

Date: ~~29 January 2014~~ ~~8 November 2013~~
Our Ref: 2013/5941/PRE
Contact: Elaine Quigley
Direct Line: 020 7974 5101
Email: Elaine.Quigley@camden.gov.uk

**Development Control
Planning Services**
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

Mr. Jonathan Ulinder
Flat 1, 1 Erskine road
London
NW3 3AJ

Tel 020 7974 4444
Fax 020 7974 1975
env.devcon@camden.gov.uk
www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Dear Mr Ulinder

**Re. Planning Pre-application advice meeting ref. 2013/5941/PRE
Flat 3rd Floor, 1 Erskine Road, London, NW3 3AJ**

Thank you for your recent enquiry regarding the above property. The proposal is for the erection of a mansard roof extension to the existing self-contained flat (Class C3). The enquiry was accompanied by the following drawings - site location plan; 1346/1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6 and an extract from the brochure relating to tapco slate (701 traditional stone black).

The response is given specifically in relation to the potential to provide a mansard roof to the building as suggested by the pre-application documentation submitted and includes the content of our discussion during various telephone calls. Should your pre-application scheme be altered this advice may become redundant; and this advice may no-longer be considered relevant if adopted planning policies at national, regional or local level are changed or amended; other factors such as case-law and subsequent planning permissions may also affect this advice.

The following advice is based on the drawings that you have submitted. The letter has been broken into sections for the ease of dealing with each of the planning considerations. The sections do overlap and need to be read collectively in order to provide a comprehensive response.

Planning policy

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that developments must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The document which makes up the development plan is Camden's Local Development Framework (LDF). There are a number of documents making up the LDF, but those primarily of concern in this instance are the Core Strategy (2011), and the Development Policies (2011). Other documents which are of relevance include the Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) (2011 and 2013).

Finally, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published in 2012, is an important consideration as well as the London Plan (2011).

Constraints

The site falls within Primrose Hill Conservation Area (sub area 3: Regent's Park Road North). It is identified within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (CAS) (adopted in 2000) as a building that makes a positive contribution to the

character and appearance of the conservation area as part of four terrace properties (nos. 1-4 consecutive). The building is not a listed building.

Planning History

Planning permission was **refused** on 27/04/2005 for the erection of a conservatory at roof level in connection with the use of the roof as a terrace (2005/0175/P).

Planning permission was **granted** on 11/07/2005 for alterations at roof level involving installation of railings behind front and rear parapets and creation of flat roof with openable skylight to form terrace (2005/1951/P).

Other relevant planning permissions

2 Erskine Road

Planning permission was **granted** for the erection of mansard roof extension in connection with the existing third floor flat (Class C3) (2012/6566/P). The scale, design and materials was considered to comply with CS14, DP24, DP25 and CPG1 (design) guidance.

Site and surroundings

The site is located on the southern side of Erskine Road and is directly east of the entrance to Erskine Mews. The road lies in between Ainger Road and Regents Park Road. The site contains a four storey mid terrace 19th Century property with an A1 shop and entrance to Erskine Mews at ground level and residential units above. The property is within the Primrose Hill conservation area.

Land use

Policies CS6 (Providing quality homes) and DP2 (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing) are of most relevance. The proposal would include the erection of a mansard roof over the roof of the building to create additional habitable accommodation for the third floor flat. The creation of additional residential floorspace is welcomed subject to the acceptability of the principle of a roof extension and the detailed design.

Design

The overarching aim of Policies CS5, CS14, and DP24 are to secure high quality design that safeguards the heritage of the Borough. CPG1 also provides detailed advice on acceptable forms of development. Reference to the NPPF is also required.

The common objective of these policies is to ensure that development is of the highest quality, that it respects local context and character and, within conservation areas, that it preserves or enhances their character and appearance. CPG1 (Design) is consistent with these policies and is an additional "material consideration" in planning decisions. It provides further detailed advice on design in Camden. In relation to alterations and extensions to existing buildings it states that they should respect and enhance the character and appearance of the property and its surroundings.

Principle of the mansard roof

Roof extensions are a key issue that are specifically referenced in the CAS. Paragraph PH18 of the CAS states that "*roof extensions and alterations, which change the shape and form of the roof, can have had a harmful impact on the Conservation Area and area 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 necessarily 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 and views from the parks*
- *The building is higher than many of its surrounding neighbours. Any further roof extensions are therefore likely to be unacceptably prominent”.*

PH19 of the CAS further advises that roof extension and alterations which change the shape and form of the roof are unlikely to be acceptable at all the buildings along Erskine Road.

