

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	28/12/2012
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	13/12/2012
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number</b>		
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin			2012/5800/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
59 and 61 Kingstown Street London NW1 8JP			Refer to draft decision notice		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal</b>					
Erection of mansard roof extensions and raising the side walls to provide additional residential floorspace to 2 x single-family dwellinghouses (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation:</b>		Refuse planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>08</b>	No. of responses	<b>02</b>	No. of objections	<b>02</b>
			No. electronic	<b>01</b>		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 14/11/2012 to 05/12/2012. A press notice advertised on 22/11/2012 and expired on 13/12/2012.</p> <p>The occupiers of 68 Regent's Park Road and Rosenfelder Associates on behalf of the occupiers of 70 Regent's Park Road objected to the proposal. In summary, their concerns are:</p> <p>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This pair of houses represents 1960s architectural style and the proposed roof extension would compromise the existing design which is typical of its period.</li> <li>The proposed roof extension would be out of keeping with the proportions of all the houses in this end of Kingstown Street and would set an undesirable precedent for others.</li> <li>The proposed increase in height will adversely impact the streetscape and the wider conservation area.</li> <li>The proposed uPVC windows would be inappropriate to the conservation area.</li> </ul> <p>Amenity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed windows on the rear elevation of the mansard roof would significantly increase the overlooking to the back gardens of and rear of 68 Regent's Park Road and 70 Regent's Park Road within 12.6m -13m.</li> <li>There would be loss of outlook and daylight to the neighbouring properties.</li> <li>No Daylight/Sunlight Assessment submitted with this application.</li> </ul>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>Primrose Hill CAAC strongly objected to the proposal. In summary, the grounds of their objection are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Kingstown Street houses are characterised by their low height (essentially 2 story mews houses). The proposed roof extension would exacerbate the massing of the existing houses.</li> <li>The proposed roof extension including the crude raising of the flank walls would be obtrusive and harmful form of development to the appearance and character of the conservation area.</li> <li>They refer to the appeal decision for 34 Kingstown Street (refs: APP/X5210/A/09/2104256 and APP/X5210/A/09/2104294) and drew attention to the importance of the character of Kingstown Street as a collection of small unpretentious buildings which merge into a well-integrated whole.</li> </ul>					
<b>Site Description</b>						

The application site relates to a pair of 1960s two storey semi-detached dwellings on the corner of Kingstown Street and Fitzroy Road in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. The application properties make a neutral contribution to the appearance and character of the conservation area. Each of the dwellings is in use as single family dwellings.

The application properties have Article 4 directions which remove some of their permitted development rights (including extensions, alterations and alterations to boundaries next to highway and constructing a hard standing).

### **Relevant History**

#### **34 Kingstown Street:**

**2008/3674/P** – Planning permission was refused on 25/03/2009 for the erection of a new single dwellinghouse on basement, lower ground, ground and first floors. Reasons for refusal:

*The proposed new building would, by virtue of the volume of additional accommodation below ground level, represent an overdevelopment of the site.*

**2008/3827/C** – Conservation Area consent was refused on 25/03/2009 for the demolition of the existing 2-storey dwellinghouse. Reasons for refusal:

*“The demolition of this building in the absence of an approved scheme for its replacement would be likely to result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area.”*

An appeal was logged in on 20/05/2009 for refusal of the both of the applications above and dismissed on 12/10/2009 (refs: APP/X5210/A/09/2104256 and APP/X5210/A/09/2104294). The inspectorate made the following comment in terms of character of that part of the conservation area.

*“The Council’s Conservation Area Statement describes Albert Terrace Mews, Kingstown Street and Regal Lane as a contrast to the wide roads and villa style properties that dominate this sub-area. These narrow mews road originally provided servicing to the rear gardens of the villas..... these small mews buildings are generally located directly abutting or close to the highway. This seems to me to be the essence of the street: narrow; small; a function of servicing with the implied subservient or ancillary nature of the character here.”*

### **Relevant policies**

#### **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

DP25 Conserving Camden’s heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

##### **Camden Planning Guidance (2011)**

CGP1 – Design (Section 5)

CPG 6 - Amenity (Section 6 and Section 7)

##### **Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (2000)**

Pages: 9-12; 28-29; and 31-32.

## Assessment

### Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of mansard roof extensions including raising the side walls to the pair of the semi-detached dwellings to provide additional floor areas of 37sqm to each of the dwellings. The proposed mansard roof extensions would be almost immediately adjacent to the rear and front parapet walls and would have two front dormer windows and two rear dormers each. The proposed mansard roof extensions would be tiled with slate and the proposed dormer windows would be upvc.

