Date: 13/10/2016
Our ref: 206/4562/PRE
Contact: Laura Hazelton
Direct line: 020 7974 1017

Email: laura.hazelton@camden.gov.uk

Rebeca Fieldhouse Flitcroft House 114-116 Charing Cross Road London WC2H 0JR

By email

Dear Ms Fieldhouse,

## Re: 286-290 Kilburn High Road, NW6

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry for the above property which was received on 30 August 2016 together with the required fee of £960.00.

# 1. Drawings and documents

Letter dated 12/08/2016 and drawings numbered 5431-PA.01, 5431-RA.02, and PN.0S.

### 2. Proposal

Erection of roof extension, rear extensions at first and second floor level, alterations to shopfronts, and amendments to residential mix previously approved under reference 2015/4791/P.

### 3. Site description

The application site consists of 3 mid terrace 4 storey buildings on the north-east side of Kilburn High Road. The site has historically been used as offices (B1a use), but prior approval was recently granted on 13 October 2015 for the change of use from B1 to C3 (residential use).

The application site is not listed, nor located within a conservation area; however, the site sits within the designated Kilburn Town Centre.

The surrounding area is a mixture of office, commercial and residential uses.

#### 4. Relevant planning history

**2015/4791/P** – Prior approval – Change of use of ground floor (part), first, second and third floors from office (Class B1a) to residential (Class C3) to create 11 one bed units, 1 two bed unit, and 4 studio units. Granted 13/10/2015.

**PWX0103835** - Alterations and extensions in connection with the use of the whole building as a solicitors office, including the installation of new shop fronts, the erection of rear extensions at first and second floor levels. Granted 18/06/2002.



Planning Solutions Team Planning and Regeneration

Culture & Environment
Directorate
London Borough of Camden

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor 5 Pancras Square

London N1C 4AG

www.camden.gov.uk/planning

### Neighbouring terrace

No.280

**2013/7833/P** - Conversion of existing flats above ground floor level, comprised of  $3 \times 1$  bed and  $1 \times 2$  bed units, into  $1 \times 1$  bed and  $2 \times 2$  bed units, erection of second floor rear infill extension, erection of third floor rear roof terrace, erection of fourth floor roof extension, alterations to front and rear elevations, and alterations to roof of ground floor rear extension including new plant enclosure. Refused 23/04/2014 for the following reasons:

- The proposed roof extension, by reason of its location, scale, and detailed design would interrupt the unbroken roofline of the terrace to the detriment of the wider area, contrary to LDF policies.
- The proposed second floor rear extensions, by virtue of its height, bulk, and detailed design, would appear as an incongruous additions detracting from the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to LDF policies.
- The proposed roof terrace, would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy of both adjoining properties (Nos.278 and 282 Kilburn High Road), contrary to policies.

Appeal APP/X5210/A/14/2224856 dismissed 11/12/2014.

**2015/0696/P** - Conversion of existing flats above ground floor level, comprised of  $3 \times 1$  bed and  $1 \times 2$  bed units, into  $1 \times 1$  bed and  $2 \times 2$  bed units, erection of second floor rear infill extension, erection of third floor rear roof terrace, erection of roof extension, alterations to front and rear elevations, and alterations to roof of ground floor rear extension including new plant enclosure. Refused 16/06/2015 for the following reasons:

- The proposed second and third floor rear extensions, by virtue of their height, bulk, mass and detailed design, would appear as overly dominant and incongruous additions detracting from the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.
- The proposed roof extension, by reason of its location, scale, and detailed design would interrupt a line of unbroken roofscapes in this terrace of properties to the detriment of the wider area, contrary to policies.

Appeal APP/X5210/W/15/3130914 dismissed 11/01/2016.

