

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		19/12/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		18/11/2016	
Officer				Application Number			
Kate Phillips				2016/5809/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
First & Second Floor flat 90 Torriano Avenue London NW5 2SE				Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal							
Two storey front extension at first and second floor levels, mansard roof extension, replacement windows, in association with conversion of existing 1st and 2nd floor flat (3-bed) into 2x self-contained flats (1x 1-bed flat and 1x 2-bed flat) (Class C3)							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	1
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>Ste notices were displayed near the site on 28/10/2016 (end date 18/11/2016). One letter of objection has been received. The comments are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of light to No. 88 at first and second floors • Mansard roof will block views from top floor 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		N/A					

Site Description

No. 90 Torriano Avenue is a three storey (plus basement), brick built, terraced property with a butterfly roof, on the eastern side of the road. The main front facades of Nos. 84 to 90 (first and second floor levels) are set back from the front facades of Nos. 92 to 102 by approximately 4.7 metres. Nos. 84 to 90 all have a two storey front extension (lower ground and upper ground floor level) which extends out to the front by approximately 3.7 metres, with an open lightwell to the front with stairs providing access to the lower ground floor level from the street level.

The building is not listed and it is not within a conservation area.

Relevant History

90 Torriano Avenue

2016/0361/P - Mansard roof extension to create additional living accommodation and alterations to rear windows - **Granted 05-04-2016**

2015/5256/P - Erection of 2 no. conservatories at rear of building; lowering of ground level in rear garden; reduction in height of privacy screen at end of rear garden; erection of glass canopy in rear garden; creation of porch underneath main staircase at front; replacement staircase to front to access lower ground floor; creation of lower ground floor storage area; erection of street-level glass balustrade at front; new bin storage with screen at upper ground floor level at front; alterations to openings - **Granted 30-12-2015**

9003463 - Change of use from shop and residential to three self-contained dwelling units including works of conversion and the erection of a rear extension at first floor level and a roof extension (Renewal of time expired permission dated 02.02.81) – **Granted 03-01-1991**

8501176 - Change of use from shop and residential to 3 self-contained dwelling units and the erection of a rear addition at first floor level (renewal of time-expired planning permission – **Granted 16-10-1985**

31508 - The change of use from shop and residential to three self-contained dwelling units including works of conversion and the erection of a rear addition at first floor level and a roof extension to provide an additional habitable room at the rear – **Granted 02-02-1981**

30392 - Change of use from shop and residential to three self-contained dwelling units including works of conversion and the erection of a rear addition at first-floor level – **Granted 21-07-1980**

AD1306 - The display of a double-sided illuminated projecting sign measuring 0.48 metres x 0.7 metres positioned 2.5 metres above the footway – **Granted 23-01-1980**

88 Torriano Avenue

2016/2061/P – Rear extension to enlarge the second floor level rear element – **Granted 01/08/2016**

2008/2207/P - Erection of a rear extension at second floor level and alterations to existing window at first floor level to the self-contained flat (Class C3) – **Refused 23/07/2008. Appael dismissed 08/06/2009**

29415 - The change of use to two self-contained dwelling units including works of conversion and the

erection of a 3 storey rear addition and alterations to the front elevation – **Granted 10/01/1980**

32847 - The change of use of the ground and basement floors from residential maisonette to solicitors office – **Refused 20/10/1981**

36929 - The erection of a roof extension to provide one additional habitable room for the upper maisonette – **Granted 28/10/1983**

86 Torriano Avenue

2005/1175/P - Construction of a mansard roof extension and provision of a new access door to existing first floor level rear terrace – **Granted 16/05/2005**

2004/4704/P - Construction of a mansard roof extension with roof terrace to front, and provision of new access to existing roof terrace – **Refused 21/12/2004**

PEX0200134 - Alterations to the fenestration on the front elevation – **Granted 23/04/2002**

8401051 - The erection of a roof extension to provide an additional habitable room – **Granted 31/10/1984**

CTP/F13/15/16/32596 - Alterations to the front elevation as a modification to the planning permission granted by letter dated 10th October 1980 for the change of use to 3 self-contained dwelling units including works of conversion and the extension of the existing basement and ground floor rear addition – **Granted 20/10/1981**

CTP/F13/15/16/32846 - Amendment of the two storey rear extension approved by letter dated 10th October 1980 to extend the basement level by 1ft (0.3m) and reduce the ground floor level by 2ft (0.6m) – **Granted 20/10/1981**

CTP/F13/15/16/28128 - Change of use of the ground floor from retail shop to mini-cab office – **Refused 03/10/1979**

