



# Building Design Consultancy UK Ltd

Chartered Architects

42 Forestdale, Southgate, London N14 7DX.

Tel: 020 8886 4297. Fax: 020 8886 4297

## P L A N N I N G   S T A T E M E N T

2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR FLAT, 36 MILL LANE, LONDON NW6 1NR

(APPLICATION REF: 2017/4390/P)

4<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2017

### **1.00 Introduction**

- 1.01 This Statement has been prepared in support of a planning application for the erection of roof extensions to the existing second floor flat at 36 Mill Lane. It supplements the originally submitted Design Statement.
- 1.02 Also submitted to support the original application documents is Drawing No 16524/03; this showing the rear elevation of the entire terrace of properties of which the application premises form a part. It shows on it the detail of the extant planning permission Ref: 2016/2661/P for 40/42 Mill Lane, the extant planning permission Ref: 2017/2062/P for the application premises themselves and also an outline of what we have been advised has recently been submitted for planning permission for a roof extension at 34 Mill Lane (albeit we note that this latter application is not yet showing on the Council's website). Our client has, however, recently been served a Party Wall Notice from the owner of No.34 and it is therefore clear that it is the neighbours intention to proceed. Given permission Ref: 2017/2062/P as approved in April 2017 for the application premises and the similarities between the proposals with them being immediately adjoining properties, we see no reason why the Council would not grant planning permission for the proposals to similarly erect a mansard roof at No.34.

## **2.00 Site and Surroundings**

- 2.01 The application site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area. There is no listed building in the vicinity of the site.
- 2.02 There are a variety of alterations and extensions to the terrace comprising the application premises itself including, on the rear outrigger extension of No.32 is a prominently sited full height extension to provide access to the roof space with railings around the roof – on the rear outrigger and on the main part of the roof. Additionally extant permission Ref: 2016/2661/P for 40/42 has increased the bulk of the outrigger extension and added to its prominence by allowing access on to its flat roof as a terrace with railings around.
- 2.03 Likewise there is no uniformity to the neighbouring terrace to the east of Ravenshaw Street with that terrace containing a number of different styles of properties with different roof forms – flat roofs, mansard roofs, crown roofs and butterfly roofs, together with pitched roofs with dormers. Properties in that terrace range from two to four storey with their rear outrigger extensions being between one and four storeys high. Indeed a number of properties have rear outrigger extensions that sit just below the height of the main street frontage part of the building, sitting partially below the main roof height as is the case with 36 Mill Lane (both as it exists today and as proposed). Appended is an aerial photograph of this neighbouring terrace to the east which clearly shows this.
- 2.04 The surrounding area is mixed in its nature. Immediately to the west of the terrace containing 36 Mill Lane is an extremely bulky part 4/part 12 storey block of flats
- 2.05 On the opposite side of Mill Lane there is no uniformity with there being a variety of three and four storey buildings of entirely different character to the terrace containing the application premises.
- 2.06 Furthermore when looking at the side roads in the vicinity and utilising on-line birds-eye views, it can be seen that a number of properties have outrigger extensions with the same number of storeys as the main building. In the terrace immediately to the south of the application premises No.9 Ravenshaw Street has had an extension to its outrigger wing linking its roof to the main roof of the house.
- 2.07 As the only difference from the extant permission involves the roof extension on the rear outrigger, and with the premises being centre terrace, it will only be visible from the rear of properties within the street block. Given the significant variety of buildings in the vicinity with their varied rear outrigger extensions, it is not considered that the current proposals for 36 Mill Lane will detract from the appearance of the building, the appearance of the terrace of which it forms a part or the wider area. Indeed the additional roof extension, above the rear outrigger, will only be seen from within the street block where it will be in keeping with the general existing character.

