<b>Delegated Report</b>	Analysis shee	et	Expiry Date:	09/01/2017		
	N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	23/12/2016		
Officer Tessa Craig		Application No 2016/6270/P	umber(s)			
Application Address 338 Kilburn High Road and 2A	Iverson Road	Drawing Num	bers			
London NW6 2QN		See decision n	otice			
PO 3/4 Area Team Sign	nature C&UD	Authorised Of	ficer Signature			
Proposal(s)						
Erection of part single, part two storey roof extension to create 1 x 1 bed and 2 x 2 bed self- contained units.						
Recommendation(s):	Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type: Full F	Full Planning Permission					

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: Informatives:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice				
Consultations					
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. of responses	02 02	No. of objections	02	
Summary of consultation responses:	No. electronic 02   A site notice was displayed on 02/12/2016.   Objections were received from:   • 7 and 8 Iverson Road.   The objections relate to:   • Overcrowding;   • Parking pressure;   • Refuse issues;   • Blocking light;   • Height;   • Out of keeping with area;   • Misrepresentative drawings.				
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	N/A				

## Site Description

The application site is located on the corner of Iverson Road and Kilburn High Road with the principal elevation on Iverson Road. The building is a four storey terrace with an A1 commercial use on the ground floor and permission for C3 use on the first, second and third floors (Granted permission for residential units on the first, second and third storeys 2014/0548/P & 2014/7304/P, neither yet to be implemented). The site is located between Brondesbury and Kilburn train stations and has been used historically for commercial uses.

#### **Relevant History**

338 Kilburn High Road (Application site)

Ref -2015/3445/P – Granted September 2015. Erection of a single storey mansard roof extension creating 1 x 2 bedroom & 1 x 1 bedroom units.

Ref – 2014/7304/P – Granted Prior Approval January 2015 (Subject to Section 106 Legal agreement) Change of use from offices (Class B1a) to 3 x 2 bedroom flats (Class C3) at 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor levels.

Ref – 2009/2014/P – Refused November 2009 Change of use for part of existing Barber shop (Use Class A1) to 24 Hour mini cab office (Sui Generis).

Ref – 9200460 – Granted July 1992 Change of use from office use (Class B1) to financial and professional services (Class A2).

#### 2A Iverson Road (Application site)

Ref 2014/0548/P – Grant prior Approval March 2014 (Subject to S106 legal agreement) Change of use of 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor levels from office (Class B1) to 3 residential flats (Class C3)

## 377 & 377A Kilburn High Road

Ref – 2007/3428/P – London Borough of Brent Planning application (Request for Camden Observation in 2007) The erection of an additional storey to a residential building of 3, 4 and 6 storeys high, to provide 6 new flats (1 x 1 and 5 x 2 bed units)

## Spring Court – Iverson Road

Ref 8501106 – Granted August 1985 Redevelopment of the site to provide sheltered flats for the elderly with Wardens Flat and ancillary accommodation. Further application for amendments to roof and eaves detail of original planning permission. Ref: PL/8500107(outline Planning ref.G3/7/2/8400500)

#### Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

The London Plan March 2016

## LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

DP2 (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing) DP5 (Homes of different sizes) DP6 (Lifetime homes and Wheelchair homes) DP18 (Parking Standards and limiting the availability of car parking) DP24 (Securing high quality design) DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

## Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design 2015 CPG2 Housing 2015 CPG6 Amenity 2011 CPG7 Transport 2011

## Assessment

## 1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a part single, part two storey roof extension to create 1 x 1 bed and 2 x 2 bed self-contained residential units. The extensions are to include angular roof slopes and both are setback from the main elevation. The fifth floor extension shall include a roof terrace (12sqm) with a 1.1m high glazed balustrade. The materials are to be contrasting dark grey standing seam zinc vertical cladding at fourth floor and light grey at fifth floor. The proposed windows are to be aluminium framed. The proposal results in 188m<sup>2</sup> of additional floor space. The proposed units are:

Flat	M <sup>2</sup>	Bedrooms/Persons
Flat 4 (Fourth Floor)	50	One/Two
Flat 5 (Fourth Floor)	61	Two/Three
Flat 6 (Fifth Floor)	63	Two/Three

1.2 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:

- Quality of Residential Accommodation;
- Design and Appearance;
- Impact on Neighbours;
- Transport Implications.

