

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>01/07/2021</b>
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	06/06/2021
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Laura Hazelton			2021/1532/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
18 Stukeley Street London WC2B 5LR			Please refer to 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>				
Demolition of existing 4th floor extension and erection of new 3 storey roof extension to create 3 additional residential units (Class C3), with roof terraces.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Refuse planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Full Planning Permission			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>			No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>The application was advertised in the local press on 13/05/2021 (expiring 06/06/2021) and site notices were displayed on 12/05/2021.</p> <p>No objections were received from neighbouring residents.</p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>	<p>The <b>Seven Dials CAAC</b> objected to the application for the following reasons (summary):</p> <p>Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Object to the scale regardless of design alterations.</li> <li>- The building could accommodate a two storey extension at most.</li> <li>- Significant invasive structural works are required to strengthen the foundations of the building to accommodate the increased load. This suggests that such an ambitious extension is inappropriate for this building regardless of design and conservation issues.</li> </ul> <p>Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The design pays little regard to the character of the host building and wider conservation area, and would harm the existing building and wider townscape.</li> <li>- The 2.5 storey extension appears entirely alien to the appearance of the building, conservation area, and Central London.</li> <li>- The fenestration is inappropriate in proportions and design and the use of Staffordshire blue bricks is also inappropriate.</li> <li>- Do not agree that the design intention should be to contrast with the existing building and wider townscape. Should be clearly subservient to the existing building, and clearly read as being an extension rather than separate entity.</li> <li>- Each storey above parapet should be set back to minimise impact.</li> </ul>					

## Site Description

The application site comprises a five-storey building plus basement located at the junction of Stukeley Street and Smart Place. The building has a white rendered finish at ground floor level with a stock brick finish to upper floors. The property is in residential use as five flats (Class C3), following conversion from the previous use as offices (Class E).

The property is located within the Central London Area and the Seven Dials Conservation Area. Stukeley Street and Smart Place are characterised by large commercial buildings of 4-6 storeys in height interspersed with residential flats. The site is well served by public transport (PTAL rate of 6b) and is located in close proximity to retail goods and services on High Holborn, Tottenham Court Road and Oxford Street.

## Relevant History

**2013/4021/P** - Variation of condition 3 of permission granted 28/02/2013 (ref: 2012/6680/P) and subsequently varied (ref:2013/1692/P) for the change of use to residential; namely, to insert a new external entrance access door for Unit 1 and to amend the internal layout of Unit 1. Granted 15/04/2014.

**2013/1692/P** - Variation of condition 3 (development in accordance with approved plans) of permission granted 28/02/2013 (ref: 2012/6680/P) for minor material amendments to the proposed roof extension. Granted 28/05/2013.

**2012/6680/P** - Change of use from offices (Class B1a) to self-contained residential flats (Class C3) comprising 2 x 1 bedroom, 2 x 2 bedroom and 1 x 3 bedroom units from basement to fourth floor level, erection of a mansard roof extension with a roof terrace, alterations to fenestration and relocation of main entrance. Granted 28/02/2013.

**2012/2401/P** - Erection of a mansard roof extension to create additional accommodation with a new roof terrace along the south-west elevation; change of use of the basement, first, second and third floors from office (Class B1) to residential (Class C3) with the provision of 2 x 1 bed and 1 x 3 bed flats at basement, first, second, third and fourth floor levels; change of use of the ground floor from office (Class B1) to a flexible use for office (Class B1) or education/community use (Class D1); and alterations to the fenestration along the front (north-west) and side (south-west) elevations at ground floor. Granted 19/09/2012.

**2010/6611/P** - Replacement of existing timber windows with aluminium framed windows at ground floor and basement level of front and side elevation of office building (Class B1). Refused 01/02/2011 for the following reason:

- 1. The proposed windows, by virtue of their inappropriate design, form and proportions, would detract from the architectural integrity of the building and be harmful to the character and appearance of the building and fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Seven Dials conservation area, contrary to policies of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) & CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design); DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) & DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Development Framework Development Policies.*

**2010/4431/P** - Erection of roof extension to create fifth floor with side roof terrace, replacement of windows on front and side elevation with new windows to match the existing and replacement of entrance doors to create level access to building (Class B1). Granted 12/10/2010.