### 5. Relevant policies and guidance

**National Planning Policy Framework 2012** 

**The London Plan March 2016** 

#### LDF Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

CS6 (Providing quality homes)

CS7 (Promoting Camden's centres)

### **LDF Development Policies**

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

DP5 (Homes of different sizes)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)
DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)
DP30 (Shopfronts)

## Camden Planning Guidance 2011/2015

CPG1 (Design) 2013 CPG 2 Housing 2013 CPG 6 (Amenity) 2011

## 6. Proposal

The proposal consists of the following:

- Change of use of office (B1a) use to residential (C3) to provide 3 x studio units, 10 x 1 bedroom units and 3 x 2 bedroom units.
- Minor amendments to shopfront and office layout at ground floor level.
- Rear extensions at 1st and 2nd floor to provide additional residential floorspace.
- Roof extension to provide additional residential floorspace.

#### 7. Assessment

The Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025 sets out the key elements of the Council's planning vision and strategy for the borough and Camden Development Policies contribute to implementing the Core Strategy by setting out detailed planning policies that the Council will use when determining planning applications. The Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) Supplementary Planning Document supports the policies in the LDF by giving detailed guidance on the implementation of the policies.

The main planning considerations would be:

- Land Use
- Design (impact of the development on the character of the host building and surrounding area);
- Residential mix;
- Standard of residential amenity;
- Impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

## 8. Land Use

Development Policy DP13 seeks to retain land and buildings that are suitable for continued business use and will resist a change to non-business unless it can be demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that the site is no longer suitable for its existing business use; and there is evidence that the possibility of retaining, reusing or redeveloping the site or building for similar or alternative business use has been fully explored over an appropriate period of time.

Prior approval was previously granted for the change of use of part of the ground floor and first to third floors from office use (B1a) to residential use (C3), and involved the creation of  $4 \times 10^{-5}$  x tudio units,  $11 \times 10^{-5}$  bed units and  $1 \times 20^{-5}$  bed unit.

However, unless this change of use was implemented prior to the submission of a full application for the current proposals, the principle of the change of use from B1a to C3 would be considered in the determination of the full planning application. You would therefore need to justify the loss of the B1a accommodation, in accordance with the principles set out in DP13 and CPG5.

Chapter 7 of CPG5 (Town Centres, Retail and Employment) provides additional guidance and states that the Council expects the supply of offices in the borough to meet the projected demand over the plan period and as a result, may allow a change from B1a offices to another use in some circumstances such as older office premises, or buildings that were originally built as residential buildings. The priority land use replacement would be housing or community use. When assessing applications for a change of use from office to a non-business use, the council would consider the following:

- The criteria listed in paragraph 13.3 of policy DP13;
- The age of the premises. Some older premises may be more suitable to conversion;
- Whether the premises include features required by tenants seeking modern office accommodation:
- The quality of the premises and whether it is purpose built accommodation. Poor quality premises that require significant investment to bring up to modern standards may be suitable for conversion;
- Whether there are existing tenants in the building, and whether these tenants intend to relocate:
- The location of the premises and evidence of demand for office space in this locations;
   and
- Whether the premises currently provide accommodation for small and medium businesses.

Providing the loss of B1a floorspace is considered acceptable, then new residential dwellings would be the priority replacement land use. Policy DP5 relates to the development of self-contained houses and flats and is used when assessing new housing schemes. Policy DP5 expects a mix of large and small homes in all residential developments and sets out the priority dwelling sizes. 2 bedroom market rental properties have been identified as very high priority and the council seeks at least 40% of the new dwellings to be 2 bedroom units. It is therefore recommended that if a full planning application is submitted, the mix of units is revised to include a greater proportion of two bedroom units.

### 9. Design

Policies CS14 and DP24 seek to ensure all development is of the highest quality and design and exhibits consideration of the character, setting, context and form of neighbouring buildings. This is supported by CPG1 (Design) which provides further detailed guidance.

### **Shopfront**

The proposal includes alterations to the ground floor shopfronts in order to allow for the installation of a new door providing access to the new residential units. The proposals also include minor alterations to the shopfront fenestration and fascia signs.

