

| | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Delegated Report | | Analysis sheet | Expiry Date: | 18/01/2017 |
| (Members Briefing) | | N/A / attached | Consultation Expiry Date: | 29/12/2016 |
| Officer | | | Application Number | |
| Seonaid Carr | | | 2016/6394/P | |
| Application Address | | | Drawing Numbers | |
| 3-7 Bayham Street and 46 Bayham Place London NW1 0EY | | | See draft decision notice | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signature | C&UD | Authorised Officer Signature | |
| | | | | |
| Proposal | | | | |
| Erection of a mansard roof extension to Nos.3, 5 and 7 Bayham Street, two storey rear extension to No.3, the installation of windows to the flank wall facing Bayham Place and replacement windows to the front elevation. | | | | |
| Recommendation: | Grant conditional permission subject to Section 106 legal agreement | | | |
| 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 | 04 | No. of objections | 04 |
| Summary of consultation responses: | <p>A press notice was published on 08 December expiring on 29 December 2016 and a site notice was displayed on 02 December expiring on 23 December 2016.</p> <p>1 objection has been received from a neighbouring business Koko nightclub at 1A Camden High Street, 1 from the landlord of Koko nightclub and 1 from a neighbouring resident at King's Terrace. A summary of their responses are summarised below:</p> <p>Koko objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst our client is supportive of development and improvements to the existing buildings in principle, in the absence of a noise assessment to allow consideration regarding amenity of future residents, we object to the application. • The proposed changes are materially different to the current residential configuration and could raise new impacts that need to be considered. • In its current form the application does not take into account the proximity of Koko and other nearby leisure venues. It is crucial the Council is satisfied the application proposals include appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that this will not impact the amenity of future residential of the proposed scheme. • The Council's local validation list does state 'if your proposal is for a noise sensitive development...a noise assessment should be submitted.' Residential use is considered noise sensitive. Whilst the use is not changing, by virtue of the fact the layout is changing and the alterations require planning permission, the development as a whole needs to be considered and a noise sensitive use is being proposed adjacent to noise generating uses and a main road. • We are aware of a number of previous residential development within London which have resulted in the closure of long-standing nearby leisure uses due to the impact on amenity of residents within the new schemes. • We are concerned the application has not fully assessed the implications of this proximity to Koko within the submission, specifically the lack of submission of a noise impact assessment. • The new windows to Bayham Place are sensitive to noise arising from Koko, it is therefore crucial the Council is satisfied that any changes to these residential units do not make them more susceptible to noise disturbances from the existing/future operation. Indeed, the proposals must include for appropriate mitigation measures to prevent any implications for future residential tenants. • We have concerns the current application fails to include a Noise Impact Assessment and any mitigation measures. We consider the application cannot be determined until this document is submitted and duly assessed. | | | | | |

- The importance of considering noise implications was highlighted in the recent decision at the Hope and Anchor site, where the decision for conversion to residential was challenged on the grounds that noise was not adequately assessed.
- The recent approved scheme at 48-56 Bayham Place included a Noise Impact Assessment, we see no reason why this should not.

Officer Response:

- *Following the receipt of the above objections a noise report was requested from the applicant. This has since been received and reviewed by the Councils Environmental Health officer who has considered the noise assessment sufficient and raises no objection to the proposal. Further details are assessed within section 4 below.*
- *This application is different to the recent decision at the Hope and Anchor site in the respect that the Hope and Anchor was proposing new residential accommodation whereas this application is extending existing residential accommodation and would not create any additional units.*

King's Terrace objection

- This is a total loss of butterfly roofs that is clearly not supported by DP25 with includes paragraph c. By no stretch of the imagination can the loss of an historic roofscape meet either of the criteria of preserves and enhances the conservation area.
- The importance of butterfly roofs is confirmed in part 6 of your guidance 'Roofs – A guide to Alterations on Domestic buildings' which was published in 2004, this has not altered in respect of the importance of butterfly roofs by any subsequent guidance. This applies throughout the Borough and must be of particular importance in Conservation Areas. No where in the submission can I find an argument that the circumstances in this case are other than normal.
- The fact these type of roof originated in London reinforces the importance.
- The development would fail to comply with DP24, which seeks to secure high quality design. It would not respect the character, setting, context, form or scale of neighbouring buildings.
- Object to the incrementally increasing sense of enclosure and loss of light which has taken, and continues to take place.
- The effect of the development should be considered in conjunction with the effect of the other recent and proposed developments in the immediate vicinity of which you are well aware. Those already permitted have or will add to an increased sense of enclosure and loss of light, it would be in breach of DP26.

