

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		09/03/2018	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		08/03/2018	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Kristina Smith				2018/0051/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
47 York Way LONDON N7 9QF				See draft decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of mansard roof extension and rear extensions at ground floor and second floor levels in association with conversion of 2 units into 3 units (2 x 2-bed; 1 x 1-bed) (C3)							
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 objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		<u>2 site notices were displayed between 09/02/2018 and 02/03/2018</u> <u>A press advert was published between 15/02/2018 and 08/03/2018</u> No responses received					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		Camden Square CAAC - No response					

Site Description

The application site is a three storey mid-terrace property on the western site of York Way in use as two self-contained units (1x1-bed; 1x3-bed). The application site comprises an original two-storey rear closet wing extension, common to the majority of properties along this side of the street. The property backs on to the rear of properties along the east side of Marquis Road.

The building is not listed; however, is located in the Camden Square Conservation Area and is identified to as a positive contributor for its group value as part of no's 37 to 61 York Way.

Relevant History

Application site

2017/2238/P - Erection of single storey rear extension at second floor level – **Refused 03/07/2017** on the grounds that:

1. The proposed second floor rear extension, by reason of its height, bulk and location, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building, the terrace as a whole and the Camden Square Conservation Area
2. The proposed rear extension would result in the loss of daylight to the neighbouring first floor flat at no. 47 York Way

2016/6828/P - Conversion of two units to provide 3 self-contained units (1x2-bed; 2x1-bed) (C3); erection of single storey rear infill extension at ground floor level. **Granted subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement 03/07/2017**

24307 - Change of use, including works of conversion, to form a self-contained flat and a self-contained maisonette including the provision of a roof terrace above the existing two-storey back addition. **Conditional 05/08/1977**

No's 35 and 37 York Way

8602300 - Change of use and works of conversion to provide six 1-bedroom flats including the erection of rear extensions at second-floor level **Granted 26/02/1987**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

National Planning Practice Guidance

The London Plan 2016

Camden Local Plan 2017

- G1 Delivery and location of growth
- H1 Maximising housing supply
- 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
- DM1 Delivery and monitoring

Supplementary Planning Guidance (updated July 2015)

- 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
- 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 Car free and car capped housing, section 10.1, page 53

Camden Square Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011) (CAAMS)

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for:

- Conversion of 2 units (1x1-bed; 1x3-bed) into 3 units (2 x 2-bed; 1 x 1-bed);
- Erection of mansard roof extension with two dormer windows to front and rear;
- Erection of rear extension at second floor level;
- Erection of side/ rear extension at ground floor level.

1.2 The submitted information refers to the property as a single dwelling house; however, based on the existing floorplans, planning history and Council Tax records, the Council considers the lawful use of the property to be 2 x self-contained units.

2. Assessment

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

- Principle of Development and Land Use
- Standard of residential accommodation
- Design and Conservation
- Amenity
- Transport Considerations

3. Principle of Development and Land use

3.1. The principle of converting two units into three units has already been established under previous consent ref. 2016/6828/P (dated 03/07/2017) and remains acceptable under the new policy context.

3.2. 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. The increase in residential floorspace on the site is therefore acceptable.

3.3. Policy H7 seeks to provide a range of unit sizes to meet demand across the borough and regards 2-bed units as high priority and 1-bed units as lower priority. As the scheme would comprise two 2-bed units, the mix of unit sizes is considered acceptable overall.

4. Standard of residential accommodation

4.1. The size of the units would all be compliant with Nationally Described Residential Space Standards. The units would benefit from adequate daylight, outlook and ventilation, and two of the properties would have access to private amenity space in the form of a rear patio and terrace. The standard of residential accommodation proposed is therefore acceptable.

5. Design and conservation

5.1. 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

5.2. Furthermore, by virtue of the site being located within the Camden Square Conservation Area, the Council has a statutory duty, under section 72 (Conservation Areas) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. This is reflected in Policy D2 which seeks to only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area.

5.3. The CAAMS provides specific guidance on development in the conservation area

Mansard roof extension

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 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”*

5.5. The mansard roof extension would involve converting an original valley roof, a distinctive feature shared by all the properties in the building group, to a mansard roof. There are no other mansard roof extensions evident across the building group and the proposal would therefore interrupt an unaltered roofline to the detriment of the wider terrace and conservation area. There are examples of mansard roof additions further down York Way; however, these are not regarded as part of the immediate context and do not set a precedent for the proposed development. The mansard is therefore not acceptable in principle.

5.6. The application suggests that the mansard would not be visible when standing directly opposite which may be the case; however it is likely that it will be visible in longer oblique views from the public realm, as well as ‘above ground’ windows of the properties situated opposite. Given there are no other examples of mansards nearby, the addition would be particularly prominent.

5.7. In terms of detailed design, the mansard roof would be set behind the front parapet with a 70-degree angle to front and rear roof slopes, which is compliant with CPG1 guidance. The mansard would comprise two dormer windows to the front and two, the positioning of which demonstrate no response to the windows below. Furthermore, the two rooflights project above the roofslope to an unacceptable extent and are likely to be prominent in the aforementioned views. The Design and Access statement refers to the use of high quality materials; however, no materials for the mansard roof are actually specified. The detailed design of the mansard shall therefore constitute part of the reason for refusal.

Second floor rear extension

5.8. A previous application for a rear extension at second floor level was refused under planning ref. 2017/2238/P. Although the footprint of the extension has been reduced, the principle of additional height in this location remains unacceptable.

