Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry	ry Date: 18/01/2018		018	
		N/A / attached			ultation / Date:	22/12/2	017	
Officer			Application N					
Sofie Fieldsend			2017/6282/P					
Application Address			Drawing Num	Drawing Numbers				
250 and 252 Kilburn High Road London NW6 2BS			See draft decis	See draft decision notice				
PO 3/4 Area Team Signature C&			Authorised Officer Signature					
71100 100	ini oignataro	Guob						
Proposal(s)								
Joint roof extension to No.250 and 252 involving raising the ridge height and 2x rear dormers. Third floor rear extension to No.252								
Recommendation(s):	Refuse planning permission							
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	00	No. of o	bjections	00	
			No. electronic	00				
Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice was displayed on the 01/12/2017 and the consultation period expired on the 22/12/2017.							
	No responses were received.							

## **Site Description**

The application site relates to a pair of three storey semi-detached properties located on the North/Eastern side of Kilburn High Road. The ground floor of both properties are in A1 use and the remaining floors are in residential (C3) use. The property is not listed or located within a Conservation Area, but it is located within Kilburn Town Centre.

The site at 246-248 has been recently demolished and planning permission for the erection of a part-four, part-five storey residential building is currently pending decision subject to a legal agreement. The neighbouring site at No.254 has a gap which provides an access lane to a six storey mixed use building set back significantly from Kilburn High Road which was granted permission in 2016 but it noted that it has not yet been implemented.

### **Relevant History**

## 250 Kilburn High Road

H3/3/4/4660 - The agreement to extend the premises (Change of use and extension to first floor) – Refused 12/02/1968

# 252 Kilburn High Road

None relevant

Neighbouring sites

### 246-448 Kilburn High Road

2017/3206/P - Demolition of existing building on site and erection of two buildings for residential use, providing 27 new units (9 x one-bed, 13 x two-bed, 5 x three-bed). Building A (street block) to be partfour, part-five storeys in height and Building B (courtyard block) to be part-five, part-six storeys in height. Associated landscaping, cycle parking and plant room – Pending decision (Resolved to grant subject to a legal agreement).

#### 254 Kilburn High Road

2015/2775/P - Redevelopment of the site (following demolition of existing buildings) to provide a mixed use development, comprising the erection of six storey building (with set back top floor) to provide 955 sqm of commercial space (Classes B1 and B8) and 60 dwellings plus cycle parking, 2x disabled car parking bays, refuse/recycling facilities and access together with landscaping including outdoor amenity space. Granted 22/12/2016

### Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan (2016)

Camden's Local Plan (2017)

Policy A1 – Managing the impact of development

Policy D1 – Design

Policy H1 – Maximising housing supply

Policy H6 - Housing choice and mix

Policy T1 – Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport

Supplementary Guidance

CPG 1 – Design

CPG 6 – Amenity

CPG 7 - Transport

### **Assessment**

### 1.0 Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for a joint roof extension to No.250 and 252 involving raising the ridge height and 2x rear dormers. Third floor rear extension to No.252.
- 1.2The ridge height will be increased by 0.5m and will be built up 2.6m to the rear. Both rear dormers will measure 2m wide, 2.4m high and 0.8m deep.
- 1.3 The proposed third floor rear extension will project 5.4m to the rear, measure 3.9m wide and will be built up to the eaves with a flat floor. The proposed materials will match the existing red stock brick.
- 1.4 Overall the proposal will provide No.250 with 1 additional bedroom and bathroom in the roof, increasing it from a 2 bed to a 3 bed flat. At No.252, the proposal will provide two additional bedrooms and one bathroom, increasing it from a 1 bed to a 3 bed flat.

#### 3.0 Assessment

- 3.3 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:
- Design and Appearance
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers
- Transport

#### 4.0 Design and Appearance

- 4.1 Policy D1 of Camden's Local Plan outlines that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings and the character and proportion of the existing building.
- 4.2 CPG 1 (Design) in regards roof extensions states that 'The lower slope (usually 60-70°) should rise from behind and not on top of the parapet wall, separated from the wall by a substantial gutter. Original cornice, parapet and railing details should be retained and where deteriorated or lost, should be incorporated into the design of new roof extensions. Visible chimney stacks should be retained and increased in height, where necessary. Only party walls with their chimney stacks and windows should break the plane of the roof slope, and should be accommodated in a sensitive way and be hidden as far as is possible'.
- 4.3 When viewed from the front elevation the proposed roof extension will increase the height by 0.5m, however when viewed from the side and rear of the property it will create a 2.6m uplift. It is

considered that this non-traditional mansard roof adds additional height and bulk to the rear of the existing four storey building.

