

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date: 09/06/2023	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date: 18/06/2023	
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Ewan Campbell			2023/1547/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
59 Constantine Road NW3 2LP			Please refer to draft decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of a front and rear dormer and front conservation roof light					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission			
Application Type:		Householder Application			
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
Informatives:					
Consultations					
		No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
Neighbour Consultation		<p>A site notice was put up on 24/05/2023 and expired on the 17/06/2023 and a press advert was put up on 25/05/2023 and expired on 18/06/2023</p> <p>1 letter of objection from local resident at 129 South End Close raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DAS includes false statements relating to assessment and neighbour consultation - Issues of scaffolding, noise and disruption significantly affecting residents on South End Close - Separate land being used for storage of building materials amongst other <p><i>Officer Comments: Whilst it is appreciate that the issues raised above are important to residents these are not material planning considerations for this application. Although it would be seen as positive engagement with local residents there is no statutory requirement for applicants to carry out a consultation exercise in advance of the submission of a planning</i></p>			

	<i>application of this size and type.</i>
Mansfield Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC)	<p>MCAAC has raised an objection. Concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rear roof extension far too excessive - Front dormers should be refused where possible - Totally at odds with Conservation Area (CA) appraisal - Heritage statement does not include any analysis of the CA statement <p><i>Officer Comments: in relation to the proposed works these are discussed in section 3. The comments regarding the heritage statement are noted.</i></p>

Site Description

The application site is a three-storey mid-terraced period property constructed of brick with timber windows and a tiled roof. At the rear, the property has an existing two-storey rear projection with a mono-pitch roof.

The application building is not listed but is located within sub area two of the Mansfield Conservation Area (CA) and is regarded as making a positive contribution to the conservation area for its group value. The site is located in the Western Area and in sub area two and is described as:

The majority of residential properties within this sub area conform to one basic plan form and period of development. The main building type is the three storey house, without basements, which generally forms part of a terrace, although there are some examples of semi detached properties on Savernake Road. The buildings are flat fronted with a projecting bay window over two storeys, recessed paired entrance doors, visible pitched roofs and prominent chimney stacks and party walls, and original two or three storey part width rear extensions

Relevant History

Application site:

9592429 - Seeking permission to remove 1 X Eucalptus and 1 X Fastigiata Pear in rear garden to ground level. **Agree to Tree removal without replacement 01-11-1995**

Neighbouring sites:

57 Constantine Road

8804041 - Change of use and works of conversion to form two self- contained flats at ground and first floor levels and a self-contained maisonette at second and attic floors including the erection of a single storey rear extension at ground floor level the formation of a roof terrace at rear second floor level and the installation of dormer windows in the front and rear roof as shown on drawing nos. 8864-1000 1001 1002 1004C 1003A. revised on 18th July and 17th August 1988. **Grant Full or Outline Perm. with Condit. 01-09-1988**

86 Constantine Road

2015/6381/P - Erection of rear dormer window, creation of terrace at 3rd floor level with installation of a metal balustrade and access door and 3 front rooflights. (Refused 23/03/2016 Allowed at Appeal). Inspector stated:

The proposed development would be largely concealed from street level. The dormer would be centrally aligned and offset from the sides and ridge. I find that this sensitive approach to design would lead it to appear as a modest addition with a largely “tucked away” appearance. It would appear subordinate to the host property, whilst the choice of materials, including the use of timber frames, would lead it to appear as a discrete addition, in keeping with local character. It would appear neither intrusive nor insensitive and it would allow for adequate habitable space without appearing disproportionate, or raising the roof ridge.