The existing shopfronts are not considered to be of high quality and retain no historic architectural details which the Council would be minded to preserve. Therefore, the alterations are likely to be acceptable in principle, subject to their detailed design. Further guidance is provided in chapter 7 of CPG1 (Design), which states that shopfront alterations should respect the detailed design, materials, colour and architectural features of the shopfront and building itself.

At present, units 286 and 290 feature overly large fascia signs, and the proposal to reduce these and unify the size of the fascias across all three units would be welcomed.

No details of proposed materials has been specified, but timber or aluminium framed windows would be recommended to complement the existing fenestration of the host building and surrounding shopfronts.

### Roof extension

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1: Design) states that a roof alteration is likely to be considered unacceptable in certain circumstances including within unbroken runs of valley roofs or where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations and extensions. It adds 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.

The application site consists of a group of 3 buildings within a larger terrace of 15. All of these properties still feature valley roofs to the rear and a distinctive decorative parapet to the front elevation (bar two properties, nos. 292-294, where the front parapet has been replaced with a plain stone wall).

The property is not listed or located within a conservation area; however, the whole terrace is characterised by an unbroken roofline which is considered to make a positive contribution towards the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The addition of the proposed roof extension is considered to fundamentally alter the roof form which would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the building, the wider terrace and streetscene; setting an unwelcome precedent which would erode the current consistency of appearance within the terrace.

The proposed extension is set back from the front elevation which would limit its visibility from street level, but it is likely that it would be highly visible from Kilburn Grange Park to the rear and from the upper stories of neighbouring properties opposite.

In addition, two previous applications at no.280 for the erection of a similar roof extension were refused and dismissed at appeal (see history section) after the inspector noted that "the roof extension would give rise to an alien feature which would be at odds with the traditional butterfly roof of the terrace. By virtue of its scale and design, it would create a visual interruption, particularly when viewed from the park to the rear, which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the wider area."

The proposed roof extension is therefore unlikely to be considered acceptable in principle due to the harm caused to the unbroken roofline of the terrace and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

### Rear extensions

The proposed extension at first floor level would match the height of the existing first floor extension to the rear of no.290. Although it would increase the bulk at this height, it would replace a number of discordant, piecemeal developments at this level and overall, is considered to improve the appearance of the host buildings. The extension would project from the existing first floor extension at no.290, across to meet the raised boundary wall with no. 284, and therefore would not appear to greatly increase the bulk at this level when viewed from the south/east.

The erection of an almost full-width extension at second floor level spanning the width of the three properties is unlikely to be considered acceptable due to the increased bulk at such a high level. The rear elevation of these properties is highly visible from Kilburn Grange Park to the rear and the sports courts directly abutting the rear boundary of the site.

At present, the rear elevation of the terrace is characterised by a fairly consistent row of half width outriggers. The erection of a full width element spanning the three properties would disrupt the rhythm of the rear elevations and is not characteristic of the terrace as a whole. As such, it is considered that the development would be bulky and would not appear subservient to the buildings or wider terrace, and would detract from the character and appearance of both.

If you wish to extend at second floor level, I would recommend amending the design to include three separate and distinct half width outriggers, of the same height and depth as those to the rest of the terrace.

Materials have not been specified, but it is recommended that the extensions are constructed of matching brickwork to complement the host building and surrounding terrace. Similarly, the design and materials of the rear fenestration should respect the character, materials and layout of the windows at higher levels.

Further guidance relating to the erection of rear extensions is provided in chapter 4 of CPG1 (Design). It states that rear extensions should be secondary to the building being extended and should respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building including its architectural layout, style and features such as projecting bays.

