Delegated Report	ŀ	Analysis sheet		Expiry I	Date:	15/01/2	017	
		N/A / attached		Consult Expiry [		13/01/2	019	
Officer			Application N					
Thomas Sild			2018/5779/P					
Application Address			Drawing Num	Drawing Numbers				
73 Farringdon Road LONDON EC1M 3JQ			See decision n	See decision notice				
PO 3/4 Area Tea	am Signature	C&UD	Authorised Of	ficer Sig	nature			
Proposal(s)								
Erection of single storey mansard style roof extension to provide 1 x 2 bed residential unit (Use Class C3)								
Recommendation(s): Refuse planning perm			nission					
Application Type:	cation Type: Full Planning Permissic			n				
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:			Neder					
	Refer to Draft Decision Notice							
Informatives:								
Informatives: Consultations								
	No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of ol	ojections	00	
Consultations	No. notified Press Notice Site Notices	13/12/201 (x 2) 14/2/2	18 – 13/01/2018 2018 – 07/01/2018	00	No. of ol	ojections	00	
Consultations Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of consultation	No. notified Press Notice Site Notices	13/12/201 (x 2) 14/2/2	8 – 13/01/2018	00	No. of ol	ojections	00	
Consultations Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of consultation	No. notified Press Notice Site Notices	13/12/201 (x 2) 14/2/2	18 – 13/01/2018 2018 – 07/01/2018	00	No. of ol	ojections	00	
Consultations Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of consultation responses: CAAC comments:	No. notified Press Notice Site Notices • No resp	13/12/201 (x 2) 14/2/2	18 – 13/01/2018 2018 – 07/01/2018	00	No. of ol	ojections	00	
Consultations Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of consultation responses:	No. notified Press Notice Site Notices • No resp <u>N/A</u> x-storey mixed	13/12/201 (x 2) 14/2/2 ponses to p commerci	18 – 13/01/2018 2018 – 07/01/2018 pubic consultation	se building	g, sited o	on western	side	

# **Relevant History**

• **5 October 2018 - 2018/0927/P –** Permission refused for erection of single storey roof extension to provide 2 x 2 bed residential units (Class C3).

- 21 January 2008 2007/6029/P Refused permission for erection of a 5th floor roof extension, including 3 dormer windows and front roof terrace, to provide a one bedroom selfcontained 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 NPPF 2018

London Plan 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 (2018) CPG6 Amenity (September 2011 updated March 2018) CPG7 Transport (2011) CPG8 Planning obligations

Hatton Garden Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2017

### Assessment

### The proposal

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 70sqm.

The main considerations with this application are:

- Affordable housing contribution
- Quality of accommodation
- Design and heritage impact
- Impact on neighbour amenity
- Transport

### Affordable housing contribution

The proposal would create approximately 70sqm of additional residential floorspace at the site and as

such would not trigger the requirement for an affordable housing contribution.

## Quality of accommodation

The proposed additional 2 bedroom unit would enjoy a good level of outlook and would exceed the borough's adopted minimum space standards in relation to both overall area and bedroom sizes. As such there is no objection to the provision of a residential unit of the quality proposed.

### Design and heritage impact

The Council will welcome high quality contemporary design which responds to its context. Camden's Local Plan Document is supported by Supplementary Planning Guidance CPG1 (Design).

Through Local Plan policy G1 the Council will deliver growth by securing high quality development taking into account quality of design, its surroundings, sustainability, amenity, heritage, transport accessibility and any other considerations relevant to the site. Policy D1 seeks to ensure development respects local context and character. Development must propose details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character.

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.

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 neighbouring properties and where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural composition

In assessing the 2007 appeal also for a largely mansard style roof extension, the Inspector noted that the two adjacent buildings to the south have mansard roof extensions and that "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" going on to say that "Their existence does not justify the further harm to the character and appearance of the terrace which the proposal would cause"

The Council affirms that these comments still stand in relation to this current application. Given its additional height and the corner nature of the building, the proposed extension on no. 73 would be significantly more prominent and visually intrusive than the existing neighbouring roof extensions at 69-71.

No. 73 is currently distinguished by its flat top and lack of roof form above the parapet. The scale and form of the extension would be apparent in views along both St Cross Street and Farringdon Road. The 'mansard' style form in this context is considered to detract from the horizontal emphasis and flat top of the building which provides it with a distinct cube like form appropriate to its origin as a commercial rather than residential building. The overall combination of form, appearance and materials of the proposal would therefore fail to respect the building's architectural heritage, language and strong horizontal emphasis, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the surrounding conservation area as a result.

As such the proposed development has not overcome the previous reasons for refusal and fails to comply with policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2018.

#### Impact on Neighbour Amenity

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.

There are existing roof terraces to properties at 44 Saffron Hill situated to the rear of the site, with a separation gap of 20m+. The proposed additional rear windows at no. 73 would not be considered to cause harm to the amenity of these residential dwellings. Whilst overlooking to the rear would be possible, the additional rear windows would share the same general outlook as both the existing rear windows of no. 73 and the rear windows and terrace areas of the adjoining nos. 69-71 Farringdon Road. This would not introduce 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

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

### Transport

### Car parking

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, and parking will only be considered for new non-residential developments where it can be demonstrated that the parking provided is essential to the use or operation of the development. The development should therefore be secured as a car free development, restricting the ability of the future occupiers from obtaining on-street parking permits.

No on-site parking is proposed as part of the current proposal and the proposed unit would not be eligible for on street permits. The car-free requirement would be secured by a legal agreement if the scheme was otherwise considered acceptable. The absence of a legal agreement is considered a valid reason for refusal.

### Cycle Parking

Policy T1 of the Camden Local Plan requires development to provide cycle parking facilities in accordance with the minimum requirements of the London Plan and the design requirements outlined in CPG7.

The development is required to provide 2 additional secure and covered cycle spaces to meet London Plan minimum requirements.

There are no details in the plans or the supporting information in respect to the required cycle parking and should the scheme have been otherwise acceptable, further details would have been required.

### Recommendation

Refuse planning permission.