

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>16/05/2018</b>
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	19/04/2018
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Patrick Marfleet			2018/0927/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
73 Farringdon Road London EC1M 3JQ			See decision notice		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
Erection of single storey roof extension to provide 2 x 2 bed residential units (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full planning permission			
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Decision Notice			
<b>Informatives:</b>					
<b>Consultations</b>					
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. of responses	<b>03</b>	No. of objections	<b>03</b>
		No. electronic	<b>03</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Site notice: 26/03/2018 - 16/04/2018 Press notice: 29/03/2018 - 19/04/2018  The existing occupants of 73 Farringdon Road and Flat 5, 71 Farringdon Road objected to the application on the following grounds: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design of extension not in keeping with building and adjoining terrace.</li> <li>Plans show additional building on joint party wall, concerned how rainwater will be dealt with.</li> <li>Windows of proposed development would overlook neighbouring roof terrace.</li> <li>Erection of additional floor would cause unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to existing tenants during construction. Scaffolding erected would block natural light.</li> </ol> <p><u>Officer response</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See section 2.2 of this report.</li> </ol>			

2. *Issues relating to party walls are a civil matter and do not form a consideration in the assessment of the current planning application.*
3. *See section 2.3 of this report.*
4. *Issues relating to the potential disturbance caused by construction works are an environmental health matter that would not form a planning consideration relevant to the determination of this application. An informative controlling hours of construction would be added to the decision notice if the scheme was considered acceptable.*

**CAAC/Local groups comments:**

No comments received.

### Site Description

The application site is located on the western side of Farringdon Road and relates to an end of terrace property that forms part of a group of Italianate style Victorian buildings.

The site is located within the Hatton Garden Conservation Area, it is not a listed building but is identified as making a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area.

### Relevant History

#### Application Site

**2007/6029/P** - Erection of a 5th floor roof extension, including 3 dormer windows and front roof terrace, to provide a one bedroom self-contained flat. **Refused 21/01/2008.**

**APP/X5210/A/08/2080749** – The refusal was appealed and subsequently dismissed by the Inspector who agreed with the Council’s view that the proposed extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding conservation area.

### Relevant policies

#### **National Planning Policy Framework (2018)**

#### **The London Plan March 2016**

#### **Camden Local Plan 2017**

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

Policy D1 Design

Policy D2 Heritage

Policy H4 Maximising the supply of affordable housing

Policy T2 Parking and car-free development

#### **Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG1 Design (July 2015 updated March 2018)

CPG Amenity (March 2018)

#### **Hatton Garden conservation area appraisal and management strategy 2017**

## Assessment

### 1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey, fifth floor, roof extension that would create a new 2 bed flat (C3) at the site. The proposal would also alter the existing fourth flat at the site - which has a bedroom in the main roof space of the building - from a 3 bed to a 2 bed unit. The fourth floor flat would have an area of 65sqm and the fifth floor flat would have an area of 83sqm. The proposal would create approximately 84sqm of additional floorspace at the site.

1.2 The proposed extension would be a predominantly glazed structure with an outer layer of metal louvres and would sit directly above the parapet of the existing building, spanning its entire width and depth. A small terrace area is proposed to the rear at fifth floor level.

### 2.1 ASSESSMENT

The material considerations for this application are summarised as follows:

- Design and Conservation; and
- Amenity of neighbouring residential occupants;
- Mix and quality of accommodation
- Car parking

### 2.2 Design and Conservation

2.2.1 Local Plan Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy D1 requires development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, which improves the function, appearance and character of the area; and Policy D2 states that the Council will preserve, and where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas and listed buildings.

2.2.2 Paragraph 9.10 of the Hatton Garden Conservation Area Appraisal and Management strategy (2017) states that roof extensions are unlikely to be acceptable where: They would detract from the character and form of the existing building, the property forms part of a group or terrace with a unified, designed roof-scape, the roof is prominent in the townscape or in long views.

2.2.3 Similarly, Paragraph 5.8 of Camden's Supplementary Design Guidance (CPG Design) document states that roof extensions are likely to be unacceptable where (inter alia):

- Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a coordinated design; and
- Buildings are already higher than neighboring properties and where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural composition;

2.2.3 On the second point it is considered that the proposed roof extension, with respect to its scale and bold contemporary design, would add a prominence and bulk which would harm the

architectural composition of the host building and the wider group.