### 10. Residential Mix

As stated above, unless the prior approval had been implemented, the principle of the change of use, as well as the residential mix and quality of residential accommodation would be considered in the determination of a full planning application. Although the current proposals increase the number of 2 bedroom units from that previously approved which is welcomed, the council would expect this to be revised to increase the number of 2 bedroom units in accordance with DP5. The current proposal would provide 3 out of the 16 as 2 bedroom units (approximately 19%), and it is recommended that this is changed to 6 or 7 units.

Please note that if the floorspace of the new residential units was over 1000sqm, this would trigger the requirement for affordable housing to be provided. Further guidance is provided in Development Policy DP3 and CPG2.

### 11. Residential Amenity

The Council expects development to provide high quality housing that provides secure, well-lit accommodation that has well-designed layouts and rooms in accordance with guidance provided by CPG2 (Housing). The London Plan 2016 sets out new nationally described space standards which all new dwellings, including conversion of existing residential units, must meet.

The proposals would increase the gross internal floor area of units 2, 3, 9, 10, 15 and 16 so that these units would meet nationally described space standards. This would be welcomed by the Council.

However, many of the new dwellings would be single aspect which would limit the daylight and natural ventilation to these properties, which would not be encouraged by the Council. Similarly, not all properties would benefit from an adequate outlook. Unit 7 in particular would only have views onto an internal lightwell, which would not be considered acceptable. Any application for planning permission should be supported with a daylight and sunlight assessment which demonstrates that new units would receive a suitable level of daylight and sunlight.

## 12. Amenity of neighbouring residents

Policy CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore, Policy DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting planning permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight.

CPG6 (Amenity) provides specific guidance with regards to privacy, overlooking and outlook.

The proposed roof extension would be set back from the front and rear elevations and the increase in bulk would be unlikely to result in a loss of light, outlook or privacy in neighbouring properties.

To the rear, the development includes a full-width extension at first floor level and an additional extension at second floor level, which is set back slightly from the boundary with No.292. No. 284 is unlikely to be affected by the additional extensions due to the existing projection at second floor level adjacent to the shared boundary.

However, the proposed extension would be to the south east of neighbouring property No.292 and could therefore impact the levels of daylight entering the rear windows of this property. As this building is in commercial use, the impact on daylight reaching these rooms would be less of a concern than if it impacted residential rooms; however, it is recommended that a sketch is prepared using the advice provided in paragraph 6.7 of CPG6 (Amenity) to assess is the development is likely to impact the daylight reaching these windows.

In addition, the second floor extension includes windows to the side elevation which may overlook No.292. These windows may need to be obscure glazed, depending on their relationship to and the use of the neighbouring rear rooms.

### 13. Conclusion

It is unlikely that the development would receive a favourable outcome should a planning application be submitted. It is recommended that the roof extension is removed from the proposal, and the design of the second floor extension altered to consist of a series of separate outriggers, as opposed to a solid mass.

Similarly, the mix of residential units would not be considered acceptable, nor the quality of residential accommodation provided, and further justification should be provided for the loss of B1 floorspace.

### 14. Planning application information

If you submit a planning application which addresses the outstanding issue detailed in this report satisfactorily, I would advise you to submit the following for a valid planning application:

- Completed form full planning application
- An ordnance survey based location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red.
- Floor plans at a scale of 1:100 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Roof plans at a scale of 1:100 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Elevation drawings at a scale of 1:100 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'

- Section drawings at a scale of 1:100 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Design and access statement
- The appropriate fee
- Please see <u>supporting information for planning applications</u> for more information.

We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would notify neighbours by letter, and must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.

It is likely that that a proposal of this size would be determined under delegated powers, however, if more than 3 objections from neighbours or an objection from a local amenity group is received the application will be referred to the Members Briefing Panel should it be recommended for approval by officers. For more details click here.

This document represents an initial informal officer view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage and would not be binding upon the Council, nor prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact Laura Hazelton on the number above.

Thank you for using Camden's pre-application advice service.

Yours sincerely,

Laura Hazelton

Planning Officer
Planning Solutions Team