

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>29/10/2012</b>
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	11/10/2012
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Seonaid Carr			2012/4650/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
6 Elizabeth Mews London NW3 4TL			See 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(s)</b>					
Erection of mansard roof extension front roof terrace, alterations to front and rear fenestration including replacement of garage doors with new front door and windows in connection with conversion of ground floor garage to habitable space all in connection with existing dwellinghouse (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant planning permission subject to conditions			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	17	No. of responses	04	No. of objections	04
			No. Electronic	03		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed on 14/09/2012 (expired 05/10/2012) and a press notice was published in the Ham &amp; High on 20/09/2012 (expired 11/10/2012).</p> <p>4 objections have been received from residents at 7 Elizabeth Mews and three flats within 12 Endlands Lane raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern the builders will start early in the morning, we ask the work will not start before 8:30 and finish before 21:00, we also ask the builders do not smoke under our window or stump their fee or shout in the morning;</li> <li>We would like to know when the work is planned for and how long it will take;</li> <li>Concern regarding amenity of properties to the rear in respect of loss of light, impact on privacy and harm to outlook;</li> <li>Impact on value of own property;</li> </ul> <p><b>Officers Response:</b> Concerns regarding amenity will form part of the assessment below. In respect of hours of building operations a standard informative will be on the decision notice advising the application that building works that can be heard at the boundary of the site can only be done so between 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturday and there shall be no building works on Sundays and Public Holidays. The impact of development on the value of neighbouring properties is not a material planning consideration and as such would not warrant a refusal of planning permission.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>Belsize CAAC were consulted on the proposal and raised the following objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of garage,</li> <li>- To relocation of front door and scale of new front fenestration,</li> <li>- To further subdivision of lower rear windows,</li> <li>- To the placing of velux windows relative to others in the façade.</li> </ul> <p>The CAAC also raised a query with regard to preplanning advice which stated a basement may be considered acceptable.</p> <p><b>Officers Response:</b> The response to the objections in terms of the design features will form part of the assessment below.</p> <p>With regard to the loss of the garage, the conversion of the garage into habitable space would not in itself require planning permission. However given the Article 4 direction, all external alterations to the principle elevation of the property would require planning permission.</p> <p>The query regarding the basement was raised at pre-application stage and the applicant was advised that a basement may be considered acceptable subject to demonstration through a Basement Impact Assessment that the excavation would not cause material harm to the amenity of the neighbours, affect the stability of building, cause drainage or flooding problems, or damage the character of areas and the natural environment. This current application does not include any basement works.</p>					

## Site Description

The application site comprises a two storey Mews property, with an integral garage. The site is located to the south eastern side of Elizabeth Mews which is a residential Mews development.

The surrounding Mews properties have undergone a number changes, including alterations to the front facades and introduction of roof extensions, primarily in the form of mansard additions. The opposing side of the Mews has been rebuilt but is of an appropriate scale and materials, retaining the height of the original buildings.

The site is located within the Belsize Park Conservation Area and since 2010 has been subject of an Article 4 Direction, which removes most of the permitted development rights.

## Relevant History

In 1993 planning permission was granted for the erection of a mansard roof extension to Nos.6 and 7 Elizabeth Mews (Ref: 9300761)

The relevant history relating to neighbouring properties within Elizabeth Mews is outlined below:

Nos.3&4

- Planning permission granted in 1994 for the erection of a mansard roof extension (Ref:9400245).

No.5

- Planning permission granted in 1993 for the erection of a mansard roof extensions (Ref:9301171).

No.8

- Planning permission granted in 1983 for the conversion of part of the existing garage into habitable room and elevational changes to the front elevation (Ref:36049).
- Planning permission granted in 1993 for the erection of a mansard roof extension (Ref:9300233).

No.9

- Planning permission granted in 1986 for the erection of a mansard roof (Ref: 8601515).

