

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 10th December 2007. For further information see

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	06/12/2007
(Members Briefing)		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	23/11/2007
Officer		Application Number(s)		
Thomas Smith		2007/5190/P		
Application Address		Drawing Numbers		
33 Rhyl Street London NW5 3HB		See draft decision notice.		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of mansard roof and part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension and change of use of single-family dwellinghouse to 3 self-contained flats (Class C3).				
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional permission, subject to a S106 agreement		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	09	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
			No. Electronic	02		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The Headteacher of the adjoining Rhyl Primary School has objected on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The modifications to the previous proposal do not overcome her concerns; • The proposal would overshadow the nursery playground; and • Builders walking along the party wall alarm the children. <p>Councillor Scott has objected on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overbearing impact on the neighbouring school; • Overlooking into the playground; • Additional height would have a detrimental impact on the terrace; • Increase in parking stress and congestion; • There have been burglaries at the school and those involved may have gained access via 33 Rhyl Street; • The current height of the wall means that balls from the playground go into the garden at 33 Rhyl Street; • High quality fencing should be required on top of the boundary wall with the school. 					
CAAC comments:	Kentish Town CAAC No reply to date.					

Site Description

This application relates to a 2-storey plus lower ground floor end-of-terrace single family dwelling house. The building is located within the West Kentish Town Conservation Area and is recognised as making a positive contribution to the CA.

Relevant History

Planning application (2007/3336/P) for change of use and works of conversion of single-family dwellinghouse into four flats (2 x 1 bed, 2 x 2 bed), including erection of part one, part three-storey rear extension, plus erection of a roof extension to provide two additional floors was **refused** in September 2007 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed additional storey and mansard roof extension, by reason of height, location, size and design, would be an insensitive, unduly bulky and top heavy addition which would upset the architectural composition of the host building and the terrace of which it forms a part and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area, contrary to policies B1, B3 and B7 of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2006 and advice contained in Camden Planning Guidance 2006.
2. The proposed rear extension, by reason of its height, location, size and design, would be an unduly bulky addition which would not be subordinate to the host building, nor respect the historic pattern of development on the terrace of which it forms a part and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area, contrary to policies B1, B3 and B7 of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2006 and advice contained in Camden Planning Guidance 2006.
3. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure car-free housing, the proposed development is likely to result in increased parking stress and congestion in the locality to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety contrary to policies SD2, T8 and T9 of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2006 and advice contained within Camden Planning Guidance 2006.

An appeal has been lodged against this decision.

Relevant policies

London Borough of Camden UDP 2006

S1/S2 Sustainable development
SD2 Planning obligations
SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours
H1 New housing
H7 Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing
H8 Mix of units
B1 General design principles
B3 Alterations and extensions
B7 Conservation areas
T3 Pedestrians and cycling
T8 Car free and car capped housing
T9 Impact of parking

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

West Kentish Town Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

Proposal

This application proposes a mansard roof extension to the property, a full width lower-ground floor rear extension and a half width first floor rear extension in association with a change of use from a single dwelling to 3 self-contained flats.

Consideration

Principle of development

The priority use of the UDP is housing and therefore the provision of additional residential floorspace is considered to be acceptable in principle. The proposed mix of units is considered to be appropriate and in accordance with policy H8.

Design

Roof extension

The application building is an anomaly in the terrace as it sits half a storey below all of the other properties in the terrace. Whilst properties further down the terrace have mansard extensions, the immediately adjoining properties retain their original roof form.

It is considered that, in this context, a mansard roof is likely to be acceptable in principle subject to satisfactory design.

Camden Planning Guidance 2006 contains advice on the design of the mansard roof extensions. The proposal as originally submitted had little regard to these guidelines and consequently, it would have appeared far more prominent than a well designed mansard. Amended plans have been submitted so that the rear valley parapet is retained and the roof slopes rise from behind the parapet, which is considered to be more appropriate.

Rear extension

Camden Planning Guidance states that rear extensions should be designed to, *inter alia*:

- be subordinate to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions and dimensions;
- respect the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;
- respect the historic pattern and established grain of the surrounding area.

The proposed rear extension would be full width at ground floor level with half-width extensions at first and second floor levels on the boundary with the adjacent school.

Although full width extensions are discouraged, the ground floor extension would not be visible from the public realm or any neighbouring properties due to the high boundary walls. It would still appear as a subordinate addition and in these circumstances; it would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the building or the terrace generally.

The half width extension at first and second floor level would not terminate a full storey below eaves level as

suggested by Camden Planning Guidance 2006 but it would be approximately the same height as the rear closet wing at the neighbouring property 35 Rhyl Street (albeit that extension has a pitched roof and therefore appears less bulky).

Whilst the rear extension at the upper levels is rather bulky, it is not considered to be so harmful to the character and appearance of the building or the terrace generally so as to warrant refusal on design grounds.

Amenity

Objection has been raised to the impact on the adjoining school playground. Whilst there are no UDP policies which specifically protect playgrounds it is a legitimate planning consideration. Indeed, an application for a new development at 59 Mount Pleasant (2005/0537/P), in the south of the borough, was refused in 2005 on the grounds that the proposed building by reason of its height, bulk and location would lead to a loss of outlook, result in a visual intrusion and oppressive sense of enclosure for the neighbouring school building and playground. This decision was upheld on appeal.

The height of flank wall of the main building on the boundary with the school would increase from 9m to 9.7m and from 5.4m to 6.3m where the proposed rear extension would be located. It is considered that this significant increase in height would increase the sense of enclosure in the playground, but given the overall size of the playground, it is not considered that this impact would be so harmful so as to warrant refusal on these grounds. Indeed, this was not a reason for refusal for the previous larger application.

The proposal would not have any significant impact on daylight, sunlight or privacy to neighbouring occupiers at 35 Rhyl St. The noise from the proposed flats is unlikely to be significantly greater than the current use as a dwelling. Noise and construction from construction works is covered by separate legislation.

All of the units are reasonably sized and meet the minimum floorspace standards set out in Camden Planning Guidance. In terms, of daylighting standards, Camden Planning Guidance states that all habitable rooms must have an external window with an area of at least 10% of the floor area of the room. Bedroom 2 in the basement flat would have an external window with an area of only 6.54% of the floor area of the room. Whilst this is far from desirable, it is not considered that the overall standard of accommodation in this unit would be so poor that it warrants refusal.

The proposal is for conversion of an existing building and therefore it would be unreasonable to expect full compliance with Lifetime Homes Standards. The access statement notes that some measures will be taken to improve accessibility and the proposal would, in any case, need to comply with building regulations.

Transport

The site is located in an area where access to public transport is good (PTAL 3). The proposed development would result in an increase of 2 residential units and would be likely to contribute unacceptably to existing on street parking stress and congestion. This issue could be addressed by designating 2 of the units as car-free so that occupiers of these units would not be eligible for resident's parking permits in the locality and the applicant is agreeable to this.

Due to the layout of the properties, it is not feasible to require cycle storage, but the units are large enough so that occupiers could store them internally if required.

Recommendation: grant conditional permission, subject to a S106 agreement.