Delegated	Report	Analysis sheet N/A		Expiry Date:	06/04/2016 24/05/2016	
	-			Consultation Expiry Date:		
Officer			Application I			
Samir Benmbarek			2016/0756/P			
Application Addre	SS		Drawing Nur	nbers		
225 Kentish Town Road London NW5 2JU	d		22209-04; 22209 22209-P01_Rev 22209-P04_Rev P07_RevE; 2220 P10_RevA; 2220 and Access Stat Noise Assessme	Extract); 22209-01; 22 9-07; 22209-08; 22209 B; 22209-P02_RevC; B; 22209-P05_RevB; 09-P08_RevA; 22209- 09-P12_RevA; 22209- tement; Lifetime Home ent by Mayer Brown dent by Mayer Brown dent	9-09; 22209-10; 22209-P03_RevB; 22209-P06; 22209- P09_RevA; 22209- P13_RevA; Design es Assessment; ated January 2016;	
PO 3/4 Area	Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised C	Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)						
Erection of 4 storey (following substantial level from ancillary bedroom duplex flat	al demolition of ex retail (Class A1)	isting buildin	g) and change of	fuse of building ab	oove ground floor	
Recommendation:	Refuse Plan	ning Permis	sion			

Full Planning Permission

Application Type:

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice							
Informatives:								
Consultations								
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	22	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	02		
Summary of consultation responses:	objections have bee Flat 3, 35 F Research F The above have ob 1. Information the propert 2. The propose part of the strown Centre Buildings in 3. The room's is at a company at grown small in relation at a council's g 5. The propose 6. No provision 7. No indication to it is determ 2. It is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it refer to see 3. The propose is considered the Kentish relation to it is considered the	en receiver ortess Fellow at jected/c on apply (The Residence of the fast of t	c University College London commented on the following lication form is incorrect; in tiver Fleet). It detract from the architectene along Kentish Town Flage, as well as the number or coximity. In have been reduced to act to the character and appear level is also changed. Fut the neighbouring buildings can which it extends cover shop fronts.	ring add on g ground mportan tural and Road as er or con commod earance urthermo its chara building losal has importan t the Loa e do not to sectio plication on flate d by cor the follow the follow has a res omed	ds: It water course is adjaced historical significance well as the designated servation areas and Lister the accommodation of the building and settore the windows are lowest floor which is contrast floor which is considered at buildings and area. Fundon Plan space stand suit in relation to the late on 4 of this report. In 2015/0756/P. Is and 1x2 bedroom dupoint the Council's transplantion for details to appropriate for the proposal would be accommodation subject to commodation subject to the proposal would be accommodation subject to the proposal would be accommodated accommodated accommodated accommodated accommodated acc	ent to of the I Kentish sted on which ting. The wand ary to the I kentish sted on which ting the wand ary to the I in Please lards . It reger olex flat cortation prove		

CAAC/ National Amenity Society comments:	The applicant site is not within a Conservation area and therefore no CAAC were consulted.
Society comments.	

Site Description

The application relates to a three storey building on the western side of Kentish Town Road. The building itself is not located within a conservation area but is in close proximity to the Bartholomew, Kentish Town and Kelly Street Conservation Areas. The property is not within a Conservation Area, nor is it a Listed Building but is nearby 213-215 Kentish Town Road which is a Grade II Listed Building.

Relevant History

No. 225 Kentish Town Road:

(Ref 2015/0567/P)- Planning Permission withdrawn (01/09/2015) for the erection of 4 storeys with rear balconies above existing ground floor commercial unit (following substantial demolition of existing building) and change of use of building above ground floor level from Class A2 to Class C3 to provide 4x1 bedroom flats.

(Ref 2015/4655/P)- Planning Permission granted (15/12/2015) for the installation of a new shopfront and replacement of the entrance door at ground floor level associated with the upper floor flats.