Officer Response:

- *With regard to design, the buildings are Victorian townhouses. This type and age of building in London would typically have mansard roof extensions which sit in a street with varied roofscape and height. There are only 2 butterfly roofs together, it would not be considered a run of butterfly roofs which are worthy of protection. Paragraph 5.15 of CPG1 notes that mansard additions are often a historically appropriate solution for traditional townscapes.*
- *Given both valley roofs have come forward together as one development a Section 106 legal agreement will be used to ensure both are brought forward as one development to ensure their similarities are retained.*
- *The guidance noted above has been superseded by Local*

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| | <p><i>Development Plan policies published in 2010 and Camden Planning Guidance 1(Design) 2015.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>With regard to amenity impact, the application site is located 37.2m to the south of the objecting neighbour and is separated from the application site with a number of buildings. It is considered the development would not impact on this neighbouring properties sense of enclosure or levels of light received.</i> • <i>When considering it in conjunction with the permissions already granted at Nos.48-56 Bayham Place, the current proposal would not rise above what has been granted at No.48-56 Bayham Place and therefore would not result in any additional loss of light or increased sense of enclosure as a result of this proposal.</i> |
| <p>CAAC comments:</p> | <p>Camden Town CAAC have raised objection on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our committee found these proposed designs very unacceptable. No.3 is a handsome double-fronted house, probably one of the oldest in the street, No.5 and 7 are also distinguished with all their details intact. • The incorporation of No.46 Bayham Place into the plan of No.3 produces an ugly, lop-sided plan. • The north side of Bayham Place should not be altered as it dates from 1804, one of the oldest parts of Camden Town. • The designs for the proposed mansards are far too dominant, being higher than the individual heights of the ground, first and second floors of the three houses. <p><i>Officer Response:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The proposed development would retain the detailing of the buildings including the balconies to the front of Nos.5&7 which are mentioned within the Conservation Area Statement, there would be no alterations to these balconies.</i> • <i>No.46 Bayham Place and No.3 Bayham Street are already part of the same building.</i> • <i>The proposed development is considered to respect the integrity of the building, as noted within CPG1, mansard roof additions are often an historically appropriate solution for traditional buildings as is considered the case for this application.</i> • <i>Revisions were sought during the course of the application to reduce the height of the mansard addition to be more appropriate to the proportions of the parent building.</i> |

Site Description

The application site is located to the western side of Bayham Street at the corner with Bayham Place. The western side of Bayham Street is characterised by two, three and four storey houses. These vary to buildings with and without roof extensions providing a varied roofscape. To the rear of the application site is No.48-56 Bayham Place, which is a three storey building that has recently been granted permission for a roof addition. Located to the south of the application site, to the opposite side of Bayham Place, is No.65 Bayham Place and the rear of 1A Camden High Street, also known as Koko, which is a Grade II Listed Building.

It is important to note that Nos.3-7 Bayham Street front onto Bayham Street. Nos.5 and 7 are single dwelling houses, No.3 Bayham Street is formed of two self-contained units, one being No.3 Bayham Street and the second No.46 Bayham Place, the latter of which is accessed via Bayham Place.

The site is located within the Camden Town Conservation Area and Nos.3-7 Bayham Street are considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area.

Relevant History

Application Site

No.5 Bayham Street

2016/5789/P - Alterations to rear windows and installation of six rooflights – Granted on 02/11/2016.

No.7 Bayham Street

2016/5787/P - Alterations to rear windows and installation of four rooflights – Granted on 02/11/2016.

Neighbouring Sites

Nos. 48-56 Bayham Place

2016/4116/P - Erection of a part single, part double roof extension to provide 4 self-contained units (1 x studio and 3 x 2 bed)(Class C3), two rear extensions at first and second floor level and associated external alterations – Granted on 02/11/2016.

