

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>03/10/2018</b>
<b>(Members Briefing)</b>		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	28/10/2018
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Emily Whittredge			2018/2827/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
69 Patshull Road London NW5 2LE			Refer to Draft 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 part single, part two storey rear and side extension; replacement side and rear dormers; alterations to fenestration including replacement windows and doors; erection of new boundary treatment to front and rear; and minor alterations; in connection with the conversion of the property from three to two residential units.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant Planning Permission Subject to S106 Legal Agreement		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>03</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
Summary of consultation responses:	<p><b>Site notice</b> – displayed from 03/10/2018 to 27/10/2018  <b>Press notice</b> – published on 04/10/2018</p> <p>A letter of <b>support</b> was received from 67 Patshull Road, with the request that a condition be imposed to prevent use of the flat roof areas as terraces. The proposal was considered to be neighbourly, proportionate, sensitive, and appropriate in this context. The width of the proposed first floor extension was supported, subject to the depth not being increased at a later date. The provision of a 3-bedroom family unit was welcomed.</p> <p>A letter of <b>support</b> was received from 65 Patshull Road, superseding an earlier objection to the proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> floor roof terrace, now removed from the application. The front elevation changes were considered a positive enhancement to the conservation area and significant improvement on the status quo.</p> <p>A letter of <b>objection</b> was received from 71 Patshull Road on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for both flat roofs to be used as terraces, cause noise nuisance, and allow overlooking of conservatory and garden;</li> <li>• CA statement states that extensions should be no more than one storey and half the width, or where higher extensions are proposed they should be shallow in depth. The proposal does not comply and is out of keeping with CA;</li> <li>• First floor extension would result in loss of light, overlooking from window into conservatory and garden, and would be visible from the conservatory;</li> <li>• Side extension is out of keeping with the area and will cause loss of light to flank ground floor window; there should be a larger setback to avoid this.</li> </ul> <p><i>Officer Response: The use of the flat roofs can be controlled through a planning condition. Design and conservation matters are discussed in section 4 of the report. Amenity issues are discussed in detail in section 5 of the report below.</i></p>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>The Bartholomew Estate and Kentish Town CAAC <b>objected</b> on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed back infill extends too far into the garden;</li> <li>• The first floor extension constitutes overdevelopment, would overlook neighbouring gardens and reduce light and air;</li> <li>• First floor extension does not comply with policy that rear extensions be no more than a single storey, half the width of the building and as unobtrusive as possible;</li> <li>• No. 67 has no such rear addition and no. 71 has a smaller rear addition.</li> <li>• The side extension would impact on the window of no.71 that looks onto the side passage between the houses.</li> </ul> <p><i>Officer Response: Design and conservation matters are discussed in section 4 of the report. Amenity issues are discussed in detail in section 5 of the report below.</i></p> <p>The Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum did not wish to comment on the application.</p>					

## Site Description

The application relates to a three storey plus loft semi-detached building on the north side of Patshull Road. The building is not listed, but falls within the Bartholomew Estate Conservation Area and is defined as a positive contributor.

The property is currently vacant but is arranged as three self-contained flats.

## Relevant History

**15269** - Conversion of 69 Patshull Road, N.W.5. into three self-contained dwelling units. – **Granted 07/02/1973**

## Relevant policies

### Camden Local Plan 2017

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

Policy A3 Biodiversity

Policy D1 Design

Policy D2 Heritage

Policy H3 Protecting existing homes

Policy H6 Housing choice and mix

Policy H7 Large and small homes

Policy T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport

Policy T2 Car-free development and limiting the availability of parking.

### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG Design (July 2015 updated March 2018)

CPG Amenity (March 2018)

CPG Transport (September 2011 updated March 2018)

CPG Housing (interim)

CPG 2 Housing (May 2016 updated March 2018)

CPG 8 Planning obligations (July 2015 updated March 2018)

### London Plan 2016

### National Planning Policy Framework 2018

### Bartholomew Estate Conservation Area Statement 2000

### 1.0 Proposal

1.1 The application seeks to convert the existing three residential units into one three-bedroom units at the ground and first floors (Unit 1), and one two-bedroom flat at second floor and loft levels (Unit 2). The lower unit would have sole access to the rear garden.