## 2.0 Assessment

## Quality of Residential Accommodation

- 2.1 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan promotes high quality design of housing development that takes into account its physical context, local character, density, tenure and land use mix and relationship with, and provision for public, communal and open spaces taking into account the needs of children and older people.
- 2.2 The Council's LDF sets out priorities for dwelling sizes in policy DP5. This seeks to ensure that all residential development contributes to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities by securing a range of homes of different sizes. The proposed extension would create 2 x 2 bedroom and 1 x 1 bedroom units. Two bedroom dwellings are considered a high priority within Camden and the addition of a 1 bedroom dwelling, although considered low priority increases the capacity for greater dwellings in Camden according with policy DP2 (Making full use of Camden's

capacity for housing).

- 2.3 New residential units should provide a high standard of living accommodation for the prospective occupiers whilst maintaining the amenities of the neighbouring residential properties. In line with the Nationally Described Space Standard introduced in March 2015: 1 bed, 2 person dwellings over a single storey should have a minimum gross internal floor area of 50sqm and 1.5sqm of built-in storage; 2 bed, 3 person dwellings should have a minimum gross internal floor area of 61sqm and 2.0sqm of built-in storage. The proposed additional flats would exceed these space requirements and the development is considered acceptable in terms of the quality of residential accommodation to be provided.
- 2.4 From 1st October 2015 the planning authority are no longer able to apply Lifetime Homes Standards, housing designed in line with our wheelchair design guide, and our space standards for dwellings in CPG2. New build residential developments now must comply with the national space standards (reflected in the London Plan) and access standards in Part M of the Building Regulations.

## Design & Appearance

- 2.5 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions to existing buildings are proposed. Policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) aims to ensure the highest design standards from development. Policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) also states that the Council will require all development, including alterations and extensions, to be of the highest standard of design and to respect the character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties as well as the character and proportions of the existing building.
- 2.6 Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1: Design) states that a roof alteration is likely to be considered unacceptable in circumstances such as the presence of 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.
- 2.7 The site is a prominent and handsome four-storey brick building of the 19th-century, attractively articulated with projecting string courses and a substantial dentil course around the frieze. It forms a corner block on a crossroads, facing a 19th-century building of three storeys, a 20th-century building of five storeys plus "mansard", and a 20th-century building of five storeys. In long views from the north, it forms a pair with the North London Tavern, facing, to which it is similar in size, period and form, each having a bevelled corner and similar ridge height.
- 2.8 The proposed two-tone, two-storey roof extension in zinc with an irregular angular profile is considered to be overscaled and out of proportion with the host building, and unsympathetic to the host building in point of design and materials, being overly prominent, clashing with the design features and materials on the levels below, and failing to relate to the host building.
- 2.9 The existing building relates well to its immediate neighbours, being only one storey taller than them yet forming an emphasis to strengthen the corner. It also relates well to the pub opposite, as mentioned above. Adding two storeys to it would increase its size by almost 30% at the corner, greatly increasing the bulk and mass of the building. Even if this increase were acceptable, the increase in bulk and mass will not occur in the style of the host building, or in a sympathetic way. Instead, a pair of substantial asymmetrical boxes of a very different design and alien materials would be placed on top of it, giving the appearance of a second building on top of the host. The angular, diagonal lines and small metal windows proposed are at odds with the traditional, regular, rectilinear forms and mannered sash windows of the host building.

2.10 While it is true that the building across the junction is six storeys tall, it is designed of a piece, with only the top floor designed to read as a mansard, and co-operating with the storeys below in design, materials and scale. Overall, it is considered the bulk and mass are unacceptable as is the detailed design.

# Neighbouring Amenity

- 2.11 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG6 seeks for developments to be 'designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree' and that the Council 'aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight caused by a development on the amenity of existing occupiers'.
- 2.12 The proposed part single part two storey extension is not considered to result in unreasonable harm to neighbouring amenities. There would be no direct overlooking into residential properties and the location of the extension would not be likely to lead to overshadowing.
- 2.13 The noise levels resulting from the roof top units are not considered to harm amenity on account of the proposed residential use, height and existing levels of noise from Kilburn High Road. The creation of three additional units is not considered to alter the existing noise conditions typical of an existing residential building.
- 2.14 The addition of three residential units does not meet a threshold that would warrant waste collection from a designated off street location. Camden Guidance states that the development of 6 or fewer dwellings, are usually serviced by a kerbside waste and recyclables collection.
- 2.15 The set-back slope of the proposed mansard and the presence of a parapet roof reduces the angle of outlook and line of sight from the windows of the proposed mansard. The reduced angle and height of the windows in relation to neighbouring buildings is not considered to result in harm to the privacy of dwellings on either side of Iverson Road, meeting guidance in CPG3.

