

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date: 18/12/2024	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date: 24/11/2024	
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Matthew Kitchener			2024/4627/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
69 Belsize Lane London NW3 5AU			See decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of a mansard roof extension to create a second floor to the existing dwellinghouse.					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission			
Application Type:		Householder Planning Permission			
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
Informatives:					
Consultations					
		No. of responses	06	No. of objections	01
Neighbour Consultation		<p>Site Notice: posted 30/10/2024, expired 23/11/2024 Press Notice: published 31/10/2024, expired 24/11/2024</p> <p><i>Six responses were received from neighbours.</i></p> <p><i>One objection was received from a neighbouring occupier commenting that the proposal would result in an extremely asymmetrical appearance. The result will not be in keeping with either 67 or 69A Belsize Lane. Rather than 'adding interest' there will be complexity replacing a clean, modern design. The proposed materials are not in keeping with existing ones.</i></p> <p><i>Five responses were received either not objecting or supporting the proposal commenting that the proposal is carefully planned and in keeping with the area.</i></p> <p><i>Belsize CAAC commented on the scheme: The Design and Access Statement states that "The extended property remains a 4/5 bedroom single family dwelling." It is actually changing from a 3 bedroom single family dwelling to a 5 bedroom single family dwelling. The views from 33 Belsize Park will be of a mansard with windows rather than a sloping roof. This</i></p>			

stretch of the terrace is two storey except for nos. 63A and 63B. The proposed raised roof will be very visible from the south-west, like an end of terrace. It looks visually heavy, a better treatment could be to have full width glazing like nos. 63A and 63B which look subservient and lighter. The windows should be timber to match the existing.

The Belsize Society object due to the proposal as it introduces a dark, heavy and overbearing element into the building line, detracting from the buildings either side, in particular the elegant pedimented elevation next door of the former Victorian coach house (no. 67) which contributes positively to the conservation area. It destroys the clean and careful 'light-touch' design of the existing front elevation and this is especially unfortunate as this building is semi-detached and would ruin the pairing. The existing elegant roof pitch is especially visible along a large stretch of the south-west of Belsize Lane and is designed in relationship to the similar pitch of its partner building (69a) with its pleasingly calculated slightly lower step-back and 'step-down' to the lower detached property at no. 71. Most of the buildings along this side of the road have a similar height and simple straight upper elevation building-line and even from the long north-east view, this scheme would introduce a jarring note. If permitted it would create a precedent for further harmful development along this strip. This scheme does nothing to enhance or preserve the conservation area, rather it creates a very negative effect.

Site Description

The subject site is a 1980's mid-terrace brick built mews-style dwelling located on the eastern side of Belsize Lane. The property is a two storey dwelling which forms part of a terrace of properties. The immediately adjoining properties have identical roof heights. The property has a shallow dual pitch roof located behind a raised parapet at the front which matches its neighbour at 69a.

The property is not listed but is located within the Belsize Conservation Area. The building is considered to make a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Relevant History

None relevant on 69 Belsize Lane.

2004/3751/P – 63A & 63B Belsize Lane, The erection of a 3-storey side extension and single storey rear extension to no. 63A, and erection of roof extension for additional storey to both nos. 63A and 63B, plus associated external elevational alteration – **Approved 03/11/2024**. This application was supported due to the proposal involving the extension to the pair of properties and therefore the character of the pair of properties being retained by the resultant shared appearance.

Relevant Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

The London Plan 2021

Camden Local Plan 2017

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

Policy D1 Design

Policy D2 Heritage

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG)

CPG Design (January 2021) – Section 3. Heritage

Belsize Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2003)
Policy BE26 Roof extensions

Assessment

1. Proposal

- 1.1. It is proposed to replace the existing roof and construct a mansard roof extension. The ridge of the new roof would be raised in height by 600mm when compared to the existing and would change its profile from a shallow dual pitch to a flat roof with a large projecting eaves to the Belsize Road frontage with a recessed upper front wall behind the existing parapet and a sloping mansard roof form at the rear. Two new windows would be installed in both the front and rear elevations of the new mansard. The mansard roof would be slate hung with aluminium windows and a grey single membrane flat roofing membrane.