2.2.4 Furthermore, the location of the host building, on a prominent corner, would result in the extension being highly visible in all public views surrounding the site and would fail to appear subordinate or sympathetic to the historic and architectural value of the terraced group as a whole. It is noted where buildings in the group (Nos. 69-71) have been extended above the original parapet line, they have done so in a traditional manner preserving the largely complete character and appearance of the group. This point was acknowledged by the Inspector in paragraph 7 of their appeal decision (see relevant history section of this report) which stated: *While those extensions already disrupt the roof-line of the terrace to some extent, they do not have the same prominence and visual discordance within the street scene as the appeal scheme would have. Their existence does not justify the further harm to the character and appearance of the terrace which the proposal would cause.*

2.2.5 Therefore, whilst the current scheme is different in form and appearance when compared with the previously refused extension, its bold contemporary design is still considered to represent an incongruous addition that would be at odds with the architectural language of the host building and wider terrace.

2.2.6 The scale and uncomfortable nature of the extension would be particularly apparent in views along Saint Cross Street and Farringdon Road, where the extension would sit abruptly atop the parapet cornice rather than behind the existing parapet in a similar manner to the adjoining roof extensions in the terrace (69-71). The overall size of the current proposal would therefore fail to respect the architectural language and hierarchy of floors expected in a building of this age, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the surrounding conservation area as a result.

2.2.7 Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013. For the combination of reasons set out above the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the host building, adjoining terrace and wider Hatton Garden conservation area.

### 2.3 Amenity of neighbouring residential occupants

#### *Daylight / Sunlight / Outlook / Privacy*

2.3.1 Policy A1 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. It seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG - Amenity provides specific guidance with regards to privacy, overlooking and outlook.

2.3.2 It is noted that some concerns have been raised from the adjoining property along Farringdon Road over the potential overlooking that would occur from the proposed fifth floor terrace area to the rear of the site. However, given the small size and location of the terrace area, officers do not consider the proposal would exacerbate current levels of overlooking to the neighbouring properties along Farringdon Road, particularly given the existing roof terraces to the side and rear of Da Vinci House (44 Saffron Hill) which have direct views towards the rear windows of the existing properties in the terrace.

2.3.3 With regard to the existing roof terraces to neighbouring properties at 44 Saffron Hill, directly to the rear of the site, the proposed roof terrace and rear windows are not considered to cause harm to the amenity of the neighbouring residential dwellings. Whilst there would be some degree of overlooking, the proposed roof terrace and rear windows would share the same outlook as the existing rear windows and terrace areas to the terraced properties along Farringdon Road and would not cause

an unacceptable loss of privacy. Similarly, the proposed side windows on the north elevation would share the same outlook as the existing windows beneath and would not exacerbate current levels of overlooking as a result.

2.3.4 Furthermore, the size, scale and height of the proposed extension would not project beyond the established rear building line at the site and would not cause an unacceptable loss of light and outlook to neighbouring properties.

## 2.4 Mix and quality of residential accommodation

2.4.1 Policy H7 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that all housing development contributes to meeting the priorities set out in the Dwelling Size Priorities Table (below) and includes a mix of large and small homes.

**Table 1: Dwelling Size Priorities**

	<b>1-bedroom (or studio)</b>	<b>2-bedroom</b>	<b>3-bedroom</b>	<b>4-bedroom (or more)</b>
Social-affordable rented	lower	high	high	medium
Intermediate affordable	high	medium	lower	lower
Market	lower	high	high	lower

2.4.2 The proposal would comprise 2 x 2 bed market units which are identified as high priority dwelling sizes in the above table. Therefore, no objection is raised to the proposed mix of housing, which would fulfil the requirements of Policy H7.

2.4.3 The proposed 2 bed units would either meet or exceed the space standards as set out in the London Plan space standards table, and as such are considered acceptable in respect of unit size.

## 2.4 Car parking

2.4.1 Policy T2 of the Camden Local Plan states that the Council will limit the availability of parking and require all new developments in the borough to be car-free. The council will not issue on-street parking permits in connection with new development and use legal agreements to ensure that future occupants are aware that they are not entitled to on-street parking permits.

2.4.2 No on-site parking is proposed as part of the current proposal and none of the proposed units would be eligible for on street permits. The car-free requirements would be secured by a legal agreement if the scheme was considered acceptable. In the absence of an acceptable scheme (and hence no section 106 agreement) this becomes a reason for refusal.

## 3.0 **Recommendation**

### 3.1 Refuse planning permission