84 Torriano Avenue

33028 - Alterations to the front elevation at basement and ground floor levels as a modification to the planning permission granted on 28th July 1980, for the change of use to three self-contained dwelling units including works of conversion and the erection of a three-storey extension at the rear – **Granted 09/11/1981**

30285 – The change of use to 3 self-contained dwelling units including works of conversion and the erection of a 3 storey extension at the rear – **Granted 28/07/1980**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan (2016)

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies (2010)

CS1 Distribution of growth

CS3 Other highly accessible areas

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS6 Providing quality homes
CS11 Promoting sustainable and efficient travel
CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP2 Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing
DP6 Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes
DP16 The transport implications of development
DP18 Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking
DP19 Managing the impact of parking
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

CPG1 Design (2015)
CPG2 Housing (2015)
CPG3 Sustainability (2015)
CPG6 Amenity (2013)
CPG7 Transport (2013)
CPG8 Planning Obligations (2015)

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1. This application seeks planning permission for the following:

- Two storey front extension at first and second floor levels
- Mansard roof extension
- Replacement windows
- Conversion of existing 1st and 2nd floor flat (3-bed) into 2x self-contained flats (1x 1-bed flat and 1x 2-bed flat)

1.2. The proposed front extension would bring the front building line at first and second floor levels forward to meet that of the existing front building line at lower and upper ground floor levels (3.7 metres forward). The front wall (including the parapet in front of the new mansard roof) would match the height of the parapet wall at No. 92 Torriano Avenue (it would be 5.8 metres taller than the top of the existing front wall above the lower and upper ground floor level extension).

1.3. The new fenestration on the front elevation would match the existing (white painted sash windows). At the rear, the existing windows at first and second floor levels would be replaced on a like for like basis.

1.4. The proposed mansard roof would be the same height as the existing mansard roof at No. 88 Torriano Avenue, but it would extend further forward (due to the revised front building line at first and second floor levels). The front window would be 1 metre behind the new front parapet

wall. At the rear, the mansard roof would rise from above the existing rear wall.

1.5. Both new flats would be fully self-contained and would be accessed from the communal hallway via the main entrance to the building at upper ground floor level. The proposed 1-bed flat would occupy the first floor of the building and would measure approximately 46sqm. The proposed 2-bed flat would occupy the second and third floor levels of the building and would measure approximately 90sqm.

1.6. A 'study' is illustrated on the plans (between the upper ground and first floor levels, in the existing rear projection); however, this room does not appear to relate to either of the 2 flats and no mention is made of it in the Design & Access Statement which accompanies the application.

2. The principle of development / dwelling mix

2.1. Housing is regarded as the priority land-use of the LDF, as outlined by Policies CS6 and DP2, which seek to maximise the supply of additional homes in the borough. The creation of an additional residential unit is therefore welcomed.

2.2. Policy DP5 seeks to ensure that all residential development contributes to meeting the priorities set out in the Dwelling Size Priorities Table (DSPT). The DSPT indicates that 1-bed or studio flats (market housing) have "lower" priority; 2-bed flats (market housing) have "very high" priority; and 3-bed flats (market housing) have "medium" priority. The proposal would contribute to the priorities set out in the DSPT insofar as it involves the gain of a "high priority" property.

2.3. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to the detailed considerations below.

3. Living standards of future occupiers

3.1. Policy DP26 requires new development to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space; facilities for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste; facilities for bicycle storage; and private outdoor amenity space.

3.2. Each newly created flat would be accessed from the communal hallway and would be fully self-contained. As already noted, it is not clear what role the 'study' would play, or which unit (if any) would have access to it.

3.3. The proposed 1-bed flat would occupy the first floor of the building and would measure approximately 46sqm. Whilst this flat is referred to as a "studio" by the applicant, the bedroom is self-contained and due to its size (approximately 12sqm) and width (approximately 2.8 metres) it is classed as a double (or twin) bedroom according to the requirements set out in the Government's "Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard" (2015). The technical standards require a 1-bedroom-2-person (1 storey) dwelling to provide 50sqm of floor space (including 1.5sqm of built-in storage), which this unit would fail to do. The application is therefore recommended for refusal on this basis. Even if the 'study' was dedicated to this unit, as it cannot be contained within the flat itself, it would not count towards the floor space.

3.4. The proposed 2-bed flat would occupy the second and third floor levels of the building and would measure approximately 90sqm. The technical standards require a 2-bedroom-4-person (2 storey) unit to provide 79sqm of floor space (including 2sqm of built-in storage). The new

unit would exceed the required standards.