87 Constantine Road

2022/0330/P - Erection of second floor rear extension with roof terrace, installation of doors at rear first floor and doors and Juliet balcony at second floor level, erection of dormer to rear roofslope with photovoltaic cell panels above and installation of photovoltaic cell panels to front roofslope. (Refused 06/09/2023 and dismissed at appeal). Inspector stated:

The dormer would incorporate a double glazed screen and sliding door with aluminium frames, further signalling its presence. Additional glazing would be present at the rear Juliet balconies, which would also be incongruous features in the immediate setting in their own right. Even acknowledging the surrounding variety in fenestration and the light and ventilation that would be provided at the property, this combined level of glazing and use of contemporary materials would appear overtly modern, at odds with the largely traditional style of the both the property and the immediate surrounds.

These alterations would be to the rear, imperceptible from Constantine Road, and set back from the railway line and many views of it. However, even acknowledging the variation in rear elevations and the presence of sizeable adjoining basketball courts, for the reasons given the proposal would cause visual harm when experienced in the context of neighbouring dwellings, which have largely sympathetic rear alterations. While the proposal would only be viewed indirectly and in passing by railway users, it would be readily experienced from immediately surrounding dwellings, and the basketball court if it were to be used, where its incongruous nature would be evident.

The proposal would cause visual harm to the site and the contribution it makes to the surrounding character and appearance. As such, despite the lack of comments from the Mansfield Conservation Area Advisory Committee, I find it would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Its effect would be localised and would be ‘less than substantial’ harm. Nevertheless, the Framework makes it clear that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets. Paragraph 202 specifies that where development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against its public benefits. The proposal would incorporate elements to tackle climate change and result in additional residential floorspace. However, given the limited overall public benefits in these regards, this would not outweigh the harm identified.

95 Constantine Road

8502145 - Works of alteration including the formation a habitable room in the roofspace with front and rear dormers and a roof terrace at the rear as shown on drawing no. C.L. 15 130. **Grant Full or Outline Perm. with Condit. 18-02-1986**

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

The London Plan 2021

Camden Local Plan 2017

Policy D1 Design

Policy D2 Heritage

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

Policy DM1 (Delivery and monitoring)

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG)

CPG Home Improvements (January 2021)

CPG Amenity (January 2021)

CPG Design (January 2021)

Conservation Area Statements

Mansfield Conservation Area Appraisal and management strategy (CAAMS) (2008)

Assessment

1. PROPOSAL

1.1. The applicant seeks the following:

- Erection of a new front dormer measuring 2.0m in width, 1.8m in depth and 1.2m in height
- Erection of a new rear dormer measuring 4.8m in width, 4.1m in depth and 2.4m in height
- New front roof light

2. CONSIDERATIONS

2.1. The material considerations for this application are as follows:

- Design and Heritage
- Amenity

3. ASSESSMENT

Design and Heritage

3.1.1. The Local Plan policies D1 (Design) 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.

3.1.2. The supporting text for policy D1 (Design) states:

7.2 The Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider: • character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; • the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed; • the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development; • the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape; • the composition of elevations; its contribution to public realm and its impact on views and vistas; and • the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value

7.5 Design should respond creatively to its site and its context including the pattern of built form and urban grain, open spaces, gardens and streets in the surrounding area. Where townscape is particularly uniform attention should be paid to responding closely to the prevailing scale, form and proportions and materials.

3.1.3. In addition to the above, the Camden Home Improvement CPG contains the Council's guidance on dormer extensions and the following parts are considered to be particularly relevant:

- Dormers should be subordinate in size to the roof slope being extended;
- The position of the dormer would maintain even distances to the roof margins (ridge, eaves, side parapet walls);
- Consider whether the roof of your property is part of an unbroken roof line which is of heritage value - as set out in the Conservation Area Appraisal for your area;
- Consider whether there are other existing extensions in proximity, even if they are older or constructed under permitted development;
- On front roofslopes dormers could be a harmful addition due to its visual impact on the streetscene, especially in an unbroken roofscape. If your neighbouring properties do not have front dormers, then it is likely that this type of development would not be supported at application stage. Consider rear dormers and front rooflights instead;