1.2 In connection with the conversion of the property, the following development is proposed:

- Erection of a part single, part two-storey rear and side extension to replace the existing single storey rear extension;
- Replacement of existing side and rear dormer windows with larger dormers;
- Replacement timber sash windows in double glazing, and new front door;
- Erection of new boundary treatment to front and rear.

1.3 The application has been revised since the original submission, principally to omit the roof terrace that was proposed at second floor level over the new outrigger. The plans have also been revised to include a coping detail to the rear extension, and amend the glazing bars to the new rear windows to more closely replicate the original design.

### 2.0 Assessment

2.1 The key considerations in the assessment of this application are:

- The principle of the conversion from three to two residential units and quality of accommodation;

And the impact of the proposed development on -

- The character and appearance of the host building and the Bartholomew Estate Conservation Area.
- The residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers;
- Trees and landscaping;
- The transport network and the availability of car parking

### 3.0 Housing

3.1 The building is proposed to be converted from three units into two units by combining the 1-bedroom flats at ground and first floors into a three-bedroom maisonette.

3.2 Policy H6 states that the Council will expect all self-contained homes to meet the nationally described space standard. Both proposed units would comply with the minimum standard, which requires 3-bed dwellings providing 5- bed spaces over two floors to be 93 sq.m., and 2-bed dwellings providing 4 bed spaces over two floors to be 79 sq. m. The bedroom sizes meet or exceed the minimum floor areas for single and double bedrooms, bathrooms, and internal storage.

3.3 Policy H7 states that the Council will aim to secure a mix of homes of different sizes that contribute to meeting the priorities set out in the Dwelling Size Priorities Table. The Table gives high priority to the creation of 2- and 3-bedroom dwellings, and low priority to one-bedroom units. The proposed development would replace two one-bed units with a 3-bed unit, which would contribute towards the borough's housing priorities.

3.4 Policy H3 states that the Council will resist the net loss of two or more homes. The development would result in the net loss of a single self-contained dwelling, which would not be resisted under current housing policy.

### 4.0 Design and heritage

4.1 Objections were raised by the CAAC and the occupier of No. 71 to the scale of the proposed development and its impact on the conservation area. Properties on this side of Patshull Road have been extended in a piecemeal manner, and there is no uniformity with regard to the amount of development on each site, nor its scale and design. There is a prevailing pattern of two storey rear outriggers that fill the gaps between adjacent semi-detached properties.

4.2 Many similar properties in Patshull Road have two storey rear and side outriggers, which prevent views through the gaps between adjoining properties. No. 69 currently features a small two storey side infill that fills the gap between no. 71 towards the rear of the property. There are also various examples of two storey side infills, and single story infills that are recessed further from the front elevation. The character of buildings on this side of the road is formed by glimpses of sky between pairs of buildings, generally above first floor level.

4.3 The application seeks to erect a single storey full width rear extension, with a first floor outrigger mirroring the outrigger at no. 71. Both of the adjoining properties have two storey outriggers, as do nos. 63, 65, 67, 73, 75 and 79. The proposed first floor extension would be slightly wider at 4.6m than the neighbouring outriggers in order to accommodate the internal layout of the new maisonette with a third bedroom and ensuite; however, there is slight variation in the widths of the outriggers in this area (3.9m at no. 65, 4.3m at no. 73). The extension would match no. 71 in depth and height, and the modest variation in width would be balanced by the significant benefit of providing a three-bedroom family unit.

4.4 The application proposes a full width extension at the ground floor, measuring 6m deep to match the adjoining extension at no. 67, and maintaining the depth of the current rear extension. The conservatory extension at no. 71 would project approximately 0.7m further than the proposed extension. While the new extension would eliminate the existing gap provided by the side return and therefore have a larger footprint, there is no consistent pattern of development within this part of the conservation area. The rear extensions at no. 67 fill the full width of the site, and there are a number of full width extensions nearby. The extension would help to harmonise the scale of development with its semi detached pair no. 67, and on balance, the proposal would improve the appearance of the rear of the site and is not considered to cause harm to the character or appearance of this part of the conservation area.