- 3.5. Both new units would be dual-aspect and would have a pleasant outlook to the front and rear. In the first floor (1-bed) flat, the bedroom would be located at the rear of the building and the living room would be at the front. The small kitchen would be accessed via the living room and would have no windows. This room would therefore be likely to function as an extension of the living room. This is considered to be acceptable insofar as there is a permanent partition between eating and sleeping areas, although the desirability of the windowless kitchen for potential occupiers is questioned.
- 3.6. In the second and third floor (2-bed) flat, the bedrooms are placed at the front of the building and the living room and kitchen are located at the rear, on separate levels. In terms of stacking corresponding uses above each other, it is considered that putting the living room for the 2-bed flat above the bedroom of the 1-bed flat may cause noise transfer problems for future occupiers; however if the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable, a planning condition could require the submission and approval of noise mitigation measures prior to occupation.
- 3.7. In the 2-bed flat it would be possible to access any habitable room in the unit without passing through another. There would also be a permanent partition between eating and sleeping areas, which is welcomed.
- 3.8. Both new units would benefit from adequate built-in storage space.
- 3.9. No details have been provided regarding the storage and disposal of waste; however, the building is already subdivided and it is considered that it would be possible to satisfactorily cater for 1 extra residential unit in terms of waste storage and disposal arrangements.
- 3.10. No cycle storage is illustrated on the plans (see Transport section for further discussion).
- 3.11. Neither new unit would have access to private outdoor amenity space. However, the lack of private outdoor space is considered to be acceptable, taking into account the fact that neither new unit is particularly well suited to families with children.

4. Impact on the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene and the wider area

- 4.1. The application building, No. 90 Torriano Avenue, is a three storey (plus basement), brick built, terraced property, with a front extension at lower and upper ground floor level, which extends out to the front of the original building by 3.7 metres. The building sits at the northern end of a row of 4 matching terraced buildings (Nos. 84 to 90) and is partly adjoined to another terrace of residential dwellings (Nos. 92 to 102).
- 4.2. The front facades of Nos. 84 to 90 at first and second floor levels are set back from the vertical front facades of Nos. 92 to 102 by approximately 4.7 metres. The planning history of the site and evidence provided by the applicant suggests that the front extension at No. 90 (and most likely at Nos. 84 to 88 also) was built some time before 1985 and housed a retail unit. Later, planning permission was granted for a change of use of the shop to residential use.

Two storey front extension

- 4.3. Policy DP24 requires all development, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design, taking into account the character, setting, context and form and scale of neighbouring buildings. Similarly, CPG1 (Design) guides that extensions and alterations to a property should always take into account the character and

design of the property and its surroundings, and extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation, unless the specific circumstances of the site enable an exception to this approach.

- 4.4. The proposal to extend the building at the front at first and second floor levels is considered to be wholly inappropriate. The proposed first and second floor front extension would not appear subordinate to the host building in terms of location, form, scale, proportions or dimensions. Neither would it respect or preserve the original design and proportions of the host building, including its architectural period and style. Rather than retaining and preserving existing historic architectural features, such as the window openings and the parapet wall etc., the proposal would seek to replicate the same details on the newly built front façade. Whilst the building is not statutorily or locally listed, this loss of historic fabric is considered to be unnecessary and harmful to the building, particularly because it is likely to be difficult to find suitable and sympathetic materials to carry out the works so that the extension would blend well with existing historic fabric.
- 4.5. It is recognised that the original building has already been extended at the front, but this is not considered to represent a reason to allow further, inappropriate development of the building, particularly in the form of an extension which would fully obscure/remove the original front façade of the building. As a result of the proposed two storey front extension it would no longer be possible to discern the original building at all when viewing it in the public realm, which is not considered to be acceptable.
- 4.6. The resultant building would also be excessively deep from front to back, which is out of keeping with the surrounding pattern of development and represents overdevelopment of the host building and application site. It is recognised that the extreme depth might not be apparent when viewing the building from the street, but in plan form, the resultant building and application site would be at odds with neighbouring buildings / plots in terms of size and depth of the building, and the ratio of built and un-built space on the plot. This is not considered to be acceptable.
- 4.7. The proposal would also spoil the appearance of the wider street scene. The building sits within a row of 4 buildings which, despite subtle differences in external design and materiality, make up an attractive group in townscape terms. It is clear that these buildings were originally built together and there was a clear intention to set them back from the adjacent terrace (Nos. 92 to 102) and for the plain flank wall of No. 92 to be visible in the street scene. To extend the application building at the front would fail to preserve and respect the historic pattern of development and established townscape of the surrounding area; and it would cause significant harm to the visual relationship between the group of 4 buildings (Nos. 84 to 90) and the relationship between the two separate terraces (Nos. 84 to 88 and Nos. 92 to 102).
- 4.8. It is recognised that the blank flank wall of No. 92 Torriano would be covered and essentially replaced with the new flank wall of No. 90; however, insofar as this is not the original design of the buildings or street, this is not considered to be appropriate or acceptable. It is considered that the resultant building would appear as an unsuccessful hybrid of the two adjacent terraces, rather than appearing to belong fully to one or the other. As already outlined, this would have a detrimental impact on the street scene along this part of Torriano Avenue.

