

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	14/02/2018
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	12/01/2017
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Kristina Smith			2017/6926/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
72 Cricklewood Broadway LONDON NW2 3EP			Refer to Decision Notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of a mansard roof extension and associated alterations to create 2-bed flat (C3)				
Recommendation(s):		Refuse		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice			
Informatives:				
Consultations				
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
Summary of consultation responses:	<p><u>2 x site notices were displayed between 22/12/17 and 12/01/2017</u></p> <p>One objection was received from an unknown address on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mansard will break an unspoiled row of roof lines which date back more than a century, stretching all the way along the terrace from 62 to 80 Cricklewood Broadway. An identical roof line exists on the opposite side of the road from 63 to 81. • To allow a mansard roof to be built along this terrace would spoil the existing historic architecture. 			
Local groups comments:	<p><u>The West Hampstead/ Fortune Green Neighbourhood Forum objected on the following grounds:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be the first roof extension above any of the 10 or so properties and could set a precedent for subsequent applications which would rapidly destroy the iconic architecture of Cricklewood Broadway • The development entails loss of ground floor retail space as a result of access provision to upper floors • No net increase in bedrooms so the claim that the scheme would increase housing is invalid • A scheme with immense implications should have longer consultation than the 14 working days, particularly as consultation spanned Christmas holidays 			

Site Description

The application site comprises a three storey mid-terrace property on the eastern side of Cricklewood Broadway. The property consists of a retail unit (Use Class A1) at ground floor level with a 5-bed maisonette (Use Class C3) above. At the time of the site visit, the entire building was vacant.

The application site is located within a designated Neighbourhood Centre. It is also situated within the area covered by the Fortune Green West Hampstead Plan.

The property is not located in a conservation area; however, it is locally listed along with its wider building group (terrace of 10 located between Ebbsfleet Road and Skardu Road) in recognition of their architectural and townscape significance. The Local List entry reads,

“Terrace of 10 units with original shopfronts at ground floor, dating to the early 20th century. Red brick, with applied terracotta ornament to pilasters, dentil cornice above 2nd storey windows and castellated parapet above, with paired castellations at party wall line and single in between, all linked by decorative railings. Shopfronts largely of no significance, but decorative pilasters and console brackets survive between the shop units. Along with similar terraces to the north and south (and opposite, outside Camden’s borough boundary) this creates a striking piece of townscape with strong repetition and emphasised horizontality.”

Relevant History

Application site

2017/6363/P - Change of use of approx.30sqm of retail (A1) floorspace to rear of shop into residential (C3), erection of single storey rear/side extension at ground floor level and conversion of existing maisonette at second and third floor levels in association with creation of 3 units (2x2-bed; 1x1-bed) (C3) – **Pending decision**

82 - 84 Cricklewood Broadway

2005/1435/P - The erection of a mansard roof extension to create 2 studio flats at 3rd floor level of the main building. **Refused 05/07/2005 on the following grounds:**

- *The proposed mansard roof, by virtue of its size, height, design and location, would fundamentally alter the form of this valley roof and be detrimental to the appearance of the building and of this terrace of buildings with their unaltered roofscape and to the character and appearance of the area*
- *The proposed additional flats would result in an over-development of the overall site with an excessive number of small residential units for the property and area, and would result in substandard residential accommodation in terms of flat layout, daylight and outlook*

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

National Planning Practice Guidance

The London Plan 2016

Camden Local Plan 2017

The Local Plan policies relevant to the proposals are:

- G1 Delivery and location of growth

- H1 Maximising housing supply
- H4 Maximising the supply of affordable housing
- 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 Parking and car-free development
- T4 Sustainable movement of goods and materials
- TC2 Camden's centres and other shopping areas
- DM1 Delivery and monitoring

Camden Planning Guidance

- CPG 1 – Design
 - o Design excellence: sections 2.6 – 2.8, page 10
 - o Context & Design: section 2.9 – 2.12, pages 11 – 12
 - o Heritage Chapter 3, pages 15 - 27
 - o Materials: section 4.7, page 31
 - o Roofs, terraces and balconies – Chapter 5, paragraphs 5.6 – 5.10 and 5.14 – 5.18 (mansard specific guidance)
- CPG 2 – Housing
 - o Residential development standards: Chapter 4, pages 59-68
- CPG 6 – Amenity
 - o Daylight: section 6.6 page 32
 - o Sunlight: section 6.16 page 34 - 35
 - o Overlooking and privacy: paragraph 7.4, page 37
 - o Outlook: section 7.8 page 38
 - o Construction Management Plans: Chapter 8, pages 39 – 44
- CPG 7 – Transport
 - o Car free and car capped development: Chapter 5, pages 25 – 28
 - o Location, design and layout of off-street cycle parking: paragraph 9.8, page 48
- CPG 8 – Planning Obligations
 - o Use of planning obligations, section 2.12, page 9
 - o Construction, section 3.6, page 17
 - o Car free and car capped housing, section 10.1, page 53

Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015)

Policy 2 (Design & Character)

Policy 3 (Safeguarding & enhancing Conservation Areas & heritage assets)

Policy 8 (Cycling)

Policy 12 (Business, Commercial and Employment Premises & Sites)

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought to replace the existing pitched roof with a mansard roof extension to create a fourth storey which would comprise a 2-bed unit (C3). The proposed roof extension would take the form of a flat topped mansard that would be situated behind the front parapet and result in an additional height of 2.5m. To the rear, the extension would be a sheer continuation of the rear elevation that would increase the height of the roof by between 0.8m (top of pitch) – 2.8m (eaves level).

2.0 Assessment

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

- Land use
- Quality of residential accommodation
- Design
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers
- Transport considerations

3.0 Land use

3.1 Self-contained housing is regarded as the priority land-use of the Camden Local Plan and Policy H1 states that the Council will make housing its top priority when considering the future of unused and underused land and buildings. Furthermore, policy TC2 of the Local Plan encourages the provision of housing at above ground level in Neighbourhood Centres. The proposal would provide an additional 2-bed residential unit at third floor level and is therefore compliant with policy H1 and TC2 in terms of land use.

3.2 Policy H7 seeks to provide a range of unit sizes to meet demand across the borough and regards 2-bed units as high priority. Given the proposal is for a 2-bed unit, the scheme is compliant with the Council's dwelling size priorities.

3.3 Policy TC2 seeks to retain convenience shopping for local residents in Camden's Neighbourhood Centres and requires development to not harm the function, character or success of the centre. The property has retail use at ground floor level which is to be retained; however in order to provide access from the street to the proposed second floor unit, a corridor would be inserted through the retail unit, resulting in the loss of approx. 16 sqm of retail floorspace. Given that approx. 68sqm of retail floorspace would still remain, the loss is considered to be an acceptable reduction that would not compromise the long-term viability of the unit and is therefore compliant with TC2.

4.0 Provision of residential accommodation

Residential standards

4.1 The proposed 2-bed flat would measure 62 sqm which complies with the 61sqm required by the nationally described space standards for a 2b3p unit. It would be a dual-aspect property with sufficient sized windows serving all habitable rooms for purposes of daylight and ventilation. The quality of accommodation is therefore acceptable.

Affordable housing

4.2 Policy H4 expects a contribution to affordable housing from all developments that provide one or more additional homes and involve a total addition to residential floorspace of 100sqm GIA or more. As the scheme would provide less than 100sqm of residential floorspace, the requirements of this policy would not apply in this instance.

5.0 Design and Conservation

5.1 The application site and its wider building group have been included in Camden's Local List, introduced in 2015 to identify locally significant buildings, landscapes and features of heritage value. The Local List and the accompanying Camden Planning Guidance help ensure that change is balanced with the heritage significance of the building or feature in question. Policy D2 states that the Council will seek to protect heritage assets, including non-designated heritage assets.

Principle of roof addition

5.2 Policy D1 of the Local Plan requires all developments to be of the highest standard of design and will expect development to consider:

- Character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings and constraints of its site;
- The prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development;
- The impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape

5.3 The Fortune Green West Hampstead Neighbour Plan requires development to have regard to the form, function, structure and heritage of its context - including the scale, mass, orientation, pattern and grain of surrounding buildings, streets and spaces. With particular regard to roof extensions, the Neighbourhood Plan requires that they fit in with existing rooflines and be in keeping with existing development.

5.4 Paragraph 5.7 of CPG1 Design provides more detailed advice on roof alterations, stating that, "*Additional storeys and roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where:*

- a) There is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would help to re-unite a group of buildings and townscape;*
- b) Alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form;*
- c) There are a variety of additions or alterations to roofs which create an established pattern and where further development of a similar form would not cause additional harm."*

5.5 In response to the above criteria, the Council would argue that:-

a) Mansards are not an established roof form on Cricklewood Broadway and particularly not on the eastern side of the street. The applicant references isolated incidences of mansard roofs on the western side of the street; however, this falls under the administration of Brent Council which operates under a different policy context and cannot be considered a suitable guide for development with Camden's boundaries. Moreover, these examples are not located on the terrace directly opposite the application site and are sufficiently far away to not be seen in the same views.

b) The properties are linked at roof level by decorative metal balustrade, which draws attention to the roofline. Introducing a mansard behind the balustrade would impair this distinctive feature of the building group and compromise the special interest of the undesignated heritage asset. The alteration would therefore undermine what the Local List identifies as a '*striking piece of townscape with strong repetition*'. Due to the form of the extension to the rear, the extension would completely remove the distinctive pitched roof, which is an unaltered feature common to every property within the building group.

c) there are currently no other visible additions or alterations to the building group of which the application site forms part of, and therefore a mansard roof would certainly cause harm.

