

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	31/05/2017	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	11/05/2017	
Officer			Application Numbers			
Anna Roe			2017/1882/P			
Application Address			Drawing Numbers			
73 Maygrove Road, London, NW6 2EG			Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature			
Proposal						
Erection of 2 storey external lift shaft with connecting walkway to the north elevation.						
Recommendation:	Refuse Permission					
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	N/A	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:	<u>Planning</u> Advertisement in local press on 13/04/17 – 04/05/17 Site notice displayed on 12/04/17 - 03/05/17					
CAAC comments:	N/A					

Site Description

The site is located on the northern side of Maygrove Road opposite Arial Road and adjacent to Maygrove Peace Park.

No. 73 is arranged over four storeys (including basement). The property was originally constructed as a factory but has since been converted to offices, residential apartments and live work units.

73a Maygrove Road, the building behind 73 Maygrove Road, replaced old storage sheds associated with the factory and is now in residential use. A car park / court yard separates the two buildings.

The property is not located in a Conservation Area and is not statutorily listed.

Relevant History

2017/2984/P - Variation of condition 9 (the approved plans) pursuant to planning permission 2015/2396/P dated 14/07/2016. *Decision pending.*

2017/0991/P - Variation of condition 4 (Building Regulations Part M4 2) of planning permission 2015/2396/P dated 14/07/16 (for erection of a mansard roof incorporating 3 residential dwellings). Granted 11/04/2017.

2016/5498/P - Erection of 4 storey extension comprising 4 flats (3x2 bed and 1x1 bed) and associated cycle and bin stores. *Granted Subject to S106 (unsigned).*

2016/2021/P - Variation of Condition 9 (approved plans) of planning permission 2015/2301/P dated 14/07/2016. *Granted Subject to S106 17/02/2017.*

2015/2396/P - Erection of a mansard roof incorporating 3 residential dwellings (1x1 bed & 2x2 bed). *Granted Subject to S106 14/07/2016.*

2015/2301/P - Erection of 2 storey side extension at 1st and 2nd floor and single storey side extension at 1st floor (both extensions bridging over existing vehicle access at ground floor) to provide additional live/work unit and extension of existing live/work unit. *Granted Subject to S106 14/07/2016.*

2015/0216/PRE - 3 storey extension and dormer roof extension to provide an additional 6 residential units. *Pre-application Issued 05/03/2015.*

2014/4728/P - Installation of a dormer window to rear elevation. *Granted 29/09/2014.*

2014/3204/P - Change of use from offices (Class B1) to residential use (Class C3) to provide 18 flats. *Grant Prior Approval 23/07/2014.*

2013/8259/P - Change of use from offices (Class B1) to residential use (Class C3) to provide 15 flats. *Refuse Prior Approval 04/03/2014.*

2004/3715/P - Change of use and works of conversion of the 2nd floor and roof void from business use (Class B1) to 5 x live/work units (Sui Generis). *Refused 15/10/2004.*

2004/0856/P - The change of use of the 2nd floor and roof void from 5 x business units (Class B1) to 5 x live/work units (Sui Generis). *Refused 13/05/2004.*

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework, 2012
London Plan, 2016

Camden Local Plan, 2017

A1 Managing the impact of development

C6 Access for all

D1 Design

Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design, 2015, chapter 1,2 and 4

CPG6 Amenity, 2011, chapter 6, 7 and 9

Assessment

1. Proposal

- 1.1 Permission is sought for the erection of a partial 2/3 storey lift shaft to the rear elevation of the property on its northern side. The lift is designed to service the second floor level.
- 1.2 The proposed lift shaft would be positioned some 1.73 metres from the properties rear façade with a semi glazed elevated walk way at second floor connecting the lift shaft to the main building.
- 1.3 The lift shaft would be clad in dark grey stained Accoya wood and would measure 7.4m high x 2.7m deep x 2.7m wide.

2. Assessment

The main issues in this case are:

- Land Use
- Design
- Amenity impact

3. Land Use

- 3.1 The applicant considers the use of the ground floor property adjacent to the proposed development to be residential. Planning history demonstrates the last known use to be B1. Given the uncertainty in the use of the adjacent ground floor property for the purposes of the application it has been assessed as residential given what the applicant has noted. However that does not mean the lawful use is residential. An enforcement enquiry will be set up to investigate the use of the premises.