No. 1A Anglers Lane:

(Ref PEX0000219)- Planning permission granted (07/06/2000) for the erection of erection of a three storey dwelling. As shown on drawing Nos 101; 102; 103; 104; 105; 106; 07B; 08B and 09A.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework, 2012

The London 2016

LDF Core Strategy, 2010

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)

CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy)

Camden Development Policies, 2010

DP5 (Homes of different sizes)

DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport)

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)

DP28 (Noise and vibration)

Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance

CGP1 (Design)

CPG5 (Town Centres and Employment)

CPG7 (Transport)

Assessment

1. Proposal

- 1.1 Permission is sought for the erection of 4 storeys to include a mansard roof extension following substantial demolition of existing building. This will also involve the change of use of building the first floor and above. This will result in the creation of 2x1 bedroom flats on the first and second floors and a 2 bedroom duplex flat on the third and fourth floor. 86.6sqm of ancillary retail space (A1) will be lost.
- 1.2 The main issues for consideration are:
 - The impact of the change of use from retail (Use A1) to residential (Use C3);
 - The quality and standard of the proposed living accommodation;
 - The impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host building and nearby conservation areas
 - The impact the proposal may have upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring and potential residential occupiers
 - Transport implications

2. Assessment of Change of Use from Retail (Use A1) to Residential (Use C3)

- 2.1 The host building is located along within the Kentish Town Town Centre, in which there are a mix of uses; namely retail, financial, restaurants and cafes, drinking establishments and offices. The host building is currently in A1 Use (retail) with the ground floor currently in refurbishment to continue operations as a retail unit. This relates to planning application 2015/4655/P in which permission was granted for a new shopfront.
- 2.2 When assessing the proposal against the Local Development Framework (LDF) policies, retaining retail uses and the vitality of Town Centres is an important aim. In particular, DP13 requires non-retail development to have an effect on the shopping provision or character of the centre which it located within.
- 2.3 The change of use applies to the first and second floors changing from ancillary A1 Use (retail) to C3 Use (residential). It is considered acceptable within this proposal for the change of use as the ground floor will still continue to operate as an A1 Use and the frontage and function at ground floor level will not be compromised, diminished or removed as a result of the proposal.

3. Assessment of the Quality and Standard of the Proposed Living Accommodation

- 3.1 The proposal would provide 175.6sqm of residential floorspace to the building including 85sqm of converted A1 ancillary space. The proposed one bedroom flat on first floor level will have a gross internal area (GIA) of 41.4sqm; the one bedroom flat on the second floor level will have a GIA of 42.2sqm; and the duplex two bedroom flat on third and fourth level will have a GIA of 92.0sqm. This exceeds the minimum floor space requirement as stated by the Department of Local Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Technical Housing Standards of 39sqm for a 1bedroom1persons flat and 79sqm for a 2bedroom4persons flat across two storeys.
- 3.2 The bedrooms sizes across all the proposed flats are acceptable for double bedrooms as they all exceed the DCLG requirement of 11.5sqm.
- 3.3 The height of the proposed flats does not meet the standard as set out in the London Plan 2016 of a minimum of 2.6m. This standard is set to mitigate the "heat island" effect of London due to its heavy density and strongly encouraged. It is further considered necessary within this site as it is heavily built up. However the flats would meet or exceed the minimum floor to ceiling height in the DCLG Technical Housing Standards (2.3m). Therefore this could not be sustained as a reason for refusal.
- 3.4 The new dwellings are considered to provide a good standard of residential accommodation in terms of layout, amenity space, room sizes, sunlight, daylight, outlook and ventilation.
- 3.5 The existing building does not have step-free access to the flats within and therefore the proposed residential flats and additional storeys will not be able to meet all the requirements of Part M4(2) of Building Regulations. However, it is considered acceptable in this context, as the proposal will not worsen the situation on accessibility

to and within the building. A new Part M compliant staircase will be installed at ground floor level for improved access to the upper floors.