**2010/4284/P** - Retention of change of use from office (Class B1) to educational centre (Class D1).

Refused 11/10/2010. Appeal dismissed 30/03/2011.

**9000072** - Change of use from Class B8 warehouse use to B1 office use. Granted 26/04/1990.

### 8 Smart's Place

**2019/1420/P** - Erection of 3 storey roof extension to create 1x 3-bed self-contained flat with roof garden; installation of replacement plant machinery for existing four-storey office building; alterations to existing building. Granted 10/03/2020.

### 16 Stukeley Street

**2006/3798/P** - Extensions, external alterations and change of use from non-residential use (Class D1) to mixed use office / non-residential use (Class B1/D1) on the lower ground and mezzanine ground floor levels and residential use (Class C3) on the upper ground and first to fifth floors creating 10 self-contained units (4x1 bed, 4x2 bed and 2x3 bed units), and formation of roof terraces at third, fourth, and fifth floor levels. Granted 14/12/2006.

## **Relevant policies**

### **National Planning Policy Framework 2021**

#### **The London Plan 2021**

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

##### *Growth and spatial delivery*

Policy G1 Delivery and location of growth

##### *Meeting housing needs*

Policy H1 Maximising housing supply

Policy H3 Protecting existing homes

Policy H4 Maximising the supply of affordable housing

Policy H6 Housing choice and mix

Policy H7 Large and small homes

##### *Community, health and wellbeing*

Policy C5 Safety and security

Policy C6 Access for all

##### *Protecting amenity*

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

##### *Design and Heritage*

Policy D1 Design

Policy D2 Heritage

##### *Sustainability and climate change*

Policy CC1 Climate change mitigation

Policy CC2 Adapting to climate change

Policy CC3 Water and flooding

Policy CC4 Air quality

Policy CC5 Waste

##### *Transport*

Policy T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport

Policy T2 Parking and car-free development  
Policy T3 Transport infrastructure  
Policy T4 Sustainable movement of goods and materials

## **Camden Planning Guidance**

Housing CPG 2021  
Design CPG 2021  
Amenity CPG 2021  
Transport CPG 2021  
Developer contribution CPG 2019

## **Seven Dials Conservation Area appraisal and management strategy 2003**

### **Assessment**

#### **1. Proposal**

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the following works:

- the demolition of the existing setback fourth floor extension,
- the erection of a new three storey roof extension comprising two floors to match the footprint of the original building and a setback top floor constructed of Staffordshire blue bricks,
- creation of roof terraces at sixth floor and roof level surrounded by metal balustrading,
- alterations to the existing windows at third floor level to match the size and design of the existing windows at first and second floor level, and
- the creation of three new dwellings.

#### Revisions

1.2 Revised drawings were submitted during the course of the application to remove a rooftop pavilion structure which was previously proposed to provide access to the roof terrace, to change the design of the existing third floor and proposed fourth floor windows, and to change the design of the fifth floor and sixth floor in terms of footprint, materials and fenestration design.

1.3 The proposals previously included a setback fifth and sixth floor constructed of Staffordshire blue brick, which was amended so that the fifth floor matched the footprint and materials of the floor below, with a single setback sixth floor.

#### **2. Assessment**

2.1 The principal planning considerations are considered to be the following:

- Creation of new housing
- Housing mix, unit size, quality of accommodation and affordable housing
- Design and Heritage
- Neighbouring amenity
- Transport considerations
- Energy and Sustainability
- Air quality
- Water and drainage

#### **3. Creation of new housing**

3.1 Housing is regarded as the priority land-use of the Local Plan as set out in policy H1 and the Council makes housing its top priority when considering the future of unused and underused land and buildings. Given the existing residential use of the host building, this is considered an appropriate location for additional homes, and the proposals would comply with Policy H1 in this regard. Great weight has been given to the provision of additional housing.

#### **4. Housing mix, unit size, quality of accommodation and affordable housing**

##### Mix of unit sizes

4.1 The existing building comprises 2 x 1 bedroom flats, 2 x 2 bedroom flats and 1 x 3 bedroom flat. The proposals include alterations to the existing 3 bedroom flat to convert it to a 2 bedroom flat, and the creation of a new 1 x 1 bedroom flat and 2 x 2 bedroom flats, to provide an overall mix of 3 x 1 bedroom flats and 5 x 2 bedroom flats and an uplift of three units.