4. Design

- 4.1 Camden's Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance the environment and heritage. Policy D1 require all developments, to be of the highest standard of design and the Council will expect developments to consider the character and proportions of the existing building, where extensions are proposed and the quality of materials will be a key consideration.
- 4.2 Chapter 4 of Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design) offers detailed advice on the design of rear extensions. The guidance recommends extensions should be secondary to the building being extended in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing.
- 4.3 The lift shaft would constitute a subordinate addition which would not be overly dominant when viewed against the host building, as it would measure just 2.7m deep by 2.7m wide. Furthermore, given its location to the rear of the site, it would not be open to significant public

views.

4.4 With regard to the choice of materials, Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design) stipulates that materials should form an integral part of the design process and should relate to the character and appearance of the area. The durability of materials and an understanding of how they will weather should be taken into consideration.

4.5 It is proposed to clad the lift shaft in Accoya wood, a form of modified wood known for its durability and stability. The dark grey stain would form a harmonious contrast with the property and would help to distinguish it from the existing building. The proposed glazing within the elevated walk way is considered appropriate as it contributes to the extension appearing as a lightweight form.

4.6 As such, this part of the proposal would not adversely affect the character of the building nor its wider surroundings and is considered to accord with the objectives of D1.

5. Residential Amenity

5.1 Camden's Local Plan seeks to conserve and enhance the features which make Camden an attractive place to live, work and visit and promoting and protecting high standards of amenity is a key element of this. Policy A1 requires the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours to be fully considered. It states that the Council will only grant planning permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity.

5.2 Camden Planning Guidance 6 (Amenity) provides more detailed advice on applying the Council's planning policies. Paragraphs 7.8 and 7.9 state that the proximity, size or cumulative effect of any structures should not have an overbearing and/or dominating effect that is detrimental to residential occupiers. Careful consideration should be given to the location of bin or cycle stores if they are in close proximity to windows or spaces used by occupiers.

5.3 The resulting built form would be sited only 1.73 metres from a window serving a habitable room, believed to be a bedroom in the ground floor. The assumption that this window serves a bedroom is based on the evidence provided including the proposal plans and the Sunlight/Daylight Study stating that 'ground floor bedroom window sited behind the proposed extension'. It was also confirmed by the agent to be bedroom window.

5.4 As defined in Camden Planning Guidance 2 (Housing) a habitable room is 'a room that is capable of being used as primary living space, generally consisting of living rooms, dining rooms, large kitchen/diners and large bedrooms'.

5.5 Due to its position both above and forward of the affected window, the lift shaft would substantially reduce the outlook from the bedroom and would create a significant feeling of enclosure contrary to the aims of the Policy A1 and paragraphs 7.8 to 7.11 of CPG6 (Amenity).

5.6 At present, the bedroom benefits from 180 degree views and whilst it is recognised that these views are across a car park / courtyard, the space is wide and open and the window has benefitted from good views up until this point. It is acknowledged that planting is proposed between the window and lift shaft however it is not considered to be a mitigating factor against the loss of the open view.

5.7 By virtue of the position of the existing buildings the courtyard / parking area is largely shaded. However the Council still considers that the proposal would erode existing levels of daylight and sunlight enjoyed by residents, particularly in the aforementioned ground floor unit and neighbouring units.

5.8 A daylight / sunlight study has been submitted. On review of this study it is noted that the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) score is currently 23.2% with a further reduction to 8.4% with the proposed lift shaft. This is a 0.36 reduction which is considerably less than 0.8 times its former value. It is acknowledged that the daylight / sunlight study then assesses the daylight to

the ground floor bedroom window using the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) test. This test results in a score of 1.1% that indicates that the bedroom will not fall below the minimum recommended level of daylight 1%.

5.9 The Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight Guidance only discusses the VSC test in the circumstances of existing buildings while ADF is applied in the circumstances of proposed buildings. The guidance also states that 'if the VSC, with the new development in place, is both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value, occupants of the existing building will notice the reduction in the amount of skylight.' Therefore as the study found that the VSC is less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value there will be a noticeable loss of daylight.

5.10 The agent did provide a revised option to move the lift shaft an additional 500mm further from the building. However this revision was not considered to address the concerns of the loss light and impact on the outlook enjoyed by occupiers.

5.11 The proposal would not result in any significant overlooking or loss of privacy to the occupiers of the existing flats.

5.12 For the reasons identified above the proposed lift shaft, by reason of its height, bulk, mass and location in close proximity to a habitable residential window, would result in loss of outlook and daylight to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of that residential unit. Consequently, the proposal would fail to accord with Policy A1 as the outlook would be inadequate and there would be an undue sense of enclosure, in addition to loss of daylight.

5.13 The application is therefore recommended for refusal on this basis.

1. Recommendation

Refuse Permission