

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		23/05/2017		
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		27/04/2017		
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>				
Kristina Smith				2017/0695/P				
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>				
17 Greville Street London EC1N 8SQ				Location Plan; GS SCH 2 01; GS SCH 2 02				
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>					
<b>Proposal(s)</b>								
Erection of additional storey and reprovion of mansard roof to provide 2-bed flat (C3)								
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refused						
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission						
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice						
<b>Informatives:</b>								
<b>Consultations</b>								
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. of responses			00	No. of objections		00
		No. electronic			00			
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		A site notice was displayed between 30/03/2017 and 20/04/2017 A press advert was published between 06/04/2017 and 27/04/2017  No responses received.						
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>		No responses received						
<b>Site Description</b>								
<p>The application site is a four storey (plus mansard roof extension) terraced property located on the southern side of Greville Street, at the junction with Kirby Street. The property is in retail use (A1) at ground floor level and residential use (8 x 1-bed units) at first to fourth levels.</p> <p>To the rear, the property adjoins no.1 Bleeding Heart Yard which also adjoins no.19 Greville Street forming a central courtyard/ lightwell area to the rear of no.18 Greville St.</p> <p>The property is located within the Hatton Garden Conservation Area and it is identified as making a neutral contribution to the conservation area. The two adjoining properties at no. 16 and 18 Greville</p>								

Street are both identified as positive contributors.

## Relevant History

### APPLICATION SITE

**2006/4466/P** - Change of use and works of conversion of 1st floor from retail (Class A1) to residential (Class C3) to provide 1x 1-bedroom self-contained flat, addition of side extension to rear lightwell at 1st - 4th floor levels to enclose replacement staircase, conversion of existing residential flats at 2nd - 4th floor levels to provide 1x 1-bedroom self-contained unit at 2nd floor level, and 1x 3-bedroom self-contained unit at 3rd and 4th floor levels, and provision of new dormer window at the rear. **Granted subject to s.106 legal agreement 30/03/2007**

### 18 GREVILLE STREET

**2005/5052/P** - Erection of a roof extension and a four storey rear extension to existing B1 use at first to fourth floor levels, together with the change of use of ground floor and basement from retail (Class A1) to restaurant (Class A3) use, the installation of a new shop front and an extract flue to the rear. **Refused 24/04/2006** on the grounds that: *The proposed change of use by reason of the loss of a retail unit within the designated Hatton Garden Protected Retail Frontage would be detrimental to the character and function of the area*

### 19 GREVILLE STREET

**PS9804830** - The erection of a mansard roof storey for office use, together with kitchen extract flue and 4 chiller units at roof level and the restoration of the shopfront. **Granted 01/01/1999**

**PSX0105134** - Extension of roof to provide additional office space. **Refused 09/11/2001** on the grounds that, *"The proposed roof extension is considered detrimental to the host building and the character and appearance of the Hatton Garden Conservation Area, by virtue of its excessive bulk, height and poor design."*

### 1 BLEEDING HEART YARD (adjoining property to the rear)

**2012/0952/P** - Renewal of planning permission ref: 2007/5093/P granted on 31/03/2009 for the erection of an additional floor to comprise a self-contained residential unit. **Granted 10/05/2012**

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

#### National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

#### National Planning Practice Guidance

#### The London Plan 2016

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies (2010)

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS6 – Providing quality homes

CS11 – Promoting sustainable and efficient travel

CS13 – Tackling climate change through promoting high environmental standards

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

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

DP22 – Sustainable design and construction

DP23 – Water

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance (updated July 2015)**

#### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 – Design (2015) – *paragraph 5.8*

CPG6 – Amenity (2011)

CPG7 – Transport (2011)

CPG9 – Planning Obligations (2011)

### **Hatton Garden Conservation Area Statement (Final Draft as agreed by DC Sub-Committee 5.8.99)**

#### **Emerging Local Plan**

The Inspector's report on the Local Plan was published on 15 May 2017 and concludes that the plan is 'sound' subject to modifications being made to the Plan. While the determination of planning applications should continue to be made in accordance with the existing development plan until formal adoption, substantial weight may now be attached to the relevant policies of the emerging plan as a material consideration following publication of the Inspector's report, subject to any relevant recommended modifications in the Inspector's report.

The Local Plan policies relevant to the proposals are:

H1 – Maximising housing supply;

H6 – Housing choice and mix;

H7 – Large and small homes;

A1 – Managing the impact of development;

D1 - Design

D2 - Heritage

T1 – Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport;

T2 – Car-free development and limiting the availability of parking.

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for:

- Erection of additional storey and re-provision of mansard roof to provide self-contained 2-bed flat (C3)

*It is noted that the Location Plan submitted as part of the application is incorrectly numbered. The red line is drawn around no.17; however, the site outlined is actually no.18 Greville Street.*

### 2. Assessment

2.1 The main considerations in the assessment of the application for planning permission are:

- Land use
- Quality of residential accommodation
- Design and impact on host building and the Hatton Garden Conservation Area
- Amenity
- Transport

#### 2.1 Land use

2.1.1 Housing is regarded as the priority land-use of the Local Development Framework, and the Council will make housing its top priority when considering the future of unused and underused land and buildings. The proposal would provide an additional 2-bed unit and is therefore compliant with policies CS6 and DP2 as long as it meets the Council's residential development standards and does not harm the amenity of existing and future occupiers.