4.2 Policy H7 seeks to provide a range of unit sizes to meet demand across the Borough. For market units, table 1 of this policy considers 1 bedroom/studios to have a lower priority, 2 and 3 bedroom units to be of high priority and 4 bedroom (or more) a lower priority. The majority of the existing flats in the building are higher priority dwelling sizes and include one larger 3 bedroom family sized unit which has access to outside amenity space. The proposals would provide three new dwellings and five of the eight flats would be a high priority size, but the existing larger 3 bedroom home would be lost.

4.3 It is recognised that there is a demand for homes of all sizes, and the creation of three new dwellings is welcomed. Although the loss of a 3 bedroom unit is regrettable, it is acknowledged that works could be carried out to this dwelling to convert a bedroom to an alternative use without requiring planning permission, and it is recognised that 2 bedroom units still provide homes for families. On this basis, the unit mix is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with policy H7.

##### Design and layout

4.4 Policy H6 relates to housing choice and mix and encourages the design of all housing in the borough to provide functional, adaptable and accessible spaces; and Policy D1 notes that housing must provide a high standard of accommodation. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) released nationally described space standards in March 2015, which are incorporated in the Local Plan. The minimum gross internal floor areas are set by the number of bedrooms and bed spaces/occupiers in each dwelling. The requirements are 50sqm for a 1 bedroom 2 person flat, 61sqm for a 2 bedroom 3 person flat, 70sqm for a 2 bedroom 4 person flat, increasing to 79sqm for 4 person dwellings spread over two floors.

4.5 The proposed dwellings at fifth and sixth floor would comply with the required floor areas (measuring 84sqm for the 2 bedroom 4 person flat and 63sqm for the 1 bedroom 2 person flat); however, the altered third floor flat and proposed fourth floor flat would both be below the required standard of 70sqm, at 68sqm and 67sqm respectively, and the size of the second bedroom would be below the required 11.5sqm. These units are marked as 4 person units, but it is noted that they could comply with the required standards if converted to a 3 person unit. This could be secured by condition if planning permission were to be granted, so this is not considered to constitute a reason for refusal.

4.6 All dwellings would be dual aspect which would provide adequate daylight and sunlight. Not all dwellings would benefit from outside amenity space, but as this is the current situation, this is considered acceptable in this instance. Step free access would be provided to the new units via the existing lift which would be extended upwards. The new units would have permanent separation between eating and sleeping areas, include adequate storage space and would be accessible and adaptable to a range of occupiers.

4.7 The front elevation north-facing windows do not directly overlook any neighbouring buildings, but instead face the blank façade of the rear of 190 High Holborn. The south west facing elevation would introduce new windows at fifth and sixth floor which would directly face those at 16 Stukeley Street (International House), which is in mixed education and residential use. Given the distance of less than 6m between these windows, there would potentially be harmful overlooking of the new residential flats and the existing occupants opposite. If the planning permission were otherwise considered acceptable, a planning condition would secure the installation of obscure glazing to the lower half of the windows, as was done with the 2012 approval.

4.8 Overall, subject to a condition securing units 5 and 6 as 3 person rather than 4 person dwellings, and the installation of obscure glazing, the development would provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for future occupants.

#### Affordable housing

4.9 Policy H4 seeks to maximise the supply of affordable housing in the borough. It notes that the Council will expect a contribution to affordable housing from all developments that provide one or more additional homes and involve a total addition to residential floorspace of 100sqm GIA or more. In this case, the proposal provides three additional homes and a total uplift of 176sqm (GIA) and therefore a contribution towards affordable housing in the borough is required.

4.10 Targets are based on an assessment of development capacity whereby 100sqm of housing floor space is generally considered to create capacity for one home and a sliding scale target applies to developments that provide one or more additional homes and have capacity for fewer than 25 additional homes, starting at 2% for one home and increasing by 2% of for each home added to capacity. The affordable percentage is calculated on the basis that 100sqm (GIA) is sufficient 'capacity' for a single home (rounded up or down to the nearest 100sqm). In this case, the target would be 4%.