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP17 Walking, cycling and public transport

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 and Conservation Area Statements

CPG1 Design

CPG6 Amenity

Belsize Conservation Area Statement

### National Planning Policy Framework (April 2012)

## Assessment

### Proposal

The application is seeking planning permission for the erection of mansard roof extension with front roof terrace and balustrade together with alterations to the front and rear fenestration including replacement of garage doors with new front door and windows in connection with conversion of ground floor garage to habitable space all in connection with existing dwellinghouse (Class C3).

The proposed mansard addition would be a flat topped mansard spanning the full width of the roof. To the front elevation it would incorporate a series of four folding/sliding doors which would lead onto the front terrace which measures 5.7m wide and 0.95m deep, to the rear elevation would be two rooflights flush with the rear roofslope. Within the roof of the mansard would be two raised rooflights, the roof extension would be set back behind the existing parapet at both the front and rear elevations, a 0.25m high railing would be erected to the front parapet. The proposed mansard would accommodate a kitchen, dining and living area.

The alteration to the front fenestration would involve replacement of the existing single door with a sash window with timber boarding below and render to the top and bottom of the opening together with the removal of the existing garage doors and replacement with a single door, triple hung sash window with timber boarding below and render to the surrounds. To the rear elevation it is proposed to replace the existing windows to the ground and first floor levels, all windows would be within the existing apertures, the ground floor windows would be replaced with timber casements and the first floor timber sash windows. It has been proposed to have all windows apart from one to the first floor and the velux rooflights to the mansard frosted glass.

### Design

Policies CS14 and DP24 seek to ensure all development is of the highest quality design and considers the character, setting, context and form of neighbouring buildings. Furthermore Policy DP25 seeks to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.

With regard to the alterations at ground floor level, the conversion of the garage into habitable space would not in itself require planning permission. However given the Article 4 direction, all external alterations to the principle elevation of the property would require planning permission. It is considered that the proposed treatment to the front elevation at ground floor level would be an acceptable form of development. In recessing in part of the original opening it would ensure the character of the building is retained. Furthermore, in using a contrasting material such as render to the surrounds there would be a visual contrast between the brickwork and the opening, helping to maintain the character of the front elevation.

In respect of the mansard extension, it is considered this would be an acceptable addition to the host property. The mansard is considered to be of an appropriate scale and follows the design features of mansards as outlined in paragraphs 5.14-5.18 of CPG1(Design) in respect that it would be set back from the existing front parapet by 1.2m, the rear roofslope would have an angle of 65degrees, given the front would be flat with sliding doors this wouldn't strictly apply, however were the slope above to continue down it would have an angle of 68 degrees. The mansard would be to the same design as that at the direct neighbour No.5. The proposal would be well integrated with the surrounding roofscape and would not appear incongruous. It has been annotated on the plans that the proposed mansard would be covered with grey tiles which would in keeping with the existing mansards to the Mews, a condition is recommended requiring further details of the tiles to be used to ensure the development would be well integrated with the neighbouring properties and would preserve the special interest of the Conservation Area.

CPG1 (Design) advises that mansards should not have an internal head height greater than 2.3m. The proposed mansard would have an internal height of 2.55m. The purpose of setting this height is to avoid excessive additional height to the host building. In the context of the application site, there are existing parapet walls either side of the roof which are continuous throughout the Mews. Therefore when seen from a long range view it appears as if there is already high level structures at roof level. The proposed mansard would be set down from the parapet by 0.5m. As such it is considered that in this instance the mansard would not add excessive additional height to the host building or surrounding Mews.

It is also important to note that planning permission was granted in 1993 for the erection of a mansard to the host property together with No.7. Whilst this was not implemented and since this time the Council has adopted new policies it is considered to be noteworthy as the Council have previously accepted a mansard addition in this location.