1A Camden High Street(Koko) & Hope and Anchor

2016/6959/P & 2016/6960/L - Redevelopment involving change of use from offices (Class B1) and erection of 5 storey building with basement to provide 32 bedroom hotel (Class C1) following demolition of 65 Bayham Place and 1 Bayham Street (retention of façade) including change of use at 1st and 2nd floor of 74 Crowndale Road from pub (Class A4) to hotel (Class C1), mansard roof extension to 74 Crowndale Road, retention of ground floor of Hope & Anchor PH (Class A4), conversion of flytower to ancillary recording studio and hotel (C1), creation of terraces at 3rd and 4th floor level and erection of 4th floor glazed extension above roof of Koko to provide restaurant and bar to hotel (C1). Application currently pending consideration.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2016

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance 2013/2015

CPG1 (Design)

CPG6 (Amenity)

Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2007

Assessment

1.0 Revisions

1.1 During the course of the application amendments were received which secured a reduction in the height of the mansard addition.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a mansard roof extension across the three properties of 3-7 Bayham Street together with a two storey rear extension to No.3 Bayham Street and the installation of windows to the flank wall facing Bayham Place. The proposal also includes replacement windows to the front elevation.

2.2 The proposed mansard extension would span across Nos.5 & 7 set at the same height, pitch and depth. The mansard would be set behind the parapet at both the front and rear elevation and would rise at an angle of 70 degrees, it would accommodate 2 dormer windows to each of No.5 & 7 which would align with the windows in the elevation below and would be clad in metal cladding.

2.3 Given the character of No.3 and 46 Bayham Place is slightly different with a pitched roof rather than a butterfly and as the property is set slightly lower, the mansard addition at this point responds to the context of the building. The extension would be set lower than the mansard addition at Nos.5 & 7, to take account of the change in character of the host buildings. However it would read as a mansard to the front elevation also set at a 70 degree pitch set behind a parapet with three dormer windows to reflect the 3 window formation in the elevations below. It would also be clad in the same material as the addition to Nos.5 & 7. Given No.3 is at the end of the row it's flank elevation is terminated in a parapet wall which would adjoin the 2 storey rear extension to No.3. This side parapet would include the installation of six new timber framed windows at all levels. The development also includes alterations to the windows to the front elevation at all levels.

2.4 The proposed rear extension to No.3 Bayham Street and 46 Bayham Place would be located at first and second floor level above the existing single storey extension and infill the gap between the application site and No. 48-56 Bayham Place. Due to the splayed nature of the existing single storey extension the proposed extension at first and second floor level would extend between 1.6-2.6m in depth and would be 8.6m wide, the extension would terminate in line with the parapet of No.48-56 Bayham Place. The extension would be constructed in materials to match the existing flank elevation and would be rendered to match the existing.

3.0 Design

3.1 There are three elements to the proposed development; the mansard roof addition, rear extension and installation of windows to the flank wall facing Bayham Place. Each of these has been

assessed in turn below.

Mansard Roof Extension

- 3.2 The buildings are Victorian townhouses. This type and age of building in London would typically have mansard roof extensions which sit in a street with varied roofscape and height. In this regard the opportunity for adding accommodation to the building is considered acceptable in principle subject to the specific context for each building and the design of the roofs in this instance.
- 3.3 The design of the roofs has been amended during the course of the application to reduce the height and proportions of the roofs. Following this amendment it is considered that proportionally the roof addition appears subservient.
- 3.4 With regard to the detailed design, the mansard would be set at an angle of 70 degrees rising from behind the parapet wall as required within CPG1. Furthermore, the dormer windows of the mansard would align with the windows in the elevations below on all three properties and would be narrower than the windows below, thereby respecting the window hierarchy of the building.
- 3.5 Nos.5 & 7 are a matching pair of terrace houses with valley roofs above parapet. Erecting a roof extension to these properties should, and have been proposed, to be completed together to ensure the pair retain their similarities. In this regard it is recommended that a Section 106 legal agreement is used to secure the development is built out together to ensure the roof extensions are built at the same time to retain the buildings as matching pairs. It is also important to note the valley parapet detail would be retained to the rear of Nos.5 & 7.
- 3.6 No.3 is lower in height than 5 & 7 and is three bays wide instead of being two. It has a pitched roof behind parapet as oppose to a valley roof. The proposed scheme retains the step in roof height and parapet level to distinguish the building from its neighbours. The windows comply as above and the proportions of the level is adequate to comply with Camden guidance.
- 3.7 With regard to the materials, the roof addition would be clad in metal which is a traditional and typical roofing material and is considered acceptable in the context of the surrounding conservation area.