4.11 Policy H4 notes that where developments have capacity for fewer than 10 additional dwellings, the Council will accept a payment-in-lieu of affordable housing. In this case, the proposed contribution is as follows:

<b>Additional residential floorspace (GIA)</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Affordable housing percentage target (capacity x 2%)</b>	<b>Affordable housing floorspace target (% target x GIA)</b>	<b>PiL required (floorspace target x £5,000)</b>
176sqm	2 homes	4%	4% x 176 = 7.04	7.04 x £5,000 = <b>£35,200</b>

4.12 This would need to be secured by the S106 legal agreement. In the absence of an acceptable scheme and therefore no S106 agreement, this forms a reason for refusal.

## **5. Design and heritage**

### Statutory Framework and Implications

5.1 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("the Listed Buildings Act") is relevant, and requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area when considering applications relating to land or buildings within that Area.

5.2 The effect of this section of the Listed Buildings Act is that there is a statutory presumption in favour of the preservation of the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.

Considerable importance and weight should be attached to their preservation. A proposal which would cause harm should only be permitted where there are strong countervailing planning considerations which are sufficiently powerful to outweigh the presumption. The NPPF provides guidance on the weight that should be accorded to harm to heritage assets and in what circumstances such harm might be justified (section 16).

### Policy review

5.3 NPPF section 16 paras. 189 to 202 in particular, London Plan policies D1, D3, D4 and D5, and Camden Local Plan policies D1 and D2 are relevant with regards to conservation and design. Camden's Local Plan policies are supported by the 'Design' CPG and the Seven Dials Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy.

5.4 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions are proposed. Policy D1 of the Local Plan 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.

### Designations

5.5 The application site is not listed, but is located within sub area 3 of the Seven Dials Conservation Area, on the south side of Stukeley Street on the corner of the junction with Smart's Place. The building is not listed as making either a positive or a negative contribution to the conservation area. The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy notes that "on the south side of the street are examples of the narrow courts that date back to the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Smarts Place and a section of Stukeley Street, they have an industrial/commercial character, similar to a mews quality". The area offers a townscape with both variety and cohesiveness. Buildings from the 18th to the 20th century abut each other offering diversity and differing heights on the mainly narrow streets. The area has a predominance of Victorian municipal buildings, mainly built after slum clearances in 1889. This group of buildings created in one era is unified in terms of materials and design yet vary in scale, style and uses.

5.6 In terms of its significance, the conservation area appraisals notes that 'The special character of the conservation area is found in the range and mix of building types and uses and the street layout. The character is not dominated by one particular period or style of building but rather it is their combination that is of special interest'.

### Assessment

5.7 The application site comprises a five storey building plus basement level and including a modern setback top floor. The building is constructed of stock brick with a rendered ground floor and white timber windows. The windows are larger at first and second floor with a curved brick arch, and smaller at third floor with a plain lintel. The original parapet has been raised in matching stock brick, and a setback fourth floor erected above, constructed of matching stock brick with dark coloured aluminium windows. The original building is an attractive, traditional warehouse-style building, on a prominent corner location where it is also visible from High Holborn to the north.

5.8 The Seven Dials Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy gives guidance for roof extensions, and notes that there are limited opportunities for roof extensions as alterations to the roofscape could adversely affect the character of the Conservation Area. It sets out the following principles for roof extensions (para. SD25):

- a. The retention or reinstatement of any architecturally interesting features and



characteristic decorative elements such as parapets, cornices and chimney stacks and pots will be encouraged.

- b. Roof extensions should be drained to the rear of the building; no rainwater pipes will normally be allowed on the street elevation.
- c. All external works should be carried out in materials that match as closely as possible in colour, texture and type those of the original building or are common in the area.
- d. Where the property forms part of a proper terrace which remains largely, but not necessarily, completely unimpaired, an extension is likely to be unacceptable.

5.9 The Design CPG notes that additional storeys are likely to be acceptable where:

- Good quality materials and details are used and the visual prominence, scale and bulk would be appropriate having regard to the local context;
- There is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a group of similar buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would be a positive design solution, e.g. helping to reunite a group of buildings or townscape;
- Alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form (para 5.13).

