

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	02/01/2017
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	08/12/2016
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Nora-Andreea Constantinescu			2016/5966/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
40 Rochester Road London NW1 9JJ			See draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Conversion of dwellinghouse into 2 x 2 bedroom self-contained flats (Class C3) and erection of a single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and mansard roof extension.				
Recommendation(s):	Refuse planning permission			
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	Site notices	16/11/2016 – 07/12/2016	No. of responses	3	No. of objections	3
	Press Notice	16/11/2016 – 07/12/2016				
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The residents at numbers 39, 44B, 51 Rochester Road have objected to the proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -loss of single family dwelling; family sized dwellings need to be protected -height, bulk, detailed design of mansard roof extension -bulk, design and detailing of first floor and rear extension -intensifying occupancy of the site and associated parking -noise and amenity concerns -overlooking – the mansard extension will look directly into our bedroom -rear extension would impact the neighbouring amenity -rear extension would be oppressive and reduce light and daylight to the kitchen window at no 39 Rochester Road -the flat roof of the extension can be used as a terrace – will cause overlooking -the subdivision into flats would create a precedent which if repeated would significantly change the character of the residential area. <p>Officer response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Camden Policies and Guidance support the additional provision of housing through conversions -the mansard roof extension is unacceptable in principle in design terms 					
Local group/CAAC	<p>The <u>Rochester CAAC</u> has objected to the proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -no Design and Access statement ; -plans do not show the neighbouring buildings for comparison of the setting; -proposal contrary to Camden’s housing policies: Camden’s policy to increase residential accommodation is being met by major developments in designated areas; -Camden has a policy to provide larger family accommodation and is against conversion of family houses into smaller units; -proposal contrary to Rochester Road Conservation Area Statement due to the proposed alterations, extensions and mansard roof. <p>Officer response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -a Design and Access Statement has been provided and is available to view online -there is no requirement for the submitted drawings to include the neighbouring buildings for comparison. A contextual assessment has been made by officers visiting the site. - there is an expectation that a proportion of housing need is met through windfall sites, not just major developments. -Camden policies do not resist the loss of larger family accommodation 					

	<p><i>provided the proposed unit mix is acceptable</i> <i>-it is agreed that the proposed development would be contrary to Rochester Road Conservation Area statement</i></p>
--	---

Site Description

The application site is located on the eastern side of Rochester Road and lies within Rochester Conservation Area.

The property is a 3 storey end of terrace dwellinghouse, with large windows centred on the front elevation and recessed entrance.

Relevant History

No planning records found in relation to the application site

Relevant planning applications nearby:

2016/2762/P – 38 Rochester Road NW1 9JJ - Erection of single storey part-replacement rear extension and installation of garden access stairs and associated conversion of window to door at first floor level to rear

8802514 - 42 Rochester Road NW1 - Erection of a roof extension - Granted 21/02/1989

9100759 - 41 Rochester Road NW1 - Erection of mansard extension with front terrace and dormer access – Granted 23/10/1991

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan 2016

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

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 heritage / conservation areas)

Development Policies

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

DP5 – (Homes of different sizes)

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)

DP21- (Development connecting to the highway network)

DP24 – (Securing high quality design)

DP25 – (Conserving Camden's heritage / conservation areas)

DP26 – (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG 1 (Design) 2015

CPG 2 (Housing) 2015

CPG 6 (Amenity) 2011

CPG 7 (Transport) 2011

Rochester Conservation Area Statement 2001

Camden Local Plan Submission Draft 2016

The emerging Camden Local Plan is reaching the final stages of its public examination. Consultation on proposed modifications to the Submission Draft Local Plan began on 30 January and ends on 13 March 2017. The modifications have been proposed in response to Inspector's comments during the examination and seek to ensure that the Inspector can find the plan 'sound' subject to the modifications being made to the Plan. The Local Plan at this stage is a material consideration in decision making, but pending publication of the Inspector's report into the examination only has limited weight.

Policy G1 – Delivery and location of growth

Policy A1 – Managing the impact of development

Policy H1 – Maximising housing supply

Policy H3 – Protecting existing homes

Policy H7 – Large and small homes

Policy D1 – Design

Policy D2 - Heritage

Policy DM1 – Delivery and monitoring

Policy T1 – Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport

Policy T2 – Parking and car free development

Assessment

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for conversion of an existing 3 bedroom house into 2 x 2 bedroom 3 person self-contained flats:

- Flat 1 – area of approximately 89sqm
- Flat 2 – area of approximately 70sqm

The scheme also includes the following:

- Erection of a rear extension which projects the full width of the house, with an approximate depth of 2.6m and height of 3m, and replaces 2 existing storage structures to the rear;
- Extension of the first floor side wing to the front and back to create a similar structure in terms of depth and height as the neighbouring one at no 39 Rochester Road;
- Mansard roof extension, which would match in height and bulk the existing mansard extension at the adjacent property at no 41 Rochester Road. The rear elevation of the extension rises sheer.

Assessment

The main issues for consideration area:

- Residential accommodation
- Design
- Residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers
- Transport and Parking

Residential accommodation

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.

In principle, the proposal to provide additional housing is in accordance with policies CS6 and DP2 of Camden's Local Development Framework (LDF). The Dwelling Size Priority Table accompanying Policy DP5 identifies 2 bedroom market units as being of 'Very High Priority' (the aim is identified at 40%). The proposal is for 2 x 2 bedroom units which is welcomed and considered acceptable as it would provide the high priority housing need of the borough. Camden policies and guidance support the provision of housing development.

