

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		05/11/2013	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		09/10/2013	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Sally Shepherd				2013/5739/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
98 Queens Crescent London NW5 4DY				Refer to Decision Notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a mansard roof extension to residential flat (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	31	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	01
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		A site notice was displayed from 18/09/2013 to 09/10/2013 One objection was received which is summarised below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drawings do not show building correctly from rear • The same planning application was refused in 2011 (2010/6521/P). 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		N/A					

Site Description

The property is within a parade of seven properties on Queen's Crescent, within the Queen's Crescent Neighbourhood Centre. It is not within a conservation area and is not a listed building. The property has an unaltered valley roof to the rear and a parapet wall on the front elevation.

The upper floors of the property are in residential use as two flats and there is a restaurant at ground floor level.

Relevant History

98 Queens Crescent

2009/5301/P - Installation of a new entrance door to the front elevation at ground floor level of existing shop (Class A3); change of use and works of conversion at first and second floor levels from a self-contained maisonette (Class C3) into two self-contained flats (2 x 1 bed units)' (*Granted: 27/04/2010*). (The applicant had proposed a front and rear mansard roof extension as part of the planning application. Following advice from the officer, at the time, that the roof extension would be unacceptable in principle this element of the proposal was removed from the application)

2010/6521/P - Erection of a 3rd floor roof extension with front roof terrace to provide additional accommodation for the second floor flat (Class C3) (*Refused: 11/03/2011*)

94 Queens Crescent

2012/5567/P - Roof extension consisting of mansard roof to form additional 1x bedroom flat (*Dismissed at appeal: 13/12/2012*).

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework

The London Plan

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

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

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG 1 (Design) 2013

CPG 6 (Amenity) 2011

Assessment

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a mansard roof extension to the existing flat at second floor level to provide additional residential accommodation in the form of two bedrooms. Two windows are proposed to the front and two to the rear. The mansard will project above the parapet by 1.18m and will have an asphalt roof.

Assessment

The main planning considerations are the impact of the proposal on the application site, the impact of the proposal on the terrace and on the wider streetscene.

Planning history

An application for a mansard roof extension at the application site (no. 98) was refused in 2011 (Ref.

2010/6521/P). The previous proposal differed from the current proposal as it proposed a flat roof which projected above the front parapet at a right angle. The extension also included a rear roof terrace. The application was refused due to the design, size and location of the roof extension on a terrace of properties with an unimpaired roofline as it was contrary to policies CS14 and DP24 of the London Borough of Camden LDF.

An application for a mansard roof extension was refused and dismissed at appeal at no. 94 Queen's Crescent which lies within the same terrace of properties. The application was dismissed at appeal for the following reasons: the scheme would disrupt the continuity of the terrace's roof form and design; it would be an incongruous addition to the roof of the property and would not be sensitive to the character of the host building; the roof extension's prominence in the street scene would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area; an acceptable level of accommodation for the intended future occupiers would therefore not be provided.

Impact of the proposal on the host property and streetscene

Since the previous refusal in 2011, Camden Planning Guidance has been updated and the LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010 are still in place. Camden's Design Planning Guidance (2011) maintains that a roof extension is likely to be unacceptable where there is an unbroken run of valley roofs and/or where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions.

The application site forms part of a terrace of 7 properties, each with three storeys. The terrace comprises a run of unaltered valley roofs with all parapet walls to the front intact and valley roof profile at the rear. The proposal is considered to be unacceptable as the proposed roof extension would disrupt the unimpaired roofline and would be visible from long and short views from the street as well as the cul-de-sac opposite. Although it is acknowledged that there are only restricted and oblique public views of the rear valley roofs along the terrace as seen from Weedington Road, this does not diminish the importance of retaining this feature in a well preserved terrace such as this.

The property is not listed or located within a conservation area; however, it is located within a terrace of buildings which have a roof line that is largely unimpaired. The addition of the proposed roof extension is considered to fundamentally alter the roof form which would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the building, the wider terrace and the streetscene and would set an unwelcomed precedent.

Camden Planning Guidance (Design) provides specific guidance on the design of mansard roof extensions. The lower slope of a mansard extension should be between 60°-70°. The proposed mansard has a lower slope with a 75° angle and therefore does not comply with the guidance. It is noted that the mansard is set back behind the front parapet wall by 50cm, however the proposed extension would still be a prominent addition in the streetscene.

Roof alterations and extensions in the vicinity are mentioned by the applicant as precedents for roof extensions. However these precedents are not relevant considerations as the terrace that the application site lies within is unaltered.

Amenity

The proposed roof extension would not have any impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers with regards to loss of sunlight, daylight or overlooking.

Recommendation

Refuse Planning Permission