Obviously there have been several permissions for mansard roof extensions to the buildings along this side of Erskine Road, including the most recent at no. 2 (see planning history above). Therefore the principle of extending the roof of the building with a mansard roof extension is established within this group of properties and is considered acceptable.

Design

Mansard roofs are a traditional means of terminating a building without adding a highly visible roof. This form is acceptable where it is the established roof form in a group of buildings. As discussed during our telephone conversations there are a number of mansard roof extensions at neighbouring properties along Erskine Road including the neighbouring property at no. 2, no. 3 and no. 4. The mansard would measure 2.3m in height above the top of the front parapet wall. Two windows would be installed in the front and a roof terrace would be created to the rear where the rear elevation of the mansard would terminate 1.6m from the back of the rear parapet wall. A full height glazed sliding door opening would be installed in the rear elevation of the mansard to allow access to the newly created roof terrace.

The design of the mansard roof should follow that of a true mansard rather than a flat topped mansard in line with CPG1 (Design) guidance (paragraphs 5.16 to 5.18 are of most relevance) for mansard roof extensions. It should follow the height, roof slope design, window position and the detailed design of the recently approved mansard roof extension at no. 2 Erskine Road. Therefore the height of the proposed mansard should be reduced from 2.3m to 1.9m to match that of no. 2 in order to ensure that the angle of the roof slope together with the position and heights of the windows at the front would match and create uniformity between the pair. The proposed height of the windows should be reduced as they appear too tall and would not follow the hierarchy of the window pattern within the building with the proportions of windows becoming smaller as you move up the floors of the building. This reduction in height would also reduce the visibility of the dormers from the street.

The design shown in the drawings appears to be indicative but includes dormer cheek surrounds that are very thick and heavy. These should be slim and elegant and should be revised to follow the window pattern and design of the lower floors of the building. The window design should also mirror the windows below (1 over 1 vertical sliding sash) and have matching glazing bar pattern.

In terms of the rear elevation, we would normally expect it to take a similarly traditional form, but having viewed existing roof level development along the terrace I do feel that in this case there may be scope for you to take more contemporary approach. That said, the rear elevation as proposed is not acceptable and would require further work, the proposed opening is considered to be too large, it will need to be reduced in scale and it is suggested that sub-division is introduced. In order for the development to be acceptable it will need to be designed to the highest standard. The proposed rear roof terrace is also considered to be acceptable in design terms given the presence of others along this group of buildings

Materials

Materials, such as slate that visually blend with existing materials are preferred for roof alterations and extensions. Given the historic character of the existing building it would be necessary to use traditional materials including traditional slate tiles. It has been proposed to use 'tapco' slate which is a man made produce that appears to be similar in its texture, and colour to slate roof tiles but has longer durability. Having discussed this with a conservation officer it is considered that synthetic roofing slates are not appropriate on this type of building and natural slate would be preferred to ensure that the slates maintain the integrity of the building and the surrounding properties.

In conclusion the principle of the mansard roof extension is considered acceptable however the design of the mansard needs to be further explored in order to ensure that the proposal would not be harmful to the appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the conservation area, and would comply with policies CS5, DP24 and DP25.

Amenity

Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight.

With regard to daylight and sunlight, in terms of the impact on no. 2, the proposed mansard should not rise above the approved parapet wall that has been granted at no. 2, that would separate these properties in order to ensure that it would not cause harm to the amenity enjoyed by these neighbours. The proposed roof terrace would not appear to have an adverse impact on the amenity of this property in terms of loss of privacy or overlooking. However this would be further explored if a planning application was submitted for these works.

There is an existing mansard roof extension on the roof of 89c Regents Park Road. The proposal would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of this property in terms of daylight, sunlight, overlooking or loss of privacy.

Planning application process and supporting information

Please ensure that you submit all the required information in accordance with the validation checklist, details of which can be obtained from the council's website:

<http://camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/making-an-application>.

In addition to the necessary forms, certificates, and drawings to fully illustrate what is proposed my view is that the following documents would be required in order for the submission to be a valid planning application:

- Design and access statement

Conclusion

The comments above are based on the information which has been submitted. Based on what has been provided I am of the opinion that the principle of an extension to the roof of the existing building would be considered acceptable subject to its revised detailed design.

This document represents the Council's initial view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage.

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact **Elaine Quigley** on **020 7974 5101**

Yours sincerely

Elaine Quigley