- 4.4 The non-traditional form of the mansard roof is considered to be unacceptable in terms of its detailed design. The rear elevation slope is angled at 74degrees, which is more than the 70degrees outlined in CGP1. This element is therefore contrary to policy and the design of this flat roofed extension also makes it appear more prominent when viewed from street.
- 4.5 CPG1 design guidance recommends that alterations to, or the addition of, roof dormers should be sensitive changes which maintain the overall structure of the existing roof form; should not be introduced into shallow roofs; should not disrupt an unbroken roofscape; should maintain adequate roof slope to maintain projection into the roofline; and should utilise materials which are complementary to the host building and local area. This guidance also advises that roof alterations / extensions may be accepted where they act to re-unite a group of buildings; remain architecturally sympathetic to the host building; maintain the integrity of the roof form; or where there is an established pattern of development of a similar form would not result in harm.
- 4.6 CPG1 further adds that they should be sufficiently below the ridge of the roof in order to avoid projecting into the roofline when viewed from a distance. Usually a 500mm gap is required between the dormer and the ridge or hip to maintain this separation. Full-length dormers, on both the front and rear of the property, will be discouraged to minimise the prominence of these structures. In number, form, scale and pane size, the dormer and window should relate to the façade below and the surface area of the roof. They should appear as separate small projections on the roof surface.
- 4.7 The proposed dormers are contrary to CPG1 as both dormers occupy the full height of the roof slope and are not set 500mm from the eaves and ridges of the roof. The proposed dormers therefore subsume the character of the roof and appear as incongruous additions which fail to be subordinate in relation to the roof slope. In addition the proposed design and scale of the windows do not relate to existing rear elevation below and appear out of proportion.
- 4.8 Camden Planning Guidance document CPG1 (Design) advises that extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and proportion unless the specific circumstances of the site, such as the surrounding context, or the particular design of the property would warrant an exception to this approach. It states that 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.
- 4.9 From a site visit it is noted that No.250 has built a third floor rear extension, however there is no record of planning permission or building control for this. This element appears to have been built more than four years ago and is immune from enforcement action. In terms of its siting less than one full storey below the eaves and its excessive depth will make the extension appear bulky and highly visible when viewed from the public realm and neighbouring properties along Kilburn High Road. In addition this aspect of the proposal results in the loss of the existing chimney. It's siting, scale and design would therefore be contrary to CPG1.
- 4.10 Given the open nature of this side of No.252, the combined bulk of the roof extension, rear dormers and rear extension; the proposal would be highly visible from Kilburn High Road. It is considered that the proposal would appear bulky and represent a poor quality design.

- 4.11 Notwithstanding the issues raised above, the chosen materials of red stock brick with red tiles for the proposal will match the existing and therefore would be considered acceptable and respect the character of the host property. The proposed front roof lights to No.250 and three side windows on the North West elevation of No.252 are also considered to have an acceptable impact on the character of the host properties.
- 4.12 Overall it is considered that the proposed roof extension and the rear extension by reason of their excessive scale, bulk, height and detailed design fails to be subordinate to the existing dwellings and would cumulatively constitute disproportionate, discordant and incongruous additions to the existing buildings to the detriment of the character and appearance of the existing buildings, the street scene and the locality, contrary to policy D1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

### 5.0 Amenity

- 5.1 Local Plan Policy A1 seeks to ensure that the amenity of neighbours is protected including visual privacy, outlook, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing.
- 5.2 The proposed third floor extension to No.252 will measure 5.4m in depth, 3.9m wide and will be built up to the eaves. The extension will be set away 1.9m from the shared boundary with No.250. The adjoining building at 250 is subdivided into three flats, with one flat on each of the three upper floors. To the rear of Flat 2 of No.250 is a bedroom served by a single window. It is noted that this extension fails the 45 degree test to this flat and in absence of a daylight and sunlight assessment, it is considered that the extension is detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of flat 2 of No.250. In addition due to the limited outlook from this rear bedroom of Flat 2 and as this room does not have access to other windows, the excessive height and depth would result in a tunnelling effect for appearing overbearing and resulting in an unacceptable sense of enclosure and loss of daylight. It is therefore considered that this rear extension would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of Flat 2 of No.250 in terms of loss of daylight and a sense of enclosure.
- 5.3 Given the roof extension, associated dormers and the front roof light's siting and separation distance to neighbouring properties, it is not considered that these elements would have an adverse impact in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy or light.
- 5.4 Three windows are proposed on the North West elevation of No.252 facing onto No.256 Kilburn High Road, two at fourth floor which will serve a stairwell and bathroom respectively and one at fifth floor serving a new bedroom. All new side windows will face onto the blank gable wall of No.256, this aspect is not considered to impact on the amenity of this property in terms of loss of privacy or overlooking.
- 5.5 The proposal will provide No.252 with two additional bedrooms and one bathroom, increasing it from a 1 bed to a 3 bed flat. The current 1bed flat has a floorspace of 41sqm and meets the London plan minimum floor area for a 1B1P, however it fails the minimum requirements for a 1B2P flat which needs to have a at least 50sqm of floorspace. This existing unit is therefore considered to be substandard in terms of floorspace. The proposed increase to a 3bed flat will result in a floorspace of 97sqm across two floors and this will meet the minimum floorspace criteria for a 3B5P flat but fail the standards for a 3B6P flat which requires a floorspace of 102sqm. Although the extensions would create additional floor space and improve the housing density and mix of the building, the occupiers would not have access to any outdoor amenity space and the proposed third floor extension would result in loss of daylight to flat 2, 250 Kilburn High Road. It is therefore considered that this minor benefit of a larger unit does not outweigh the amenity harm to this property.

# 6. Transport

- 6.1 A CMP would usually be sought for major developments, however there are many instances where smaller schemes can have very significant impacts, particularly within predominantly residential areas. It is noted that a number of large scale developments are proposed or have been approved in neighbouring sites consisting of residential and mixed-use schemes. Transport officers have been consulted and considered that that in the context of the site a CMP would not be needed, as the parking restrictions allow loading between 10am-4pm on the street.
- 6.2 As the proposal does not propose the creation of a new self-contained unit, a S106 agreement would not be required for car-free development and no cycle parking would be required.

#### 7. Conclusion

7.1 To conclude the proposed roof extension and third floor rear extension are contrary to CPG1 and policy D1 of Camden's Local Plan. The third floor rear extension would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of Flat 2 of No.250 in terms of loss of daylight and a sense of enclosure and the LPA does not consider that this minor increase to the floorspace of No.252 to outweigh the harm to this property and its occupiers.

#### 8.0 Recommendation

8.1 Refuse planning permission.