of different sizes)

DP6 (Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes)

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)

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG)

CPG1 (Design) 2015

CPG2 (Housing) 2015

CPG3 (Sustainability) 2015

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011

CPG7 (Transport) 2011

CPG8 (Planning Obligations) 2015

Assessment

Background

Planning permission was granted in 2010 for the conversion of the upper floors and a two storey extension above the nightclub on the Doric Way frontage to provide 7 residential units (2 x studios, 4 x 2 bed and 1 x 4 bed). In granting permission the Council's report made clear that the 2 storey extension above the nightclub fronting Doric Way was appropriate in terms of height and design due to it being subordinate to the main building on Eversholt Street and a similar height to the adjacent Doric Way building

In 2011 an amendment was approved to the 2010 permission to allow the retention of a small mansard roof section to the rear of the existing Doric Way building.

The 2010-2011 permissions have been built completed.

In 2014 pre-application advice was obtained for the erection of a third floor extension above the buildings consisting of a mansard addition to the building fronting Eversholt Street and an additional floor to the building fronting Doric Way, all to provide 4 x studio flats. The Council's pre-application advice stated that the proposed roof extension would appear incongruous and harmful to the appearance of the adjacent terrace at 40-70 and detrimental to the character and appearance of the area generally. The extensions were considered to be incongruous and detrimental to this prominent corner site.

Planning permission was later granted in 2015 for a traditional mansard roof extension to the building fronting Eversholt Street to provide an additional 2 bedroom flat. It is noted that the plans originally submitted with that application included a third floor extension to the building fronting Doric Way. This element was subsequently removed following negotiations due to its unacceptable design and impact on the surrounding area..

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a third floor extension above the buildings consisting of a mansard addition to the building fronting Eversholt Street and an additional floor to the building fronting Doric Way. The additional level would provide 2 x 2 bed residential flats together with the reconfiguration of access steps and new cycle storage enclosures at ground floor level.

Main Issues

The main issues to consider on this application are an assessment of the i) design and visual impact of the proposed extensions, ii) the amenity impact on neighbouring properties, iii), the transport implications of the development, iv), the standard of accommodation provided.

Design and Visual Impact

Policy CS14 requires development to have the highest standard of design that respects the local context and character.

Policy DP24 requires development including extensions to have the highest standard of design, considering the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; and the character and proportions of the existing building.

The Council's Design Guidance (CPG1) provides detailed policy guidance on roof extensions and additional storeys and states that they are likely to be acceptable where there is an established form of roof addition on the terrace, the extension is architecturally sympathetic or there is variety in the existing roof form and the extension would not result in harm. CPG1 (Design) advises that roof extensions are likely to be unacceptable where it would have an adverse effect on the street scene,

the existing terrace has an unimpaired roof, and the building already has additional storeys and where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed.

The part of the existing building fronting Eversholt Street is a 3 storey building with a flat roof. The roof of the building contains a single storey stair overrun, projecting above the roof on its southern side and safety railings around the perimeter of the roof. The overrun is largely concealed by a party wall upstand (parapet) fronting Doric Way. The adjoining terrace at 40-70 Eversholt Street is also 3 storeys in height and has traditional butterfly roofs set behind a parapet. The part of the existing building fronting Doric Way is now 3 storeys, as planning permission 2010/2940/P for a first-second floor infill extension has now been constructed on the site. Its 3 storey height is now considered to be in keeping with the other buildings on Doric Way and remaining subservient to the main structure on Eversholt Street as it is set below and maintains a shadow gap. The side/rear return element fronting Doric Way is 3 storeys in height with a flat roof. There is a minor difference in the height between the section immediately to the rear of the Eversholt Street building, which was previously extended, and the part of the building further to the east along Doric Way which was originally 3 storeys in height. The adjacent/adjoining 3 storey building to the east, Ian Hamilton House is lower in height.

In relation to the part of the building fronting Eversholt Street. The proposed mansard addition would have a traditional design with a steep front pitch and traditional materials/window design to match the existing building and terrace. However, the proposed mansard addition would project forward of the angled side parapet. This is different to the previously approved mansard extension at this site (ref: 2015/4296/P), where the mansard was set back behind the side parapet to conceal its appearance. This additional forward projection beyond the parapet would make the mansard addition highly visible within the street scene on this prominent junction location. In a traditional mansard design, the side and end parapets would typically project forward of the front of the mansard. It is therefore considered that the proposed mansard addition would have an incongruous and unsympathetic design, which would harm the character and appearance of this roofscape and locally listed terrace contrary to policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010, and policy DP24 of the Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, The London Plan (2016) and National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

In relation to the part of the building fronting Doric Way the proposed third floor extension would have a vertical front wall which would be set back from the front building line along Doric Way by 2 m (approx.). It would have a maximum increase in height of 2.5 m (approx.) dropping to 1 m in height above existing parapet level (when viewed from the street) in the rear part of the site. This part of the building has been extended in the past by virtue of a first/second floor infill addition (ref: 2010/2940/P) meaning it has already had two additional storeys. The proposed development would result in a third floor addition which is a further incremental increase in scale.