4. Assessment of the Character and Appearance upon the Host Building and Surrounding Area

- 4.1 The western side of Kentish Town Road is characterised by three and four storey buildings which terminate at different heights and therefore uniformity is not a characteristic of the roofscape. The character and appearance of the buildings are of a grander scale in terms of size and the design of the buildings (e.g. windows, parapet walls, columns).
- 4.2 In regards to LDF policies, respecting the local character is an intrinsic aim. In particular DP24 require careful consideration of the characteristics of the site, features of local distinctiveness, and the wider context to be demonstrated in order to achieve high quality development which integrates into its surroundings.
- 4.3 In considering the proposal against CPG1 (Design), roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances:
 - There is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and where the continuing pattern of development would help re-unite a group of buildings and townscape;
 - Alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and they retain the overall integrity of the roof form;
 - There are a variety of additions or alterations to roofs which create an established pattern of development and where further development would not cause additional harm.
- 4.4 Within the proceeding context, the principle of the reconstruction of storeys and mansard roof extension would be considered acceptable. The neighbouring buildings feature mansard extensions and it is not considered the mansard extension would cause additional harm to the character and appearance of either the roof scape or the streetscene.
- 4.5 The form and design of the mansard is considered acceptable and will be constructed in new slate tiles. It will be at a traditional 70/30 degree pitch with the party with the party walls on either side extender higher to accommodate the mansard. It will be positioned behind a parapet wall with painted finish steel railings.
- 4.6 Notwithstanding the above, the external character and appearance of the redeveloped storeys is not considered appropriate or of high quality for a prominent London high street. The design of the development appears compressed in relation to the grander design, appearance and detail of the neighbouring buildings along Kentish Town Road.
- 4.7 The proportions of the front elevation are not in keeping with neighbouring buildings with the proposed windows of a smaller scale and not taking a high proportion of the front elevation in comparison to the existing façade of the host building or the façades of the adjoining properties on Kentish Town Road. Additionally, the use of brickwork on the front elevation is acceptable; however this should be included within the window reveal instead of render.
- 4.8 It is not considered the appearance and design of the rear extension to accommodate the stairwell or the rear elevation of the developed building would have an impact upon the streetscene of the Kentish Town Centre Frontage or the surrounding conservation area as the rear elements of the proposal would not be visible from the public realm.

5. Assessment of the Impacts of Amenity upon Neighbouring and Potential Residential Occupiers

- 5.1 The site is neighboured by a number of buildings with residential uses (mainly on the upper floors) which need to be taken into regard when assessing impacts of amenity. In particular the neighbouring occupiers of concern are the residential units at No. 227 Kentish Town Road and No. 1A Anglers Lane which is located directly to the rear of the application site.
- 5.2 Within the LDF policies, protecting the quality of life for occupiers and neighbours is important. In particular DP26 ensures that development will cause adverse amenity impacts upon neighbours in terms of sunlight, daylight, privacy and overlooking, noise and vibration and odour. Furthermore, DP28 seeks to protect development from noise sensitivity or neighbouring occupiers from potential noise generation from development.
- 5.3 At the front of the site, it is not considered no harm would be caused in regard to the amenity of neighbouring properties by virtue of the location of the works, the distance to occupiers of the opposite side of the street and its setting in a busy London high street.