Rear dormer

- 3.1.4. In terms of the proposed rear dormer, the scale is excessive in relation to the roof slope and covers almost all of the rear roof slope. This results in a very large dormer and one that is not subservient to the roof due to its excessive width (4.76m), its depth (4.11m) and its height (2.3m). The rear dormer should be sympathetic and subordinate to the existing roof slope however apart from a very small set in on the boundary with no.57, the dormer completely covers the roof slope resulting in an overbearing incongruous form.
- 3.1.5. There are examples of rear dormers along Constantine Road which are insensitive and overly large which do not benefit from planning permission including at no.77, no.139 and no. 105. However there are some rear dormers which are considered insensitive alterations as well as being completely against our current guidance which were approved before the current 2016 Local Plan was issued including at no.95, no.97, no.123 and no.133. All of these examples cannot be considered precedents considering their age and lack of permission. Our guidance on what would be accepted is clear which these, as well as the current proposal, would not ascribe to.
- 3.1.6. The two appeals which are listed above are also material considerations considering their location near the site. The appeal which was allowed (2015/6381/P) includes a dormer which is a 'modest addition' as described by the Inspector. The plans demonstrate that the dormer is set in from the sides, set up from the eaves and set down from the roof ridge meaning this is completely different and much smaller in scale from the design which is proposed. With the other appeal (2022/0330/P) which was decided within the Council's Local Plan and current policy guidance, the inspector cited the scale of the dormer as a reason to dismiss the appeal. The dormer within the current proposal is actually larger and covers more of the roof slope than this. Therefore this demonstrates the excessive nature of this element and why the application should be refused.
- 3.1.7. Whilst some form of rear dormer could be accepted, the proposed rear dormer is overly large in terms of scale and bulk, especially when this kind of development is specifically mentioned within Part 2 of the Mansfield CAAMS document which would harm the historic character of the Conservation area.

Front dormer

- 3.1.8. In relation to the front dormer, this again is far too excessive in terms of scale and bulk resulting in a dominant addition to the front, and most prominent elevation. The front dormer would project out from the ridge which increases their prominence within the roof form and from surrounding private and public vantage points. Due to the front dormer's width and the fact that the front window proportions are more squat, it doesn't follow the window hierarchy as you move up the building which creates an awkward relationship with the host property in a publically visible location. The roof light is considered acceptable. Whilst there are a couple of examples of front dormers on no. 57, 95 and 97 Constantine Road the character of the area mainly consists of unaltered front roof slopes which is especially prevalent along this part of Constantine Road. Therefore any roof

extension or dormer extension in this location would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation area.

- 3.1.9. It is clear from the submitted Design and Access Statement (DAS) that there is little evidence that the character of the Conservation area has informed the design and the proposal seems to use the example of what has been built at the neighbours at no.57. These works were approved in 1988 under ref 8804041 (see planning history section) and therefore this does not provide any justification for the proposed works or set a precedent for it. The same can be said for other similar development along the street, most notably on no.95 as listed above.
- 3.1.10. There is no objection to the materials used as they are similar to the roof and preserve the character of the conservation area.
- 3.1.11. Considerable importance and weight has been attached to the harm and special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance conservation area, under s. 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013.
- 3.1.12. Overall the proposal fails to comply with policy D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the 2017 Local Plan

Amenity

- 3.1.13. 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, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. This is supported by the CPG Amenity.
- 3.1.14. Due to the roof top nature of the works, the proposal would not result in an any additional or harmful impact in relation to outlook, loss of daylight , privacy or overlooking.
- 3.1.15. Therefore the proposal complies with policy A1 of the 2017 Camden Local Plan.

4. RECOMMENDATION

4.1. Refuse Planning Permission for the following reason:

The proposed front and rear dormers by virtue of the location, size, bulk and detailed design, would result in incongruous and bulky additions that would harm the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace of which it forms a part and the Mansfield Conservation Area contrary to policy D1 (Design) D2 (Heritage) of Camden's Local Plan 2017