The additional storey would extend to a height just below the stair overrun/side parapet of the main front part of the building fronting Eversholt Street. In addition, although the rear part of the extension would be set down, it would not relate well to the height and scale of the adjacent lower 3 storey building at Ian Hamilton House. In granting permission for the now constructed 2 storey extension above the nightclub fronting Doric Way, the Council's report made clear that it was appropriate in terms of height and design, because it was subordinate in height to the main building on Eversholt Street and a similar height to the adjacent Doric Way building. This part of the existing building and the adjacent Ian Hamilton House are sited in between the higher buildings fronting Eversholt Street and Edith Neville Cottages which effectively form bookends to the lower built form in-between. The proposed development would disrupt this pattern of development and would harm the visual appearance of the building on the streetscene.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed third floor extension to the building fronting Doric Way would appear as an incongruous and dominant addition which would fail to be subordinate to the main building or relate well to neighbouring buildings. It would be visually harmful to the building, theterrace and streetscene on this prominent corner site policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010, and policy DP24 of the Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, The London Plan (2016)

and National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Further to the above, the cumulative impact of the existing and proposed extensions would result in a building that is materially out of scale with the original building and adjoining structures. The additional elements are considered to be unacceptable by way of their scale, height and massing and this would be exacerbated by the poor design of the proposal. Especially the rear elements on Doric Way which although have a setback from the parapet of the building, would be visually incongruous as crudely designed flat roofed additions.

Amenity Impact

Policy DP26 requires development to not harm amenity when considering visual privacy and overlooking, overshadowing and outlook, sunlight and daylight and noise.

The application has been submitted with a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment which considers the impact on the closest neighbouring properties including the side/rear (west) facing elevation at Ian Hamilton House, the rear elevation of the properties at 10 & 12 Edith Neville Cottages (referred to as 10-12 Doric Way in the report) and the block to the south at Euston House. This concludes that the proposed extension would not result in a daylight impact on these neighbouring properties based on Vertical Sky Component (VSC) calculations. In relation to sunlight, the report concludes that the proposed extension would have some minor impacts on neighbouring properties in Ian Hamilton House and 10-12 Doric Way based on percentage Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH). However, the impact would fall within BRE Guidance thresholds and are not considered to result in an amenity impact.

The proposed extension along the side rear return fronting Doric Way would result in a minor increase in the level of enclosure/loss of outlook to side facing windows on the western side/rear elevation of Ian Hamilton House, and to a lesser extend the rear rears of 10 & 12 Edith Neville Cottages. However, the rear part of the extension would only extend 1 m above parapet level which is not considered to result in a material amenity impact on these neighbouring properties.

Standard of Accommodation

The development would provide 2 x 2 bed flats; flat 7 would be a 2 bed / 3 person unit with a floorspace of 63 sq. m and flat 8 would be a 2 bed / 4 person unit with a floorspace of 84 sq. m in accordance with the National Space Standards/Camden Space Standards. However, the development would not provide adequate internal storage space and would fail to provide a suitable vertical stacking arrangement as the proposed bedrooms would be provided above existing living rooms/kitchens to the flats below which would result in noise impacts. Overall, it is considered that the development would provide reasonable living conditions for future occupiers. Had the development been otherwise acceptable, these issues could have been resolved by obtaining details of internal storage and floor/ceiling insulation by planning condition.. It is also noted that no section has been submitted through the eastern part of the building fronting Doric Way to ensure that the headroom meets the minimum requirement of 2.3 m.

Transport Issues

The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 6B (excellent) and is within a controlled parking zone. In accordance with policies DP17 and DP18, the residential units would need to be car-free units as a way of encouraging car-free lifestyles, promoting sustainable ways of travelling, and helping to reduce the impact of traffic. This would normally be secured through a section 106 legal agreement. In the absence of a section 106 planning agreement to secure car-free housing, the development would fail to achieve the above objectives which is contrary to policy CS11 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010, and policies DP17 and DP18 of the Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, The London Plan (2016) and National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Policy DP21 states that works affecting Highways will need to repair any construction damage to transport infrastructure or landscaping and reinstate all affected transport network links and road and

footway surfaces following development. The footway directly adjacent to the site could be damaged as a direct result of the proposed works. Therefore a financial contribution of £13,339.99 for highway works would be required as part of a section 106 planning agreement. In the absence of a section 106 planning agreement the development would be likely to harm the Borough's transport infrastructure, contrary to policy CS11 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010, and policy DP21 of the Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, The London Plan (2016) and National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

The proposed cycle parking facilities do not meet the minimum dimension requirements of the Camden and London Plan cycle parking standards. However, had the development been otherwise acceptable a planning condition would have been applied requiring details of cycle parking to be submitted.

Conclusion

Overall, it is considered that the proposed mansard addition to the building fronting Eversholt Street by virtue of its forward projection beyond the side parapet would have an incongruous and unsympathetic design, which would harm the character and appearance of this roofscape and locally listed terrace. The proposed third floor extension to the building fronting Doric Way would appear as a bulky and over-dominant extension, which would fail to be subordinate to the host and surrounding buildings and be visually harmful to the character and appearance of those structures and the surrounding area generally on this prominent corner site.

In the absence of a section 106 planning agreement to secure car-free housing, the development would fail to promote car-free lifestyles, promote sustainable ways of travelling or reduce the impact of traffic in this highly accessible Central London location. Furthermore, in the absence of a section 106 planning agreement to secure a financial contribution to repair any construction damage to transport infrastructure or landscaping and reinstate all affected transport network links and road and footway surfaces following the development; the development would be likely to harm the Borough's transport infrastructure.