4.5 The application seeks to infill the side passage adjacent no. 71, to form a new single storey entrance to the upper flat, which would be visible from the public highway. The extension would be set back 1m from the front elevation, and its roof would be 0.8m lower than the principal entrance porch. The brickwork would match the host building and the new timber door would be sympathetic to the age of the building. This type of side infill appears on numerous similar properties within this part of Patshull Road, including nos. 65 & 67, 61 & 63, and 57 & 59, No. 49, and No. 43. The proposal, by virtue of its scale and siting, would retain the visual gap with no. 71, and would be consistent with similar development in the area. The side infill would therefore not have an adverse impact on the character of the conservation area.

4.6 The proposed front boundary treatment consists of a brick dwarf wall with railings above, which would be similar to the existing boundary at the neighbouring property no. 67. The style of boundary treatment is appropriate to the age of the building in its design and materials, and will improve the appearance of the host building and the wider street scene. Details will be required by condition to ensure that the detailed design and materials are sympathetic to the conservation area. The proposed rear boundary treatment is a dwarf brick wall with closed board fencing on top and trellis above, to match the style of the existing. This is appropriate, and no objection is raised to this aspect of the proposal.

## **5.0 Amenity**

5.1 Objections were raised by the occupier of no. 71 Patshull Road and by the CAAC to the development's potential to cause harm to the amenity of neighbours. The objections are detailed in the Consultation section of this report.

5.2 No. 71 is a single dwelling with an existing two storey outrigger adjacent no. 69, with a roof terrace over, and a single storey conservatory to the rear of the outrigger. The proposed first floor extension would not allow direct views into the conservatory roof, as the new window would be at a severely oblique angle to the conservatory, and rear-facing windows are not generally considered to result in harmful overlooking to adjoining properties. The proposed outrigger would largely match the existing outrigger at no. 71, and would have the benefit of obscuring views from the existing roof terrace at no. 71 back into the rear first floor window of the application property.

5.3 The proposed extension would not be larger in height and depth to either adjoining property, and would

not result in a loss of light or privacy. The second floor roof terrace that was originally proposed has been omitted from the application on amenity grounds. The proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of both adjoining properties.

5.4 An objection was raised to the impact of the side infill on the window facing the side passage between nos. 71 and 69 at ground floor level. Although the side infill would reduce the gap between the properties at ground floor level, The flank window serves the entrance hallway to no. 71; therefore, no habitable rooms would be affected by the proposed side infill extension.

## **6.0 Trees and landscaping**

6.1 An arboricultural report was submitted as part of the application, including details of proposed tree protection measures for the two trees on the rear boundary and one street tree. No trees are proposed to be removed as part of the development. The tree protection measures are considered to be acceptable, and their use during demolition and construction works will be secured by a planning condition attached to the decision notice.

## **7.0 Transport**

### *Car parking*

7.1 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 will use legal agreements to ensure that future occupants are aware that they are not entitled to on-street parking permits.

7.2 The property is currently vacant and the development is to have new occupiers, triggering the requirement for a wholly car-free development. A car free development will be secured for the ground and first floor units, via a S106 Legal Agreement, allowing the proposal to be in accordance with Policy T2 of the Camden Local Plan.

### *Cycle Parking*

7.3 Dedicated cycle parking would be provided within the entrance hall of Flat 2 and within a cycle store within the rear garden for Flat 1. This provision is acceptable and will be secured by a planning condition prior to the first use of the units.

## **8.0 Recommendation**

8.1 Grant planning permission subject to S106 Legal Agreement.

***The decision to refer an application to Planning Committee lies with the Director of Regeneration and Planning. Following the Members Briefing panel on Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2018, nominated members will advise whether they consider this application should be reported to the Planning Committee. For further information, please go to [www.camden.gov.uk](http://www.camden.gov.uk) and search for 'Members Briefing'.***