The side walls of the each property would be raised by approximately 2.5m with matching brickwork to the existing.

### Design and Appearance

Policy DP24 states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to be of the highest standard of design and respect character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties and character and proportions of the existing building. Policy DP25 seeks to preserve and enhance important elements of local character in order to maintain the character of the conservation areas.

The Conservation Area Statement states that new development should be seen as an opportunity to enhance the Conservation Area. All development should respect existing features such as building lines, roof lines, elevational design, and where appropriate, architectural characteristics, detailing, profile, and materials of adjoining buildings. (see page 29). According to the Conservation Area Statement roof extension to the application properties are considered to be unacceptable in principle for the following reasons:

- It would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building;
- The roof is prominent, particularly in long views and views from the parks; and
- The building is higher than many of its surrounding neighbours.

CPG1 sets similar criteria to the above to establish the acceptability of roof additions in principle (see pages 33-34). CPG1 also considers mansard roof extensions to be the most appropriate form of extension for a Georgian and Victorian dwelling if it is established that a roof extension is acceptable in principle (see page 37).

Kingstown Street is a narrow road which is characterised by two storey low-rise mews buildings and is within the sub area one. Italianate villas dominate the principle and secondary roads within this sub area. The application site is located at a prominent corner and highly visible from the street views along Fitzroy Road and Kingstown Street. The rear of the application site joins to the rear gardens of 3-4 storey Italianate villa style property on Regent's Park Road.

Although there are other 1960s block of flats on Fitzroy Road on the opposite side of the application properties they do not give justification for roof additions like the proposed ones because their site context in terms of historic form is different from the application sites. The application properties are 1960s style modern buildings and together with the rest of the mews building on Kingstown Street were built as a back land development in the rear garden of the major villas in Regent's Park Road. The application properties reflect the typical low raise style of properties on Kingstown Street and have a particular modern architectural composition which does not allow a scope for a subservient roof addition.

The proposed mansard roof extensions would have a traditional style and would not integrate well to the modern style of the existing buildings. In addition to that, the additional height resulting from the proposed mansard roof extensions would significantly alter the modest scale of the existing buildings and increase their dominance on the street scenes harming the appearance and character of that part of the conservation area. It is important to retain the low-raise appearance of the buildings on Kingstown in order to protect the dominance of the villa style properties on Regent's Park Road and maintain the low raise back land development pattern of Kingstown Street.

Consequently, the proposed mansard roof extensions by reason of their prominent location, bulk, size, height and detailed design would be detrimental to the appearance and character of the existing buildings and the wider conservation area.

### **Amenity**

Policy DP26 aims to protect the quality of life of neighbours that might be affected by developments. The proposal would most affect 70 Regent's Park Road and 57 Fitzroy Road in terms of daylight, outlook or privacy to these properties.

There is existing overlooking from the rear windows of the application properties within 12.6m. The separation distance between the proposed rear dormer windows and the rear habitable windows of 70 Regent's Park Road would be 13.3m. Although the separation distance is below the Council's guidance (18m) to prevent privacy the proposal would not be significantly worsen the existing overlooking and therefore that aspect of the proposal would not warrant a reason for refusal.

The existing buildings at the application sites already intercepts a 25 degree line drawn from the centre of the lower ground floor windows at no. 70 Regent's Park Road. The windows on the rear elevation at lower ground floor level serve a bedroom and a bathroom. It is considered that proposed roof extension would not perceptibly worsen the existing situation in terms of daylight.

The flank elevation of 57 Fitzroy Road directly faces the front of the application property within approximately 9m. That property has no habitable room windows which would be directly faced by the proposed front dormer windows. However that property has habitable room windows below the height of the proposed roof extensions. The existing buildings intercept a 25 degree line from the centre of the lower ground floor windows and it is considered that the proposed set back mansard would not result in a perceptible decrease in daylight to the lower ground floor windows on the flank elevation of no. 57.

As such, it is considered that the proposed extension would not impact on neighbour amenity.

### **Other matters**

The proposal is not liable for MoL's CIL as it would add less than 100sqm floorspace to the existing maisonette.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed mansard roof extension together with the raised side walls by reason of their prominent location, bulk, height, size and detailed design would be intrusive and obtrusive additions to the existing building which would harm the architectural integrity of the existing building and the appearance and character of the wider conservation area. The proposal would be contrary to policies CS5, CS14, DP24 and DP25.

**Recommendation:** Refuse Planning permission.

### **Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444***