5.10 The guidance also sets out situations where a roof addition is unlikely to be acceptable, including where buildings are part of a group where differing heights add visual interest and where a roof extension would detract from this variety of form; and where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional storeys (para. 5.14).

5.11 The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing setback fourth floor extension, and the erection of a new three storey roof extension with roof terraces at sixth floor and roof level. The existing windows at third floor level would also be altered to match the size and design of the existing windows at first and second floor level.



Figure 1: Existing (left) and proposed (right) front elevation

5.12 The proposed extension at fourth and fifth floor level would extend the full footprint of the building, extending the existing building line up and finished in brick slips. The windows at fourth floor would match the existing windows at first and second floor and the new windows at third floor. At fifth floor, the window openings would be larger, arched windows with a metal Juliet balcony. The design and access statement provides a description and 3D drawings showing the windows set back behind the arched openings to allow for a small terrace, but it is noted that this is not shown on the proposed fifth floor plan, which instead shows windows on the same

plane as the floors below. At sixth floor, the extension would sit adjacent to the front parapet, and be set away from the side parapet by 2.1m. The sixth floor extension would be constructed of Staffordshire blue brick with large square windows with slim frames. The proposed material of the window frames has not been specified. Roof terraces would be formed at sixth floor and roof level surrounded by metal balustrading.

- 5.13 The existing building, of four storeys with a setback fifth storey is a traditionally detailed warehouse design, with a strong horizontal emphasis. The height and massing of the three storey extension would stretch out the façade, altering its character and changing the proportions of the building.
- 5.14 The recently approved extension at 8 Smart's Place and the taller neighbouring buildings at 16 Stukeley Street and on the northern side of Stukeley Street have been cited as providing justification for the increase in height proposed; however, officers disagree with this approach. The application site is located within the Seven Dials Conservation Area, the boundary of which excludes the buildings on the north side of Stukeley Street. Instead, these are located on High Holborn, on the edge of a growth area, and it is not considered appropriate to allow that character to infiltrate into the Conservation Area.
- 5.15 The approved development at 8 Smart's Place is also noted, but again, is not considered to set a precedent for what is appropriate at the application site. The application building is a very prominent corner building, and read in a different visual context to no.8. The application building terminates a view, sits on a corner, and has its own character which is compromised by the significant increase in height. Such an increase in height would also have a significant impact on local streetscape in a way that the approved development at no.8 would not. In that case, the additional massing is stepped at each level, and is a high quality, unique design which was considered to preserve the character of the Seven Dials Conservation Area. The significant roof extension proposed is considered to overwhelm the host building, and would not be sympathetic to the existing proportions or architectural character.
- 5.16 The neighbouring building no.20 to the north east is a three storey building with a setback two storey mansard roof, meaning the building reads principally as a three storey building. The existing building at the application site with a principal façade of four storeys and a setback fifth storey sits comfortably against its neighbour. The proposed increase in height and massing would dominate and overwhelm the neighbouring building and streetscene. An extension of a lower height, and stepped away from the front elevation would be more appropriate in this location.
- 5.17 In terms of detailed design, the proposed window designs at fifth and sixth floor would not respect the character of the existing building, or the hierarchy of its fenestration. The introduction of both large arched windows at fifth floor, and large slim-framed contemporary window openings at sixth floor is out of character and unsympathetic to the existing building. Likewise, the use of Staffordshire blue brick is incongruous in this location and an inappropriate choice of material, and given the very limited setback, the development would be highly visible from street level.
- 5.18 As such, the proposed development is considered unacceptable due to the height, massing, detailed design and materiality of the proposed extensions which would harm the character and appearance of the building. The proposals would also impact the character of this part of the Seven Dials Conservation Area. Although the conservation area is characterised by a range and mix of building types and uses, with its character deriving from the combination of architectural styles and periods, the proposals would make the existing building unduly dominant next to its neighbour and in the streetscene. The proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area and the inappropriate design, height and bulk would cause harm to its significance. This harm is considered to be less than substantial.

5.19 Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Although the development would provide three new dwellings, the great weight given to the creation of a limited number of new homes would not outweigh the great weight given to the heritage harm identified.

