

# Delegated Report

Analysis sheet  
Attached

Expiry Date: 17/11/00  
Cons. Expire: 20/10/00

**Officer**

Alice Leach

**Application Number**

PEX0000552

**Application Address**

167A York Way, N7.

**Drawing Numbers**

999/101/02, 03, 04 and 05,

**PO 3/4**

**Area Team Signature**

**C&UD**

**Authorised Officer Signature**

JRL

*[Signature]*

**Proposal**

The erection of a roof extension for financial and professional services use (A2).

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN  
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS

14 NOV 2000

RECOMMENDATION AGREED  
ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL

**Recommendation**

**Refuse**

**Code RP**

**Reasons for refusal**

The proposed roof extension would be overly dominant and would disrupt the largely unaltered rooflines in the terrace to the detriment of appearance of the property. The detailed design of the proposed roof extension does not complement the architecture of the existing property and is contrary to SPG. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy EN57 of the Camden UDP Adopted March 2000.

*EN16(new) and*

**Consultations**

Adjoining Occupiers No. notified 4 No. of responses 0 No. of objections 0

**CAAC/Local groups comments**

**Summary of consultation response**

### Site Description

Terraced property in use as financial and professional services office. An access road to Camden Mews runs underneath the property. The property is not within a Conservation Area.

### Relevant History

Roof extension at 169 York Way approved 1982.

### Relevant policies

UDP: EN57 *EN16 (new)*

Others:

### Assessment

Although the neighbouring property at number 169 has a roof extension, the remainder of the terrace including those immediately adjacent to 171A (excluding 169) remain unaltered at roof level. The proposed roof extension to the property would be highly visible from Camden Mews to the rear. Given the context of a relatively unaltered roofline in this terrace, and the prominence of the proposed extension, it is considered that the proposal is unacceptable in principle as it is contrary to policy EN57 of the UDP.

*^ & EN16 (new)*

The proposed extension is not set back behind the parapet to the rear. This would be contrary to supplementary planning guidance. The proposal is therefore also considered unacceptable in terms of its detailing.