Mansard roof

- 4.9. Planning permission was granted earlier this year for a mansard roof extension at the application building to create additional living accommodation for the existing flat (planning reference 2016/0361/P). It was noted that the proposed mansard roof was acceptable in principle because the building does not already have an additional storey or mansard; the

wider terrace does not have an unimpaired roofline; and the proposed mansard roof would be similar in form to the mansard roofs at Nos. 88 and 86 Torriano Avenue.

- 4.10. It is no longer considered that the proposed mansard roof would comply with the guidance set out in CPG1, for the reasons set out below:
- 4.11. This application differs insofar as the proposed mansard roof would sit above the proposed two storey front extension as well as the existing building. The enlarged building would no longer appear to be a part of either adjacent terrace (Nos. 84 to 88 or Nos. 92 to 102) and therefore the proposal to erect a mansard roof would not continue an existing pattern of development. Instead, the building would appear on its own and not part of a group.
- 4.12. The proposed mansard would not be architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and nor would it retain the overall integrity of the roof form (it is considered that adding a mansard above the proposed two storey front extension would cause further harm to the character and appearance of the building and the group of buildings and the street scene). This is because the proposed mansard would add significantly to the bulk of the resultant building and the effect would be worsened by the fact the front building line would be brought so far forward of the neighbour, No. 88. This would serve to increase the perceived bulk and scale of the proposed mansard.
- 4.13. Overall, it is considered that the existing building would be overwhelmed by the combination of the proposed front extension and the mansard roof above, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.
- 4.14. Notwithstanding the comments above, the proposed materials for the mansard roof and the fenestration are considered to be acceptable, in line with the previous planning permission.

Replacement windows

- 4.15. The proposal to replace existing windows with timber framed sash windows is considered to be acceptable, in line with the previous planning permission.

Conclusion

- 4.16. The application is recommended for refusal based on the poor design of the proposed front extension and mansard roof and the detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene and the wider area, contrary to the requirements of Policy DP24, which requires all development, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design.

5. Impact on nearby and neighbouring properties

- 5.1. Policy DP26 notes that the Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors to consider include: visual privacy and overlooking; overshadowing and outlook; sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels; noise and vibration levels; odour, fumes and dust; microclimate; and the inclusion of appropriate attenuation measures.
- 5.2. The main property that is likely to be affected is the neighbouring property to the south, No. 88 Torriano Avenue.
- 5.3. The proposal to extend out to the front of the application building by 3.7 metres is likely to impact detrimentally on the outlook from the first, second and third floor front-facing windows at No. 88, and also from the front roof terrace (at the front of the mansard roof). Whereas

currently this property enjoys a wide and open outlook to the front (albeit partially interrupted by the flank wall of No. 92 to the north), the proposed extension would entirely block any views to the north and instead the property would look onto the blank side wall of the new extension and dividing wall at roof level. This is not considered to be acceptable and the application is recommended for refusal on this basis.

5.4. It is recognised that the front-facing windows at the application building have a similar relationship with No. 92 Torriano Avenue (which is set further forwards by 4.7 metres); however, that is how the buildings were originally designed and therefore the occupiers of No. 90 never benefited from outlook to the north. The loss of existing outlook is not considered to be acceptable.

5.5. It is not considered that the proposal would cause undue harm in terms of visual privacy and overlooking, or noise. Neither is the proposal likely to cause harm in terms of sunlight and daylight, taking into account the relative position of the two properties and the path of the sun.

6. Transport

6.1. Policy DP18 expects new development to provide the minimum necessary car parking provision. The Council generally expects development to be car-free in areas within controlled parking zones (CPZ) that are easily accessible by public transport. The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 5, which is very high, and is within the East Kentish Town CPZ (CA-M).

6.2. If the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable, it would be necessary to secure the additional unit as car-free through the use of a legal agreement. In the absence of such a legal agreement, the application is recommended for refusal on this basis also.

6.3. The London Plan 2016 requires 1 cycle space per studio or 1-bed flat and 2 spaces for all other dwellings, which equates to a requirement of 3 cycle spaces in this case. No cycle storage has been illustrated on the plans, although it might be possible to accommodate it in the study. The lack of cycle parking will form an additional reason for refusal.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.