5.9. In relation to the heights of rear extensions, CPG1 (paragraph 4.12 - 4.13) requires the height to respect the existing pattern of rear extensions where they exist. The guidance continues to state 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. The

proposed extension would result in the two storey closet wing becoming three stories in height. Along this side of York Way there is a strong pattern of two storey rear closet wings and therefore the proposed extension would interrupt this rhythm to the detriment of the building group and wider conservation area. Furthermore, the proposed extension would be situated only half a storey below eaves height rather than the recommended full storey, resulting in the loss of the subordinate relationship with the host property.

- 5.10. The only exceptions to the uniform two storey closet wings along the terrace are the two properties at the end of the terrace (no's 37 and 39 York Way), which have three storey closet wings. The works were consented historically in 1987 under now outdated design and conservation policy and prior to the adoption of the conservation area appraisal and management strategy. Furthermore, these extensions are not perceived to be as disruptive and harmful as a mid-terrace location would be, as the additional closet wing height at the end of the terrace appears to 'bookend' the building group.
- 5.11. The additional bulk at this height is also perceived to have a harmful visual impact on the completely unimpaired run of valley roofs along the wider building group. This would be contrary to CPG1 (para 4.10) which requires rear extensions to respect the original design and architectural features of properties. Aside from the aforementioned properties at the end of the terrace, there are no other extensions at this height.
- 5.12. In terms of detailed design, the extension would be constructed in matching brickwork with a slate roof which is acceptable; however, in order to keep the height of the extension low the proposed terrace door would awkwardly cut into the eaves which is not considered to be high quality design.

Ground floor side/rear infill extension

- 5.13. CPG1 (design) guidance on rear extensions advises that rear extensions should be secondary to the building being extended and allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden.
- 5.14. It is proposed to erect a single storey extension that would wrap around the closet wing at ground floor level, with a small void closest to the rear elevation to allow light to reach the centre of the building. There is an existing rear addition which the new extension would replace. The new extension would increase the depth of the rear addition by an additional 0.7m to 3.4m, resulting in the rear building line of the wider building line being extended. Not only would the property have the deepest rear addition, it is also proposed to infill the side element, resulting in an unacceptably bulky addition to the property that renounces a subordinate relationship with the host property. Furthermore, the extension would reduce the outside amenity space from 37 sqm to 18 sqm.
- 5.15. Only two other rear/ side infill extensions are evident across the building group at no's 37 and 69 York Way; however, these are less bulky additions by virtue of being shallower. Furthermore, they were consented in 2005 and 2006 under outdated design policy.
- 5.16. In terms of detailed design, the extension would have a flat roof with a large skylight on the side element and would be constructed in matching brickwork with full-length glazed doors on the rear elevation. The design is considered acceptable for the non-prominent ground floor location.

6. Amenity

- 6.1. Policy A1 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight.

Daylight

- 6.2. The side element of the rear extension would increase the height on the boundary line with no.45 by approx. 0.85m. Although the height increase would have some impact on the daylight received to the window on the north facing elevation of the closet wing (only window serving the room), it is not considered this would lead to an unacceptable loss of daylight. No daylight impact assessment has been submitted to ascertain whether this would be the case; however, the extension does not obstruct a 25 degree line as measured from the centre of the window and is therefore in accordance with CPG6 (Amenity).
- 6.3. The second floor extension would introduce a boundary wall of between 1.7m to 3.2m adjacent to the terrace at no.49. This will result in some impact on the daylight received to the terrace door; however, due

to the limited depth (2.45m) of the extension and lack of obstruction in all other directions, it is unlikely this would have an unacceptable impact. Furthermore, the terrace door serves a stairwell which is not an area of the home recognised to be as sensitive as habitable rooms by CPG6 (Amenity).

Overlooking

- 6.4. There is an existing terrace at second floor level in the same location as the proposed and therefore this element of the proposal would not lead to any additional overlooking compared to the existing situation.
- 6.5. The new window openings proposed on the new extensions are positioned in locations that would not result in any additional overlooking to neighbouring properties.

Outlook

- 6.6. The second floor extension would have some impact on outlook to the south from the terrace at no.51. Given the clear and unobstructed outlook to the north and west; however, this is not considered to be an unacceptable impact. Furthermore, the extension would not extend the full extent of the depth of the terrace and so views beyond it would be possible towards the rear of the terrace.

7. Transport Considerations

Cycle parking

- 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. The development would be required to provide a total of 5 covered, fully enclosed, secure and step-free cycle parking spaces to comply with the minimum requirements of Camden and London Plan cycle parking standards. Space for 4 cycles is shown in the front garden area; however, this appears to be of the front wheel locking variety, the use of which is not accepted as they do not hold cycles securely and can lead to wheel damage. Furthermore, the facility is not enclosed which has implications for cycle maintenance and security. The development is therefore contrary to Policy T1 and the lack of adequate cycle parking will be a reason for refusal. The shortfall in the number of cycle spaces is accepted given the constraints of the site.

Car-free

- 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. If planning permission were to be granted, all 3 units would be secured as car-free via a s.106 legal agreement. 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.

CMP/ Highways contribution

- 7.3. It is considered that as the proposed development is relatively modest in scale a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and CMP Implementation Support Contribution are not necessary in this particular instance. It is likewise considered that the proposed development is unlikely to lead to damage to the adjacent footway and as such a Section 106 highways contribution is unnecessary in this instance.

8. Conclusion

- 8.1. The provision of an additional residential unit on site is considered acceptable as self-contained housing is the priority land use within Camden's Local Plan; however, the siting, location, form and detailed design of the mansard and rear extensions are not supported by reason of their impact on the both the host building, building group and conservation area. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies D1 and D2 of Camden's Local Plan.
- 8.2. The applicant has failed to provide adequate provision for cycle parking contrary to policy T1 and in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a car-free development, the application is contrary to Policy T2 and constitutes a reason for refusal.

9.0 Recommendation

9.1 Refuse planning permission