- 5.4 It is not considered the mansard roof extension would cause undue harm upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers by virtue of its position upon the roof.
- 5.5 At the rear of the host building a three and a half storey rear extension would be erected to facilitate a stairwell to the new residential units. It will be at a depth of 5.6m and a height of 8.3m. The distance between the rear wall of the extension and the only rear habitable window of 1A Anglers Lane would measure 4.1m. The proposed extension would contribute further to loss of sunlight and daylight that is already experienced from close proximity to 217-223 Kentish Town Road. There would also be adverse harm to the outlook from the only habitable rear window. It is also considered the proposed extension would also cause a material level of harm to the residential occupiers of the first floor rear flat of No. 227 Kentish Town Road in terms of outlook from the rear habitable windows.
- 5.6 A terrace is proposed at first floor level at a depth of 3.6m with access from the proposed rear extension. This would result in a 0.5m void between the end of the terrace and the rear habitable window of 1A Anglers Lane. The terrace is considered to result in a further loss of outlook for the occupiers of 1A Anglers Lane and, more significantly, the terrace presents issues of overlooking and loss of privacy.
- 5.7 In close proximity to the application site at the rear of No. 227 Kentish Town Road is a flue extraction pipe which serves the restaurant at ground floor level (Nando's). As the flue pipe is outside of the application site, the change or manage this impact cannot be changed of managed. A noise and odour assessment was submitted with the application following comments and concerns in the previous planning application about the amenity impacts the flue would present to future occupants of the development.
- 5.8 The assessments were reviewed the Council's Environmental Health Officer who principally had no objections to the proposal in relation to noise, vibration and odour concerns towards the future occupants of the proposal. However this was subject to the followings conditions outlined below should the proposal be granted planning permission.
- 5.9 The first condition set by the Environmental Health Officer would be to submit details to be approved in writing by the Council, of an enhanced sound insulation value DnT,w and L'nT,w of at least 5dB above the Building Regulations value, for the floor, ceiling and wall structures separating different types or rooms and uses in the adjoining dwellings. This should be submitted prior to commencement and be implemented prior to occupation of the development and thereafter be permanently retained. The second condition set by the Environmental Health Officer would be to submit a demolition method statement and a construction management plan prior to the commencement of the works. Details should include control measures for dust, noise, vibration, lighting, delivery locations, restriction of hours of work, associated activities audible beyond the boundary wall during construction hours, neighbour notification and interested parties and public display of contact details. The construction management plan would be secured by a S106 agreement should the application be approved.

6. Transport Implications

- 6.1 The site's Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) is 6A and the site falls within the West Kentish Town (Outer) Controlled Parking Zone.
- 6.2 As per the requirement of Policy DP18 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Local Development Policies, should planning permission have been granted, it would have been subject to a car-free legal agreement to ensure that future occupants of the development are aware that they are not entitled to onstreet parking permits. Policy DP18 seeks to ensure car-free development in low parking provision areas, which include high areas of PTAL. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the residential units as car-free housing, the proposal cannot be supported as this would contribute unacceptable to parking congestion in the surrounding area and promote the use of non-sustainable transport, contrary to policies CS11 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and DP18 of the Local Development Framework Development Policies.
- 6.3 Following initial consultation comments from the Council's Transport Department, 4x vertical cycle parking stands were proposed in the communal landing on the first floor of the development. Although the proposed cycle stands do not entirely comply with Camden's Cycle Parking Standards as detailed in CPG7 (Transport), it is considered acceptable given the constraints of the applicant site.
- 6.4 Further details of how the site will be accessed and serviced during the construction have been requested to be submitted by the Council's Transport Department. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the submission and implementation of a Construction Management Plan, it would be likely to contribute unacceptable to traffic disruption and road safety hazards and be detrimental to the amenities of the area generally, contrary to policies CS5, CS11 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and policies DP20 and DP21 of the Local Development Framework Development Policies..

7. Water Usage

7.1 All new build or converted dwellings will be required to achieve 110L per person, per day (including 5L of water for

8.1 S C 8.2 B	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Should the application be granted planning permission, the scheme would have been liable for both the Mayoral CIL and the Camden CIL. This is as the scheme involves a creation of a residential unit.
C 8.2 B	Should the application be granted planning permission, the scheme would have been liable for both the Mayoral CIL and the Camden CIL. This is as the scheme involves a creation of a residential unit.
£	Based on the information given on the submitted plans and CIL form, the charge is likely to be £8,780 (175.6sqm \times 500) for the Mayor's CIL and £87,800 (175.6sqm \times £500) for the Camden CIL.
9. R	Recommendation
R	Refuse Planning Permission.