5.20 The proposals are therefore contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017, and this forms a reason for refusal.

## **6. Neighbouring Amenity**

6.1 Policy A1 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered and would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, outlook, noise, daylight and sunlight.

6.2 The closest properties which could be impacted by the development are nos. 16 and 20-22 Stukeley Street, and 8 Smart's Place to the rear. Nos. 20-22 and the lower floors of 16 Stukeley Street and 8 Smart's Place are in commercial / office /education use and unlikely to be unduly harmed by the works.

6.3 The upper floors of no.16 are in residential use, and it is noted that 8 Smart's Place benefits from a recent planning permission for a roof extension to provide 1 x 3 bedroom dwelling. The approved proposals at no.8 did not include any windows to the north west elevation, and therefore future occupants would not be unduly impacted by the proposed development.

6.4 A daylight and sunlight assessment has been submitted to determine the impacts of the proposed extension on existing residential units at no.16. The VSC and NSL tests were used to assess impacts on daylight, and the APSH test was used to assess sunlight impacts.

6.5 No.16 Stukeley Street is located to the south west of the site, and has a number of windows on its flank elevation that face the site. In terms of daylight, the results of the assessment demonstrate that 38 out of 45 windows would meet the strict application of the BRE guidelines (i.e. any losses would be below a noticeable 20% loss). There would be 7 windows that would experience changes in their VSC beyond the permissible 20% value suggested in the BRE guidelines. Looking in more detail at these 7 windows, the likely losses would be 20.37%, 25%, 27.88%, 29.89%, 31.39%, 25.49% and 27.14%. However, although 7 windows are affected, these serve just 4 rooms, and in each case, every room is served by between 2 – 5 other windows which would see almost zero impacts to VSC.

6.6 The NSL test was also used which considers daylight distribution within a room (rather than individual windows). This test showed that 13 of the 14 rooms would meet the BRE guidelines. The one room which doesn't records a change of 21.3%, which is just 1.3% over the recommended 20%. As such, although some windows would see a loss of daylight, these rooms are served by multiple windows and the overall reduction in daylight would not be unduly harmful to the amenity of occupants.

6.7 The APSH test was used to assess sunlight impacts and demonstrated full compliance with BRE guidance.

6.8 Overall, the proposed impacts on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring residential occupants are therefore considered acceptable.

## **7. Transport considerations**

7.1 In line with Policy T1 of the Local Plan, the Council expects cycle parking at developments to be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the London Plan. For residential uses, the requirement is for 1 space per studio and 1 person 1 bedroom unit, 1.5 spaces per 2 person 1 bedroom unit and 2 spaces per all other units. Given the proposed unit mixes in Flats 5-8, this would give a requirement for 7.5 spaces. The applicant has proposed that the new occupants of these flats will be given 2 folding cycles each (8 total) and that suitable storage lockers will be provided within Flats 6 and 7 and within the fifth floor lift lobby area (for Flats 7 and 8). Whilst the Council does not normally accept the use of folding cycles, this offer is considered acceptable given the existing constraints of the building. The Members Briefing report for the original permission acknowledged that there was insufficient space within the building to accommodate a central ground floor cycle store and that sufficient space existed within each flat to accommodate cycles if required. The provision of the folding cycles and lockers would be secured by condition if planning permission were to be granted.

7.2 In accordance with Policy T2 of the Local Plan, the Council would expect all development to be car free. No off-street parking is currently provided and none is proposed. In line with the Section 106 Agreement secured against the original permission, which secured all 5 of the flats as on-street parking permit free, the 3 additional flats should also be secured as on-street parking permit free by means of a new Section 106 Agreement. This will prevent all of the occupants of the building from adding to existing on-street parking pressures, traffic congestion and air pollution, whilst encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport. In the absence of an acceptable scheme (and hence no section 106 agreement) this becomes a reason for refusal.

7.3 Given the extent of demolition and construction works proposed, particularly given the narrow confines of the surrounding streets, particularly Stukeley Street and Smart's Place, it is considered that a Construction Management Plan and associated Implementation Support Contribution of £3,920 and CMP bond of £7,500 should be secured by means of Section 106 Agreement. This will help ensure that the development is carried out in such a way as to minimise disruption to the operation of the surrounding highway network and local neighbourhood amenity. In the absence of an acceptable scheme (and hence no section 106 agreement) this becomes a reason for refusal.

