Date: 31/07/2018

Our ref: 2018/2198/PRE Contact: Samir Benmbarek Direct line: 020 7974 2534

Email: samir.benmbarek@camden.gov.uk

Ms Niki Sole
MAP Architecture
Edspace
Hackney Community College
Falkirk Street
London
N1 6HQ



Planning Solutions Team Planning and Regeneration

Culture & Environment

Directorate

London Borough of Camden

2nd Floor

5 Pancras Square

London N1C 4AG

www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Dear Ms Sole

Re: 104 Drummond Street, London, NW1 2HN

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry for the above property, which was received on 30th May 2018 together with the required fee of £989.02.

1. Drawings and documents

Pre-Application Advice Pack- May 2018

2. Proposal

Erection of a three-storey rear extension with second floor terrace above and the erection of a mansard roof extension to residential building (Use C3). The proposal would provide additional floorspace to the existing residential units and would not alter the dwelling/housing mix.

3. Site description

The site comprises of a three-storey building located on the northern side of Drummond Street. The building is not located within a conservation area, nor is it a listed building. At lower ground floor level there is a studio flat while the ground, first and second floors comprises of a three-bedroom maisonette.

4. Relevant planning history

No planning history at this site.

No. 108 Drummond Street

8701452- Planning permission granted on 12/02/1988 for the erection of a basement ground and two storey rear extension and alterations in connection with use of the building for residential multiple occupation. Implemented.

No. 110 Drummond Street

2015/5772/P- Planning permission granted on 28/12/2016 for the erection of mansard roof extension; rear extension at basement, ground, first and second floor level including windows and doors on side and rear elevation; rear terrace at second and third floor level; subdivision of 5-bed house to 3 units comprising 1 x 2-bed, 1 x 1-bed and 1 x studio units (Class C3). Implemented.

5. Relevant policies and guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan 2016

Camden Local Plan 2017

D1- Design

A1- Managing the impact of development

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 (Design) (Updated March 2018) CPG Amenity

6. Introduction

This written response is based on the drawings submitted in the "Drawings and Documents" section and a pre-application meeting which was held on 06th July 2018. This is general and informal planning officer response to the proposal and development in relation to the submitted drawings and documentation. Should the pre-application scheme be altered, some of advice given may become redundant as a result of this. This advice may not be considered relevant if adopted planning policies at national, regional or local level are changed or amended. Other factors such as case-law and subsequent planning permissions may affect this advice.

7. Design

Assessment of the Additional Storey

Policy D1 seeks high quality design in all alterations and developments. The Council will require that development respects the local context and character and are of high quality that compliments the local character.

Camden Planning Guidance 1 (CPG1: Design) identifies that additional storeys and roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where:

• 'There is an established form of roof additions or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and where the continuing the pattern of development would help to re-unite a group of buildings and townscape.'

CPG1 goes on to clarify that roof alterations or additions are unlikely to be acceptable where they would have an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene and in circumstances where:

 'Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations and extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a co-ordinated design.'

In review of the guidance above, aerial photography and site visit, there are significant concerns regarding the proposed additional storey. The roofscape of the property and the neighbouring buildings is largely unimpaired by alterations and features no roof extensions. To introduce the additional storey would break this roof form within the row of buildings along Drummond Street by breaking the consistency of the terminating heights. Therefore, the principle of mansard roof extension in this instance is unacceptable as it is contrary to CPG1 and policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan for the above reasons.

It is acknowledged that there are roof extensions present along Drummond Street, however, these are present on the opposite terrace and the terrace of the host building is largely unimpaired by roof alterations and extensions.

No information has been provided on the materials used for the proposed mansard extension although it is expected to be natural slate. The proposed mansard extension would be positioned with the front elevation at a 70-degree angle while at the rear, 2x rear dormer windows would be featured into the design. This is considered appropriate in its detailed design with the rear dormer windows aligning with the fenestration of the rear elevation below. However, this does not overcome principle of the roof extension being unacceptable.

Overall, it is considered the proposal would be of a detrimental impact to the character of the host building and the terrace of buildings of which it forms. Any such application for a mansard roof extension would be resisted by the Council.

Assessment of Three-Storey Rear Extension

CPG1 specifies that extensions should be designed to:

- Be secondary to the building being extended in terms of location, form, scale, proportions and detailing;
- Respect and preserve the original proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;
- Respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area;
- Not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties;
- Allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden.

The proposed rear extension would be a depth of 3.6m from the rear elevation and terminate at a maximum height of 8.8m from ground level. The extension would expand the entire width of the garden at ground floor level at 4.8m, while at first and second floor level, the extension would be part-width at a width of 3.2m.

In review of the guidance above, it is considered that although the principle of an extension is generally acceptable, some amendments would be required for this scheme to be supported by officers. It is considered that the rear extension in its current form is bulky and dominant in relation to the host building and the neighbouring buildings along the terrace of which is forms a part of.