5.6 CPG1 also states that the visual prominence of roof additions should be considered. The mansard would be a prominent addition to the property and would be clearly visible above the decorative balustrade at roof level, particularly in views from the opposite side of the street. This is partly due to the mansard being positioned so close to the front parapet; however, owing to the long angled views that can be obtained from further down the street, it would not be possible to reduce its prominence entirely. The rear elevations of the building group can be read in public views from a pedestrian access route that runs behind the terrace, as well as in private views from the properties on Ebbsfleet Road and Skardu Road.

Form and detailed design

5.7 In terms of detailed design, the mansard roof would be set behind the front parapet with a 70-degree angle, which is compliant with CPG1 guidance. To the rear; however, the mansard extension would have a sheer elevation, continuing the brickwork upwards and absorbing the original pitched roof form. In views from the rear, this would read as a bulky additional storey rather than a recessive roof addition and would disrupt the uniform roofscape across the wider building group.

5.8 The extension would have 3 windows to the front elevation and 2 to the rear which would be aligned with those windows below. The proposed units would be uPVC sliding sash. Whilst the style of window is acceptable, the use of uPVC is not supported in design or sustainability terms, particularly on a Locally Listed building. The proposed detailed design is therefore unacceptable and will constitute a reason for refusal.

Alterations to shopfront

5.9 The alterations to the shopfront including the installation of a new entrance door are considered acceptable changes that would not detract from the appearance of the property. Furthermore, it is both typical and traditional for a shopfront to have two doors at ground floor level, one serving the shop and the other the residential unit above.

6.0 Neighbouring Amenity

6.1 The proposed mansard roof, on account of its location which would be a sufficient distance away from windows of nearby residential dwellings, would not bring about materially worse daylight, sunlight or outlook conditions to the surrounding neighbours. The proposed windows would not lead to any additional opportunities for overlooking compared to the existing situation.

7.0 Transport Considerations

7.1 Policy T1 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. A 2-bed unit would be required 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. Given the lack of outside space and space inside the building at ground floor level, it is accepted that step-free cycle parking cannot be provided in this instance and therefore will not constitute a reason for refusal.

7.2 Policy T2 requires all redevelopment schemes to be car-free in order to reduce air pollution and congestion and improve the attractiveness of an area for local walking and cycling. The applicant has indicated that they would be willing to enter into a legal agreement for a car-free development; however, in the absence of a legal agreement being in place at the time of determination, the lack of such agreement shall constitute a reason for refusal.

7.3 As the site is located on a main road within a busy Neighbourhood Centre, as well as being in close proximity to a large number of residential units, the implementation of the proposed development would have the potential to cause significant disruption unless carefully managed. In

accordance with policy A1, where development sites have the potential to cause significant disturbance due to their location or the anticipated length of construction period, measures required to reduce the impacts of construction works must be secured via a Construction Management Plan (CMP). Although significant concern is raised with regard to disruption from construction unless carefully managed, these concerns could have been reasonably addressed via securing a CMP through a s.106 legal agreement. In the absence of such an agreement, the unmanaged development does have the potential to cause significant harm and as such forms a reason for refusal.

8.0 Conclusion

8.1 The provision of a new residential unit on site is considered acceptable as self-contained housing is the priority land use within Camden's Local Plan; however, the principle and form of the mansard is not supported by reason of its impact on the both the host building, neighbouring properties and wider streetscene. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies D1 and D2 of Camden's Local Plan.

8.2 The applicant has failed to provide any provision for cycle parking contrary to policy T2; however, it is accepted that site constraints prevent step-free cycle storage from being possible. The applicant has expressed a willingness to enter into a Section 106 legal agreement to secure a car-free legal agreement; however, in the absence of such agreement, the application is contrary to Policy T1 and remains a reason for refusal.

8.3 In the absence of a legal agreement to secure a CMP (plus support fee), the unmanaged development does have the potential to cause significant harm contrary to Policy A1 and as such forms a reason for refusal.

9.0 Recommendation

9.1 Refuse planning permission