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 National Housing Space Standards, 2 bed, 3 person dwellings expanding on two levels should have a minimum gross internal floor area of 70sqm and for 4 person ones, an area of 79sqm. The proposed flats would match and exceed these requirements, and the development is considered acceptable in terms of the quality of residential accommodation to be provided.

The proposed units would have open plan for kitchen, living and lounge areas which would also benefit from dual aspect. Amendments have been made to the internal layout of the units in order to provide good standard accommodation. The bedrooms would be appropriate sized with an adequate level sunlight and daylight, and built-in storage space would be provided. Overall the standard of accommodation provided by the proposed conversion is considered adequate and acceptable.

Design

The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within policy DP24 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the quality of materials to be used. Policy DP25 'Conserving Camden's Heritage' states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.

In relation to the rear extension, the property has an existing storage area which projects along the boundary with no 41 Rochester Road, with a depth of 3.4m and a height of 2.3m. Along the boundary with no 39 Rochester Road, the property has an extended store area which projects with a depth of 1.6m and a height of 2.6m. The proposed single storey rear extension would have a depth of 2.6m and a height of 3m. Seen from the rear the extension would appear to extend beyond the building's flank wall and wrap around it, with a width greater than the width of the main building. It is therefore considered that the proposed rear extension would not respect and preserve the existing historic pattern and would engulf the whole rear elevation with a poor and unsympathetic design.

In relation to the first floor extension, the adjacent property at no 39 has a small side infill structure which accommodates a bathroom. It is proposed to extend this projection to both front and rear of the property in question to accommodate a new staircase and storage area, which is considered acceptable. The first floor extension would match in height, depth and appearance the existing side extension at no 39 Rochester Road. As such, the extension would appear as a subordinate addition with no significant impact on the appearance of the host dwelling or streetscene.

Rochester Road is characterised by groups of terrace properties which are 3-4 storeys high including attic and lower ground floor levels with a mix of mainly unaltered butterfly and hipped roofs, although there have been some roof extensions. The application property has one large middle window whilst the neighbouring buildings have 2 windows per floor, which emphasise the vertical hierarchy of levels through lower window heights towards the eaves.

The application site is located at the end of a group of 4 terraced properties, where the 2 middle ones

at nos 41 and 42 have been extended at the roof level. The Rochester Road Conservation Area Statement identifies these 2 existing roof extensions as they “disrupt the roofline and symmetry of the blocks by their visual prominence, scale and bulk” and that they have an “adverse effect of the roofscape” as well as the ones at nos 24 and 38 Rochester Road. Furthermore, the Conservation Area statement highlights in policy R25 that “Mansard additions and other forms of roof extension, which fundamentally change the roof form are uncharacteristic of the Conservation Area. The introduction of roof addition of this nature is unlikely to be acceptable due to the adverse effect on the skyline and surrounding streetscene.” It is therefore considered that in this instance, the proposed mansard roof extension would be considered unacceptable in principle.

Even though the existing roof extensions located in the middle of this group of 4 properties are considered to disrupt the roofline, they create a balance with the shallow pitch roofs existing on both sides at nos 43 and 40. It is considered that the proposed roof extension at no 40 would cause further harm to an already eroded roofscape and would unbalance the terrace group.

The application site appears to be in balance with the adjacent property at no 39, part of the next group of terrace properties as they have same characteristics and proportions. It is considered that the proposed roof extension would also cause harm and unbalance this relationship.

Furthermore, the proposed mansard extension due to its design and appearance would be contrary to CPG1 which details the characteristic of a true mansard.

In light of the above and paying special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013, it is considered that an additional roof extension at no 40, would further disrupt the symmetry given by the already unsympathetic two existing roof extensions and would contribute to a further erosion of the character and appearance of Rochester Road Conservation Area.

Residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers

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 any proposed development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbour by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to the amenity and that any development should avoid harmful effects on the amenity of existing and future occupiers and to nearby properties. CPG6 seeks development to be “designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree” and that the Council will “aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight caused by a development on the amenity of existing occupiers”.

The proposed ground floor rear extension is not considered to cause any significant loss of light or outlook to the neighbouring amenities, given its size, siting and projection similar to existing rear structures here. As the extension would have a flat roof, in the event that permission were to be granted a condition would be imposed which prevents the flat roof being used as a roof terrace. The only openings are on the rear elevation of the extension facing into the garden, it would not impact on the privacy of neighbours.

The proposed infill first floor extension, due to its position, location and projection, would not cause any impact in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy, and is therefore considered acceptable on these terms.

The proposed mansard roof extension, due to its position and projection and distance from properties opposite and at rear, would not cause any impact in terms of loss of light or outlook. Concerns have been raised in relation to overlooking from the mansard’s window to the properties facing the application site. There is a distance of approximately 16.6m from the mansard window to the properties on the other side of the road, which is considered to be sufficient to prevent loss of privacy and in any case is typical of all properties opposite each other in this type of street.

Transport and Parking

Policies CS11 and DP17 support cycle provision and Camden's parking standards for cycles states that one cycle parking space is required per residential unit. Changes to the London Plan recently adopted require two cycle spaces to be provided for two bed and higher units in a secure and accessible location. The development is therefore required to provide four secure cycle spaces, which have been included in the proposed scheme. In the front garden it is proposed two Sheffield Cycle stands which are considered acceptable.

Development policy DP18 states that the Council seeks to ensure that developments provide the minimum necessary car parking provision. The Council expects development to be car free in the Central London Area, town centres and other areas within Controlled Parking Zones and that are easily accessible by public transport. The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) score of 3b which indicates a medium level of accessibility by public transport. This will to be secured by means of a Section 106 Agreement. In the absence of an acceptable scheme, the lack of a s106 for car-free development forms a reason for refusal of the application.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.