2.1.2 Policy DP5 (Homes of different sizes) seeks to provide a range of unit sizes to meet demand across the borough and regards 2-bed units as very high priority. As the policy would provide a 2-bed unit it would be compliant with DP5.

#### 2.2 Quality of residential accommodation

2.2.1 The proposed 2-bed flat would measure approx. 80sqm over two floors which is compliant with the nationally described space standards for a two storey 2b4p unit. It would be dual-aspect property with sufficient sized windows serving all habitable rooms. The rear bedroom would have some private amenity space in the form of a small terrace. The quality of accommodation is therefore acceptable.

#### 2.3. Design and conservation

2.3.1 Policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) requires that all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings will be expected to consider:

- a) the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;
- b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed.

2.3.2 The character and appearance of the buildings adjacent to the application site is varied and therefore the property is not read as part of a building group with a shared architectural style. The main consideration is therefore the impact on the host property, and its relationship to its neighbours and role in the wider streetscene.

2.3.3 Compared to the properties along the rest of the street, the building has a narrow plot width akin to its next door neighbour at no.18 Greville Street which is a storey lower. The existing four storey

property already appears as a tall and narrow building on the street and any further height would accentuate its narrow proportions, contrary to paragraph 5.8 of CPG1 which discourages roof additions where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension. The proposal would also contravene the Hatton Garden Conservation Area statement (paragraph 7.22) which reads that all extensions should respect the proportions and architectural treatment of the original building.

2.3.4 The property is situated in between no.18 and no.16 Greville Street, both of which are positive contributors. No.18 has the same plot width but is already a storey lower. An additional storey would create an excessive contrast in heights between two adjoining buildings. No.16 Greville Street is a wider, more elaborate building that was designed as a pair with its neighbour at no.15 Greville Street. The pair of buildings is taller than the application site by virtue of its pitched gable roof, and this additional height allows the pair to have a more imposing presence in the townscape. An additional storey on the application site would be harmful to the pair of positive contributors to the detriment of these two properties and also result in an awkward relationship between the application site and no.16

2.3.5 Furthermore, the site is situated in a particularly prominent location opposite the junction with Kirby Street and is therefore visible in long views down the entire length of Kirby Street. The proposed extension would therefore cause more extensive harm to the character of the conservation area.

2.3.6 In terms of detailed design, the design of the mansard roof would be compliant with the Council's guidance as it would be of a 70-degree angle and have a slate tile roof. The fenestration would appear to replicate the existing style of window and is considered acceptable. No information has been provided about the use of materials of the brickwork and windows and therefore the proposed detailed design constitutes part of the reason for refusal.

## **2.4 Amenity**

2.4.1 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, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight.

2.4.2 The proposal is likely to have some impact on the daylight received by several of the windows that face into the central courtyard; however, no evidence has been found to suggest that the windows serve residential units. Furthermore, by virtue of the distance between the buildings and the existing low levels of daylight in the central courtyard, the increased height is not likely to make the situation materially worse.

## **2.5 Transport**

2.5.1 Policy DP18 (Paragraphs 18.12 and 18.13) requires new residential development to provide cycle parking facilities in accordance with the minimum requirements as set out within Appendix 2 of the Camden Development Policies document and the London Plan.

2.5.2 The application form and supporting information suggests that cycle parking facilities would not be provided. The proposal in the absence of cycle parking facilities is contrary to Core Strategies CS11 and CS19 and Development Policy DP18 as it would fail to encourage cycling as a sustainable and efficient mode of transport. The proposal would need to provide 2 covered, fully enclosed, secure and step-free cycle parking spaces to comply with the minimum requirements of Camden and London Plan cycle parking standards.

2.5.3 The application site is located in an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 6b. Given the transport accessibility level of the site a car-free development is required. The applicant has not agreed to enter into a legal agreement for a car-free development.

2.5.4 Construction vehicles servicing this site will have an impact on the surrounding road network. 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. The applicant has not agreed to enter into a legal agreement to secure a Construction Management Plan and associated financial contribution as a planning obligation which is considered unacceptable.

### **3. Conclusion**

3.1 The provision of a new residential unit on site is considered acceptable as it is considered a priority use within Camden's Local Development Framework; however, the design is considered unacceptable by virtue of its impact on the both the host building, neighbouring properties and wider streetscene. As such the proposal is contrary to policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of Camden's Local Development Framework.

3.2 The applicant has failed to provide any provision for cycle parking. The applicant has also not agreed to enter into a Section 106 legal agreement to secure a car-free legal agreement and a Construction Management Plan which is considered unacceptable and contrary to policies CS11, CS19 and DP18 of Camden's Local Development Framework.

3.3 The adjacent public highway could be damaged as part of the construction process. Such works would require a financial contribution secured via a Section 106 which would be refundable provided the public highway is left in the same state of repair as a result of the works. The applicant has not agreed to enter into a legal agreement to secure a contribution towards highway works.

3.4 It is therefore considered that the proposal is contrary to policies CS11, DP18, DP19, DP20 and DP21 of Camden's Local Development Framework.

### **4. Recommendation**

4.1 Refuse planning permission.