

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		20/06/2013	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		06/06/2013	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Gideon Whittingham				2013/1496/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
124 Fleet Road London NW3 2QX				Refer to Decision Notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a roof extension with roof terrace in connection with 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	73	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>A site notice was displayed from 10/05/2013 and a public notice was published in the Ham & High from 16/05/2013.</p> <p>An objection to the proposal was raised relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of privacy 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		The Mansfield CAAC were formally consulted. No response has been received to date.					

Site Description

The application site comprises a three-storey terraced property located on the north side of Fleet Road. The application property has been divided into a number of self contained flats. This application relates to the top floor flat. The character of the immediate area is predominantly residential in nature, save for the Royal Free Hospital to the south.

Whilst not listed, the building is located within the Mansfield Conservation Area.

Relevant History

124 Fleet Road:

PE9900742 – PP Refused (09/11/1999) Erection of a single storey extension at rear third floor level as extension to the existing second floor flat.

Reason for refusal 1:

The proposed extension by reason of its size and location would result in a loss of sunlight/daylight for existing residential occupiers of this and the adjoining property in Fleet Road to the detriment of their amenity, and is therefore contrary to policy EN27 of the Councils emerging Unitary Development Plan.

Reason for refusal 2:

The proposed extension by reason of its size, location and detailed design would not relate to the form, proportions and character of the building and its setting and would not have regard to the historic pattern of development in the surrounding area. The extension would not be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale, situation or use of materials and would dominate neighbouring buildings, and would therefore be contrary to policies EN52 and EN57 of the Councils emerging Unitary Development Plan. The proposal would also fail to enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area contrary to policy EN33 of the same plan.

116 Fleet Road:

9005161 – PP Granted (04/07/1990) Change of use and works of conversion including a rear extension and the formation of a roof terrace to provide three self-contained one bedroom flats

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)
CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)
DP24 (Securing high quality design)
DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)
DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance 2011 –

CPG1 Design: Paragraphs – 5.6 through to 5.19; CPG6 Amenity

Mansfield conservation area appraisal and management strategy (2008)

Assessment

1. Proposal:

1.1 The application proposes:

- The erection of an additional storey located at third floor level (main roof level), for the provision of 31 sqm of additional residential accommodation. The proposed extension, set 1.6m from the front façade would rise 2.7m in height (internal floor to ceiling height of 2.4m), 5m in width and 6.6m in depth. The extension would be of timber construction, with timber windows to the front elevation and timber doors to the rear elevation, whilst the roof would be covered by solar panels

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

- Design
- Amenity

2. Assessment

2.1 North of the Royal Free Hospital, on the north side of Fleet Road, Nos.90-130 (even) comprises a uniform three storey terrace, constructed of grey brick with full height projecting square bay windows containing pairs of sliding sashes. At the east end of the terrace, Nos.90-106 comprises some rebuilt frontages of a differing design, incorporating commercial elements at ground floor level. At the north end, the terraced adjoins a modern built residential development providing access to Tranley and Byron Mews at the rear.

2.2 At main roof level, the terrace (Nos. 108-130) is characterised by a decorative brickwork parapet and small pediments over the bay windows, masking valley roofslopes behind which forms a characteristic feature of this rear elevation. The terrace of buildings is largely unimpaired by extensions or alterations other than rooflights, save for No.116, permitted prior to the designation of the Mansfield Conservation Area (1990), the adoption of the Mansfield conservation area appraisal and management strategy (2008), the Council's LDF Policies (2010) and CPGs (2011).

2.3 Within this context, the pattern of the existing roofscape along the north side of Fleet Road, particularly Nos. 108-130, has not been so strongly influenced by No.116 to have become established as the dominant roof form, particularly amongst Nos. 108-130.

2.4 With regard to LDF policy approach, respecting the local character is an intrinsic aim. In particular DP24 & DP25, require careful consideration of the characteristics of a site, features of local distinctiveness, and the wider context to be demonstrated in order to achieve high quality development which integrates into its surroundings. Within areas of distinctive character, it is considered development should reinforce those elements which create the character.

2.5 The Mansfield conservation area retains its clearly visible historic rooflines, which it is important to preserve. Fundamental changes to the roofline, insensitive alterations, poor materials, intrusive dormers or inappropriate windows can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will be resisted. In consideration of guidance forming part of the Mansfield conservation area appraisal and management strategy (2008), roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable where a building forms part of a complete terrace or group of buildings which have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions.

2.6 In consideration of CPG 1 (design), roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances:

- 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 co-ordinated design;

2.7 Within the preceding context, the roof extension, by virtue of its location within a group which remains largely unimpaired and position of over prominence, being the subject of clear and direct views (both public and private) from Fleet Road and Tranley Mews and Byron Mews at the rear, would be contrary to policy.

2.8 Furthermore, whilst considered unacceptable in principle, the detailed design and form of the proposed roof extension is also considered inappropriate. The extent of glazing to the front and rear elevations, along with the flank elevations (party walls) and raised chimney would result in a bulky and top-heavy roof profile, removing the interesting characteristic roofscape feature shared with the remaining properties in this terrace. The overall extension thus does not comply with general design advice in the CAS nor CPG.

3. Neighbour amenity

3.1 Given the location of the roof extension (including proposed terrace) and its distance from the surrounding properties, namely Tranley Mews and Byron Mews at the rear, the proposal would not exert a materially harmful impact on the amenities of adjoining occupiers, in terms of access to sunlight, daylight, visual bulk, sense of enclosure or privacy.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission