

<b>74Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		20/09/2013	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		19/09/2013	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Gideon Whittingham				2013/4601/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
74 Malden Road London NW5 4DA				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>							
Erection of a third floor mansard roof extension with front glazing and rear rooflights with associated parapet alterations (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	17	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		A site notice was displayed from 23/08/2013 and a public notice was published in the Ham & High from 29/08/2013.  To date no representations have been received.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>		N/A					

## Site Description

The application site is a three storey (plus basement) terrace house (Class C3) located on the north-east side of Malden Road between the junctions of Rhyl Street and Queens Crescent.

The property is not listed but is located within the West Kentish Town Conservation Area.

The distinct quality of the West Kentish Town Conservation Area is due to the relatively short period of development (1840s to the 1870s) with terraces of well detailed houses, which remain largely unaltered. For this reason most of the buildings in the conservation area make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the general presumption is therefore that these buildings should be retained. Nos.2-22, 26-38, 42-58 and 60-108 (even) Malden Road are designated as buildings which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area

## Relevant History

### 94 Malden Road:

(8500747) – Granted planning permission 20/11/1985 - The erection of a roof extension at third floor level

### 86 Malden Road:

(CTP/G10/4/C/18536) - Granted planning permission 22/08/1974 - Change of use to ten self-contained units, including works of conversion, and the erection of roof and rear extensions.

### 74 Malden Road:

N/A

### 68 Malden Road:

(2012/5890/P) - Granted planning permission subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement - Subdivision of existing vacant dwellinghouse (Class C3) into 2 x 1 bedroom flats and 2 x 2 bedroom flats and associated alterations comprising extensions to the roof, rear lower ground, ground and first floor levels and covered bicycle and waste storage area in front lightwell

This decision is addressed in Section 4.0 of this report. The conclusions reached are material to assessment of this application

## Relevant policies

### **National and Regional Policy**

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2011

### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS6 (Providing quality homes)

CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

DP2 (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing)

DP16 (The transport implications of development)

DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

### **Camden Planning Guidance 2011/2013:**

CPG1 Design – Section 5

West Kentish Town conservation area statement (2005) – Pages 8-11, 15, Appendix 2 (page 8, 11 and 20)

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal:

1.1 The application proposes:

- The erection of a roof extension, comprising 2 dormer windows to the rear pitch and 2 rooflights to the front pitch. The rear mansard pitch would be recessed 0.5m to retain the brick valley formation.

1.2 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Design
- Adjacent residential amenity

### 2. Design

2.1 Malden Road is a busy traffic route with a mixture of commercial and residential properties. Only the east side of Malden Road retains its historic buildings (Nos.2-108), the west side being composed of a number of modern buildings, mainly large 20th century apartment blocks which lie outside the conservation area.

2.2 The property is sited in the southern section of the terrace (Nos.64-106), one of 22 buildings constituting a long terrace of similar houses, each three storeys plus basement and two windows wide. Stucco architraves and parapets can be found and unusually, each party wall is defined by a slight rise in the parapet line.

2.3 At main roof level, the terrace is characterised with shallow valley roofs, set behind a front a rear parapet. Extensions have taken place at Nos. 94 (8500747), 86 (CTP/G10/4/C/18536) and 68 (2012/5890/P).

2.4 In assessment of No.68, the Officer's Delegated report states:

“At roof level, the existing valley roof would be removed and a new part flat, part sloped roof form with a terrace (measuring 3.5sqm in area) would be erected behind the existing roof parapets. The purpose of this alteration is to create sufficient headroom in what is the existing loft, to accommodate living space for a split level, 2 bed flat over the second and third floors. Adopted planning guidance CPG1 (Design) resists roof level alterations where there is unbroken run of valley roofs (para 5.8) and this is the case in this terrace row. However, the proposals have been designed to slope down behind the existing front parapet so as to be imperceptible from the street. To the rear, the existing parapet would be raised 0.55m (to match the height of that at no. 70 Malden Road) hiding any view of the roof level alterations from the rear. As the proposed roof form would not be visible from the street or in private views from the rear, they are considered to have a negligible impact on the appearance of the building and would preserve the character of the CA. This is considered acceptable.”

2.5 With particular regard to roof extensions, the West Kentish Town conservation area statement considers some alterations to have a harmful impact on the conservation area. Because of the varied design of roofs in the conservation area it will be necessary to assess proposals on an individual basis with regard to the design of the building, the nature of the roof type, the adjoining properties and the streetscape.

Roof extensions are unlikely to be acceptable where:

- It would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building.
- The property forms a 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

2.6 In consideration of CPG 1 (design), a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances where there is likely to be an adverse affect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding streetscene:

- There is an unbroken run of valley roofs;
- Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a coordinated design;
- Buildings whose roof construction or form are unsuitable for roof additions such as shallow pitched roofs with eaves;
- Buildings are part of a group where differing heights add visual interest and where a roof extension would detract from this variety of form;
- Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.

2.7 The proposed mansard roof extension would sit within a group that has an established roof form – one which terminates consistently at parapet level. Whilst it is acknowledged 2 properties (Nos.86 and 94) in the terrace have roof extensions which rise above the parapet, these additions were permitted in 1974 and 1985 respectively, prior to the adoption of the West Kentish Town conservation area statement, Camden Planning Guidance and LDF Policies. No.68 was permitted in accordance with the West Kentish Town conservation area statement, Camden Planning Guidance and LDF Policies, terminating at parapet height so the roof form would not be visible from the street or in private views from the rear.

2.8 It is considered that the addition of an extension at 3<sup>rd</sup> floor level, projecting above the rear parapet would unacceptably detract from the architectural quality of the host building and terrace. The proposal would introduce an additional floor in the middle of a terrace which would be higher than the buildings on either side. In consequence, the contribution they make to the Conservation Area would be unacceptably diminished

2.9 The harm to the character and integrity of the building is in conflict with Policies CS14 and DP24 and criteria within CPG1. It is acknowledged that the rear alterations would not be seen from the street in the adjacent roads. However, none of the relevant policies suggest that alterations which would result in the adverse effects described above should necessarily be approved because of the absence of such viewpoints. Furthermore, they would be subject to clear and direct views from the rears of properties in Bassett Street, as well as Rhyl Street.

2.10 In this case the absence of street level views does not prevent the rear of the terrace being part of the fabric of the Conservation Area. It is therefore concluded that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be preserved. This adverse impact is contrary to LDF Policies CS14, DP24 and DP25, which requires development to preserve and to take opportunities to enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

2.11 The proposal, in form and terminating height is unacceptable in this location and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the West Kentish Town Conservation Area. As a result the principle of a mansard roof extension of this form is contrary to the criteria set out in CPG1 and fails to meet LDF policies CS14, DP24 and DP25.

2.12 The applicant argues that the proposal would improve the quality of the existing residential

accommodation in respect of matters such as light levels, amenity space and internal space. However, this would be at the undue expense of the quality of the Conservation Area which in this instance is giving greater material weight.

### **3.Adjacent residential amenity**

3.1 Given the location of the mansard extension and proximity to residential buildings, the proposal would not harm the amenities of adjoining occupiers, in terms of access to sunlight, daylight, visual bulk or sense of enclosure.

#### **Recommendation:**

Refuse Planning permission on grounds of inappropriate bulk and form.