### **3.00 Assessment In The Context Of Planning Policy**

- 3.01 At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the need to make efficient and effective use of previously developed land. The proposals comply with both of these objectives. Para 58 refers to optimising the potential of a site to accommodate development. It is considered that the proposals do this without harming local character or the identity of the surroundings.
- 3.02 Similarly The London Plan encourages such forms of development with Policy 3.3 requiring an increase in housing supply with Part E(a) referring to one of the possible ways of doing this being through intensification. Policy 3.4 specifically requires housing potential to be optimised taking into account the local context and character. As referred to above the proposals would not be out of keeping with that local context or character.
- 3.03 The proposed 3 bedroom/4 person maisonette will have a floor area of 91.1sqm. This exceeds the 84sqm required by Table 3.3 to which London Plan Policy 3.5 cross-refers.
- 3.04 The scale, mass and form of the proposed extension has regard to the pattern and grain of existing buildings and therefore complies with Policy 7.4. The detail and materials will be of high quality complimenting local architectural character in accordance with Policy 7.6.
- 3.05 For these reasons it is considered that the relevant aspects of The London Plan are complied with.
- 3.06 The proposals are also considered to comply with all relevant aspects of Camden's recently adopted Local Plan 2017. They respond to the relevant aspects in Section 3 which relates to meeting housing needs. Of particular relevance is Policy H1(d) which refers to an expectation of the maximum reasonable provision of housing on underused sites.
- 3.07 It is considered that the proposed extension, adding one further habitable room to extant planning permission Ref: 2017/2062/P, complies with this policy. The accommodation will comply with the nationally described space standards and so accord with Policy H6. Furthermore the provision of a 3 bedroom dwelling, as opposed to the 2 bedroom dwelling in the extant permission, is the size of dwelling most needed within the London Borough of Camden so complying with Policy H7.
- 3.08 The part additional floor, over the rear outrigger extension, which is the only difference between extant permission Ref 2017/2062/P and the current application, will not have any adverse effect on neighbours amenities – there will be no loss of outlook, overlooking or loss of sunlight/daylight. The proposals therefore comply with Policy A1.
- 3.09 As regards design matters the roof extension above the outrigger is considered

to comply with Policy D1 by respecting the local context and character – which as discussed above is of varied nature with there being little consistency between the main street frontage parts of buildings and their outriggers.

- 3.10 In terms of the additional accommodation provided the proposals comply with the Local Authority's CPG2 (Housing).
- 3.11 Para's 4.9 to 4.13 of CPG1 (Design) are of particular relevance. This relates specifically to rear extensions. Para's 4.14 and 4.15, also relating to rear extensions, are not relevant as the proposals do not alter the width of the existing rear extension. It is of course relevant to understand that the rear extension itself is part of the original construction as were outrigger extensions generally of buildings of this era.
- 3.12 In accordance with Para 4.10 the additional floor within the proposed roof form will be secondary to the main building, respecting its design, proportions and architectural style. It will not impact on the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area nor cause any adverse impact to neighbouring occupiers. As required by Para 4.14 the materials will match the roof of the main building as per extant permission Ref: 2017/2062/P.
- 3.13 With regard to height of rear extensions Para 4.12 refers to maximum height being determined by the points outlined in 4.10. As discussed above the proposals comply with all relevant aspects of 4.10. It is acknowledged that Para 4.13 states that in most cases extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged. Of fundamental relevance to this is the fact that the proposed extension maintains precisely the same subservience to the main building as does the existing outrigger rear extension. As can be seen from the existing plans the outrigger extension is half a storey lower in height than the main street frontage element of the building. The proposals will maintain precisely that same relationship with the roof of the additional proposed rear extension on the outrigger coming midway up the height of the already approved roof on the main part of the building (as per permission Ref: 2017/2062/P). Therefore the proposals retain exactly the same relationship with the main part of the building as was the original situation. The outrigger extension was never a full storey below roof eaves/parapet level so there is no justifiable reason for the Council to insist on such a relationship now.
- 3.14 We turn next to the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan. Policies 1 and 2 relate to housing and design/character respectively and are the only policies relevant to the proposals. It is clear from Policy 1 that 3 and 4 bedroom homes are considered to be most in need in the area. The proposals clearly assist by providing a 3 bedroom dwelling rather than the 2 bedroom dwelling as previously approved. As regards Policy 2 the proposals maintain a positive contribution to the character of existing buildings, respecting the height of the existing building and others in the vicinity. It is therefore considered that all relevant aspects of this Neighbourhood Plan are complied with.

## 4.00 Conclusions

- 4.01 For the reasons discussed in the previous sections it is considered that the proposals are entirely acceptable in all respects, providing for a much needed family dwelling by allowing the approved 2 bedroom dwelling to become a 3 bedroom unit.
- 4.02 This is achieved simply by adding an additional roof extension over the rear outrigger of the building. It will remain subservient to the main street frontage part of the building in exactly the same way as the existing/original outrigger is to the existing flat roof street frontage building, being half a storey lower than that.
- 4.03 The development will not harm the appearance of the building, the terrace of which it forms a part or the wider area. In any event it will only be visible from within the street block.
- 4.04 As all relevant planning policies and supplementary guidance are complied with it is considered that planning permission should be granted.
-