# Transport

- 2.16 Policy DP18 states that the Council expects new developments in areas of high on-street parking stress to be either car free or car-capped in the event that they would add greater pressure to the highways. The reasons for this are to facilitate sustainability, help promote alternative, more sustainable methods of transport and stop the development from creating additional parking stress and congestion.
- 2.17 The proposed development increases the number of residential units on the site by three dwellings. Policy DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking) considers limiting the supply of car parking as a key factor to address congestion in the borough. The increase in the number of units could potentially increase on street parking demand, therefore the development would be expected to be a car free development secured by legal agreement s106, according with Policy DP18. The area of Kilburn High Road is a site targeted for car free development, as stated in Policy DP18 and also has a PTAL Level in excess of 5, further strengthening the case for a car free development. As a s106 legal agreement has not been entered into to secure car-free development, the proposal would be unacceptable in this regard. This could be overcome if the proposal were otherwise acceptable.
- 2.18 Secure cycle storage for a capacity of five cycles has been provided on site in accordance with Development policy DP18 and guidance in Appendix 2. One secure cycle space per unit is expected, the provision of four exceeds the minimum standard. The storage is located on the ground floor providing excellent access to Iverson road in accordance with Camden policy.

- 2.19 The development is likely to comprise highways works surrounding the site. Policy DP21 states that the Council will expect development connecting to the highway to repair any construction damage to the transport infrastructure or landscaping and reinstate all affected transport network links, road and footway surfaces following development. In order to cover the Council's cost to repair any highway damage as a result of construction and to tie the development into the surrounding urban environment a financial contribution should be required to repave the footway adjacent to the site in accordance with policy DP16 and DP21.
- 2.20 The Council maintains that a payment for highways work should be secured through a Section 106 legal agreement, which will also combine as an agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980. CPG8 (Planning Obligations) states that the Council will secure payment for required works by preparing an estimate (including fees) for the scheme that the developer will be required to pay before commencing development (paragraph 5.14). The amount will depend on serving arrangements which are yet to be confirmed. The most effective way of securing sufficient payment and ensuring the works are carried out to the Council's procedures and standards is for a financial contribution to be paid by the developer on commencement of the development and secured by Section 106 legal agreement.
- 2.21 Works associated with the development are likely to generate a significant number of construction vehicle movements during the overall construction period and there are concerns with the impact of this on the wider transport network. The primary concern is public safety but we also need to ensure that construction traffic does not create (or add to existing) traffic congestion.
- 2.22 The proposal is also likely to lead to a variety of amenity issues for local people (e.g. noise, vibration, air quality). The Council needs to ensure that the development can be implemented without being detrimental to amenity or the safe and efficient operation of the highway network in the local area. A CMP should therefore be secured as a Section 106 planning obligation. It should be noted the Council cannot control the period it takes to construct buildings, however permission must be given effect to within 3 years of a decision.
- 2.23 The Council has a CMP pro-forma which must be used once a Principal Contractor has been appointed. The CMP, in the form of the pro-forma, would need to be approved by the Council prior to any works commencing on site. A financial contribution of £1,140 would need to be secured to cover the costs of reviewing the Construction Management Plan. This would also need to be secured by a Section 106 planning obligation if planning permission is granted.

## Community Infrastructure Levy

2.19 The proposal represents an increase of 3 units and an increase in the floor space of approximately 188sqm. The development is therefore liable for the Camden CIL payment Zone B tariff of £500 per square meter, which if otherwise acceptable would be payable on commencement of the development

## 3.0 Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission

3.1 The proposed bulk, mass and detailed design is considered unacceptable and harmful to the host building and streetscene and should be refused. In the absence of a s106 legal agreement securing car-free development, a Construction Management Plan and contribution for monitoring the plan and a Highways Contribution, the development is considered unacceptable.