7.4 The Council's Transport Officer has confirmed that a highways contribution is not considered necessary in this instance as any damage that occurs to the adjacent footways will be covered by the scaffolding bond that is secured under a separate licensing scheme.

## **8. Energy and Sustainability**

8.1 In line with policies CC1 and CC2, the Council will require development to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures. The development is classed as a minor development (< 4 units or 500sqm new floorspace), by the Energy Efficiency and Adaption CPG, and therefore an energy statement is not required; however, performance against carbon reduction targets should be included in a sustainability statement, and development is expected to meet overall carbon reduction targets of 19% below Part L of 2013 Building Regulations. Renewable technologies should be incorporated where feasible.

8.2 An energy statement has been submitted which demonstrates that the development would achieve a 10-15% improvement when compared against Part L. No renewable technologies are proposed. The scheme is therefore not policy compliant. In 2019 the council declared a climate emergency and it has made a commitment to make Camden a zero carbon borough by 2030. Great weight has been given to the failure to meet even the most basic minimum requirements of policy and this forms an additional reason for refusal.

## **9. Air Quality**

9.1 Camden Local Plan policy CC4 seeks to ensure the impact of development on air quality is mitigated and ensures that exposure to poor air quality is reduced in the Borough.

9.2 Although the development is not a major development, it would bring sensitive uses into an area of poor air quality, and therefore a basic air quality assessment would be expected. An air quality assessment has not been submitted and in the absence of this, it is not clear whether the development would protect future occupants from exposure to poor air quality, contrary to policy CC4. This would form an additional reason for refusal.

## **10. Water and drainage**

10.1 The existing site is built on hardstanding so offers little in the way of drainage, nonetheless, redeveloping the site is an opportunity to improve upon this and reduce flood risk in the area. All developments are expected to manage drainage and surface water on-site or as close to the site as possible, using Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) and the hierarchy set out in CPG Water and Flooding.

10.2 The proposals include planters and soft landscaping at sixth floor and roof level which is an improvement on the existing situation. Full details of SUDS would be conditioned were planning permission to be granted.

10.3 All new build dwellings should achieve a maximum internal water use of 110 litres per person per day (this includes 5 litres for external water use). If the development were to be approved, this would also be secured by condition.

## **11. Conclusion**

11.1 In conclusion, the proposed roof extension is considered unacceptable due to its height, bulk, detailed design and materiality, which would compromise the form and integrity of the host building, causing harm to its character and appearance, the streetscene, and this part of the Seven Dials Conservation Area. Although the provision of three new homes is welcomed, this would not outweigh the less than substantial harm caused to the designated heritage asset, or the failure to mitigate and address climate change. As such, it is recommended that the application is refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed rooftop extension, by reason of the proposed height, mass, detailed design and materials would compromise the form, character and appearance of the host building and this part of the Seven Dials Conservation Area, contrary to policy D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.
2. In the absence of an air quality assessment, it has not been adequately demonstrated that future occupants would be protected from exposure to poor air quality, contrary to policy CC4 (Air quality) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
3. The proposed development would not achieve required carbon reduction targets, and as such would not minimise the effects of climate change or meet the highest feasible environmental standards, contrary to policy CC1 (Climate change mitigation) and CC2 (Adapting to climate change) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a contribution to affordable housing, would fail to maximise the contribution of the site to the supply of affordable housing in the borough, contrary to policy H4 (Maximising the supply of affordable housing) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.
5. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing car-free housing,

would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area and fail to promote more sustainable and efficient forms of transport and active lifestyles, contrary to policies T2 (Parking and car-free development) and DM1 (Delivery and monitoring) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

6. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a construction management plan and appropriate financial contributions towards implementation support, would be likely to give rise to conflicts with other road users and be detrimental to the amenities of the area generally, contrary to policies G1 (Delivery and location of growth), A1 (Managing the impact of development), T3 (Transport Infrastructure), T4 (Sustainable movement of goods and materials), DM1 (Delivery and monitoring), A4 (Noise and Vibration) and CC4 (Air quality) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.