2. Planning Considerations

- 2.1. The material considerations in the determination of this application are as follows:
- Design and Heritage
 - Amenity

3. Design and Heritage

- 3.1. The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy D1 states that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and to respect the character, setting, form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the character and proportions of the existing building. Policy D2 states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves or, where possible, enhances' its established character and appearance.
- 3.2. Camden's Local Plan is supported by CPG Home Improvements, specifically Sections 2.2 (Roof Extensions) which says that a successful roof extension would consider the overall roof form of the existing building, adjoining buildings, and be proportionate to the roof slope being extended.
- 3.3. The Belsize Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy states that Roof extensions and alterations, which change the shape and form of the roof, can have a harmful impact on the Conservation Area and are unlikely to be acceptable where:
- It would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building
 - The property forms part of a group or terrace which remains largely, but not completely unimpaired
 - The property forms part of a symmetrical composition, the balance of which would be upset
 - The roof is prominent, particularly in long views
- 3.4. The ridge line between 67 & 69a (inclusive) is uniform in height with the properties having dual pitched roofs. No. 67 also has a dual pitch gable feature on the front elevation but the ridge height across the properties remains the same. The eaves of the properties within this part of the terrace step down from no. 67 to nos. 69 and 69a. The properties in this section of Belsize Lane are all two storey in height. When viewed from the street the roofs are mainly hidden and are hidden from views looking north by the parapet wall on no. 69a. The general consistency and pattern of the roofs of these buildings contribute to the cohesive architectural significance of this part of the conservation area. The raising of the roof at 69 in order to install a mansard roof extension would therefore result in an alteration to the uniform ridge height and dual pitch

roof form of this part of Belsize Lane. As well as forming part of a terrace, 69 is in a pair with 69a and the result of this proposal would be an unbalancing in terms of the height of the properties to the detriment of their character and appearance within the street. Most of the buildings along the eastern side of the road are similar in height and simple straight upper elevation building-line and even from the long north-east view, this scheme would introduce a jarring note that would be considered harmful to the character of the conservation and would erode the significance of it. The host property would therefore appear out of place within this terrace of properties due to the alteration to the height, as well as the profile of the roof. Due to the set-back nature of part of no. 69a the views of the main parapet wall at roof level is evident when viewed from the street looking north. The proposal would project above the height of the parapet wall at no. 69a resulting in a dominant and incongruous roof form which would harm the visual appearance when viewed from the street. This harm would be considered less than substantial harm.

- 3.5. The design of the roof extension is not considered to compliment the design and detail of the existing property, the windows aren't recessive in size so don't follow the window hierarchy of windows getting smaller as you move up the building and they appear overly tall within the roof. Furthermore the white fascia surround of the mansard emphasises the front façade of the mansard and adds to its prominence. The horizontal slates are also quite deep which, when viewed in the context of the neighbouring properties roofs, emphasises the prominence of the mansard when viewed from the street. This would be considered visually harmful when viewed from the street and would be detrimental to the appearance of this part of the street and the surrounding conservation area.
- 3.6. The proposed mansard roof extension represents an incongruous alteration to the uniform ridge height of this part of the terrace between 67 & 69a. The detailed design is unsympathetic to the host building and adds to the prominence of the mansard roof form when viewed with the surrounding properties within this part of the terrace. The development is considered visually intrusive and out of character, form and design to the host and neighbouring buildings at 67 & 69a Belsize Lane. The roof extension is considered to cause detriment to the character and appearance of the host building, terrace of properties of which it forms a part and the Belsize Conservation Area.
- 3.7. The NPPF states that where less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset (i.e. the conservation area) is identified, this should be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal including, where appropriate securing its optimum viable use. The harm is considered to be less than substantial and there are no public benefits that outweigh this harm. As the extension to a private home, the benefits of the scheme are largely private and any public benefit associated with the proposals would not be capable of outweighing the harm to the conservation area.
- 3.8. Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013.
- 3.9. As such, the proposal would serve to harm the character and appearance of the host building, the terrace of properties of which it forms a part and the Belsize Conservation Area, thus not in compliance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

4. Amenity

- 4.1. Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development), supported by Camden Planning Guidance (Amenity), seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered and by only granting permission for development that would not harm the amenity of communities, occupiers, and neighbouring residents.

4.2. Given its location directly on top of the existing dwelling, and the separation distance between the windows in the properties to the front and rear, it is not considered that the development would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light, overlooking or outlook, or through an increase in noise. Overall, the development is considered to adhere to Policy A1.

5. Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

5.1. Based on the information available this proposal would not require the approval of a BNG Plan before development is begun because the planning permission is a householder application within exemption threshold.

6. Conclusion

5.1 In conclusion, the proposed mansard roof extension by virtue of its height, bulk and detailed design would compromise the form, character and appearance of the host building, the terrace of which it forms a part and this part of the Belsize Conservation Area contrary to the requirements of policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

7. Recommendation

7.1. Refuse planning permission.