CPG1 further specifies that rear extensions should terminate at least one full storey beneath the original eaves of the roof of the building in order for it to be subordinate and secondary to the application building. It is considered in this case that the eaves of the building are at the second floor level of the building and not at the roof level. Therefore, it is strongly advised that the rear extension should be a storey lower and terminate at first floor level (two-storey rear extension).

The submitted pre-application pack states that the proposed rear extension takes the same scale and volume as the rear extension present at No. 110 Drummond Street. Although No. 110 is located nearby to the application site, the size and scale of the extension appears to be bulky within the row of immediate buildings that the host buildings forms part.

Furthermore, No. 110 can be viewed as an end of terrace building with Exmouth Mews separating No. 110 with the adjacent row of buildings, which the host building is located within. It is advised that the proposal reflects the mass, scale and terminating depth of the rear extension located present at No. 108 Drummond Street. If so, the proposal would be considered to be more respectful and preserves the historic pattern and established

townscape of the area as it reflects an extension which is part of the row building which it forms of providing consistency at the rear.

The depth of the rear extension is considered to deplete a vast amount of existing rear garden space, which is contrary to the design guidance as listed above. It is advised to set in the depth of the extension to provide a reasonable amount of remaining rear garden space (as well as to address the concerns in the previous paragraph), or to have the extension part-width for the second storey (ground floor level).

The detailed design has not been provided on the extension. A traditional or contemporary approach in design can be applied to the rear extension in this instance, provided that it would not detract from the character and appearance of the host building or the terrace of which it forms part of.

The chimney should be retained (particularly at roof level where it is of visual interest) as it form part of the design and appearance of the terrace of buildings. D1 states that local context and character should be retained and respected. The proposed railings are considered acceptable for the formation of a terrace above the extension.

8. Adjacent of Residential Amenity

Policy A1 of Camden's Development Policies seek to ensure that the amenity of neighbouring properties is protected. It states that planning permission will not be granted for development that causes harm to the amenity of occupiers and neighbours in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy.

Mansard Roof Extension

By virtue of the location of the additional storey upon the roof of the building, it is overall considered there would be none or negligible impact to the amenity of neighbouring residential occupiers. However, this does not overcome the concerns of the design principles of the proposed mansard as explained previously.

The three-storey rear extension is considered to not adversely impact upon the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers in regards to access to daylight and sunlight due to the modest depth of the extension and the orientation of the extension facing north.

The outlook of the adjoining residential occupiers at No. 102 and No. 106 Drummond Street is considered to be negligibly impacted by the development, while the residential occupiers of Exmouth Mews would not be affected by the development as there are no windows present upon the side elevation, which looks onto the rear garden and the proposed extension.

There are concerns that due to the depth of the rear extension in conjunction with the existing extension at No. 108 Drummond Street, the proposal would lead to lead to a sense of enclosure for the occupiers at No. 106 Drummond Street. It is advised that this can be mitigated to a less than harmful by reducing the depth of the rear extension to terminate at the same depth as the extension at No. 108 Drummond Street.

No further detailed design has been provided on the rear extension so it is not known where the proposed windows would be positioned. It is strongly advised that no windows be proposed onto the side elevations of the extension, as it would result in adverse levels of overlooking into the rear habitable windows of No. 102 and No. 106 Drummond Street. There are already established rear facing views and also it would be expected for the rear elevation of the extension to feature windows.

Rear Terrace

It is advised that the western balustrading be set in from the side elevation of the proposed extension to ensure that no overlooking is caused into the rear windows of No. 106 Drummond Street. As it is advised that the extension be one storey less, the terrace would expected to be at first floor level of the building.

9. Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposed mansard roof extension is considered to not be acceptable on principle, as the host building is located within a terrace of buildings that are largely unimpaired by roof extensions.

The three-storey rear extension in its current form is considered unacceptable in its current form for design and amenity concerns although this can be overcome with the advice provided. Further details would be required within the submission give an in-depth consideration the detailed design and amenity aspects of the scheme.

10. Planning application information

If you submit a planning application, I would advise you to submit the following for a valid planning application:

- Completed form Full Planning Permission
- An ordnance survey based location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red
- Floor plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Roof plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Elevation drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Section drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- The appropriate fee £407.00
- Please see <u>supporting information for planning applications</u> for more information.

We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would display site notices near the site. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.

It is likely that that a proposal of this size would be determined under delegated powers, however, if more than 3 objections from neighbours or an objection from a local amenity group is received the application will be referred to the Members Briefing Panel should it be recommended for approval by officers. For more details click here.

This document represents an initial informal officer view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage and would not be binding upon the Council, nor prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact Samir Benmbarek on 020 7974 2534.

Thank you for using Camden's pre-application advice service.

Yours sincerely.

Samir Benmbarek

Planning Officer
Planning Solutions Team