Rear extension

- 3.8 No. 3 Bayham Street is one room deep compared with 5&7 which are 2 rooms deep. This results in a small wedge of space above ground before you see the flank wall of no.5. The proposal would essentially create a 2 room deep plan building as seen from the street. Officers consider this extension to be a suitable modification to the property which is consistent with its age and typology, infilling the uncomfortable break in build development and complete the streetscape.
- 3.9 The design would match the host building in respect of materials, detailed execution and finished appearance.

Alteration to windows

- 3.10 It is proposed to install new windows to the Bayham Place elevation, which would result in a double frontage to the building. This would address the entrance of Bayham Place in a similar manner as the building opposite which also addresses the entrance. The windows are considered proportion in their size and appropriate in their design. The application includes alterations to windows to the front elevation which would include increasing the window openings by 0.3-0.4m at 2nd floor level, enlarging the windows at ground floor level to align with those in the elevation above, dropping the cills of the windows at basement level within the existing lightwells and installing a new door at basement level. The new windows are considered to be appropriate to the character of the parent buildings and details of their design will be secured via condition to ensure a high quality replacement.
- 3.11 When considering the development as a whole and its impact on the surrounding conservation

area, special regard has been attached to the desirability of preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the Camden Town Conservation Area, under s.72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013. It is considered that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

- 3.12 Furthermore it is noted that the Conservation Area Statement notes, *Nos. 3 - 7 Bayham Place are three fine houses with well detailed door surrounds and Nos.5 - 7 with balconies*. It is considered the proposed development would not harm the integrity of these parent buildings and they would retain their character as fine houses. There would be no amendments to the balconies to No.5 -7.
- 3.13 In respect of the neighbouring listed building, Section 66 of the Act requires that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects the setting of a listed building the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Great weight and importance has been given to the significance of the heritage asset set out above. In this instance the orientation of the listed building and minor nature of the works is not considered to impact on the setting of the listed building.
- 3.14 In light of the above, the proposal is considered to accord with policies DP24 and DP25 and would provide a well-considered design within the context of the parent building, the surrounding conservation area and neighbouring listed building.

4.0 Amenity

- 4.1 Given the siting of the proposed mansard extension it would not cause harm to neighbouring residents amenity in respect of daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and sense of enclosure.
- 4.2 As the infill extension would infill the gap to the rear of No.3 Bayham Street and No.48-56 Bayham Place it would not cause harm to the amenity of the future occupiers of this neighbouring buildings as there are no windows to this neighbouring elevation on No.48-56 Bayham Place.
- 4.3 During the course of the application two objections were received from the neighbouring building Koko, one from the landlord and one from the operator of the nightclub venue. Both objections raised concern in respect of the impact of residential use adjacent to the nightclub venue and considered it necessary to require a noise report to demonstrate if there would be harm to the occupiers of the residential units within the application site.
- 4.4 It is important to note that the buildings are currently in residential use and the proposed development would not be providing any new residential units. It would therefore not be a requirement for the applicant to provide a noise report. However officers sought a noise report from the applicant as part of the application with the aim of addressing the concerns of the neighbouring business. The noise report has been received and reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer who raises no objection to the proposal and has requested conditions to secure details of sound insulation to be provided prior to commencement of development and the noise mitigation measures set out in the report shall meet the noise standard specified in BS8233:2014 for internal rooms and external amenity areas.
- 4.5 The noise report has recommended that the windows facing Bayham Place have wide airspace double glazing units to control music noise and the windows facing Bayham Street have acoustic double glazed units to control traffic noise. A whole house ventilation system is also recommended so windows can remain closed. As noted above the Council's Environmental Health officer supports this method of noise mitigation.

5.0 Recommendation

5.1 Grant conditional permission subject to Section 106 legal agreement.

The decision to refer an application to Planning Committee lies with the Director of Regeneration and Planning. Following the Members Briefing panel on Monday 6th February 2017, nominated members will advise whether they consider this application should be reported to the Planning Committee. For further information, please go to www.camden.gov.uk and search for 'Members Briefing'.