No objection is raised to the proposed alterations to the fenestration to the rear elevation; these are relatively minor alterations to the property which are not considered to harm the fenestration composition of the building. This aspect of the proposal would use timber which is considered to be an appropriate material on a property on this nature.

When considering the proposed works in the context of the surrounding Mews, it is important to note that a number of properties have undergone various forms of development in recent times. There are various mansard roof extensions and differing alterations to the ground floor level. The adjoining property No.5 has been altered to the same extent as what is being proposed as part of this application, as such the proposals would not appear incongruous when considered within the context of the neighbouring properties. Due to the various alterations, there is little consistency throughout the Mews. It is considered that what is being proposed would not cause demonstrable harm to the character of the host property and

surrounding Conservation Area and in this regard no objection is raised.

## **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.

The only aspect of the proposal which would potentially harm the amenity of adjoining neighbours would be the mansard roof extension. The application site is located directly to the rear of No.14 England's Lane, three objections have been received from occupiers of No.12 England's Lane, which is occupied as three flats and neighbours No.7 Elizabeth Mews. It appears from the photos that have been sent through by the objectors that they think the development would be to No.7 rather than No.6. However the impact on these neighbours will be assessed.

In respect of the daylight and sunlight implications of the proposal, given the neighbours to the rear are located to the south east of the application site and sited from 3.7-7.4m from the proposed mansard it is considered that the development would not cause significant harm to the daylight and sunlight received by these neighbouring properties to the rear of the application site. Furthermore given there are existing parapet walls which have been built up along the terrace and the proposed mansard would not rise above these it is considered that the proposed development would not result in significant harm to the daylight and sunlight received into the neighbouring properties over and above that already received.

In terms of outlook, the proposed extension would be sited some 3.7m from the neighbouring residential properties in No.14, 7.4m from the rear elevation of No.12 and 6.6m from the rear elevation of No.16. When considering the existing development at roof level which comprises built up parapets with two horizontal steel supports and given the proposed mansard would not rise above the parapet walls and would have a rear elevation sloped away from the neighbouring properties at the rear, the rear elevation of the mansard would actually be further from the neighbours to the rear than outlined above. In light of this it is considered that the proposed development would not significantly harm the outlook enjoyed by the current residential neighbours and neither would be lead to an undue increased sense of enclosure.

With regard to privacy, it has been annotated on the plans that all windows apart from one of the sashes at first floor level and the rooflights within the mansard would be obscure glazed. This would be welcomed to safeguard the privacy of the adjoining neighbours to the rear. The sash to the first floor that would not be obscure glazed would serve a bedroom and the rooflights would serve a kitchen area. Given the existing windows at first floor level are not obscure glazed and that the window would service a bedroom it is not considered necessary to condition the permission to ensure this window would be obscure glazed. With regard to the rooflights in the mansard it is recommended that these are obscure glazed and fixed shut unless the opening section is 1.7m above the internal floor level, secured via condition as there is currently no opportunity to look into neighbouring properties at this level. Given the proposed second floor level would comprise of a single room which to the front elevation would include a series of four sliding doors it is considered obscure glazing the rear rooflights would not result in a poor standard of accommodation at second floor level and in this respect it is not considered unreasonable to request these rooflights to be obscure glazed.

## **Transport**

In response to the CAAC objection to the loss of the garage, it is important to note that the conversion of the garage into habitable space would not in itself require planning permission. However given the Article 4 direction, all external alterations to the principle elevation of the property would require planning permission.

The proposed development would see the loss of the off street car parking space however given that the proposal would not be creating any additional residential units it is not considered necessary to secure the development as car free via a Section 106 agreement.

Policy DP17 requires development to make provisions for cyclists including cycle parking. Appendix 2 states that 1 space should be provided per new unit. Therefore there is a requirement on the applicant to show adequate cycle storage for 1 bicycle. In this instance there is no possibility of providing covered secure cycle parking outside the dwelling, but within the building itself. There is however adequate space within the building to store a bike. It is therefore not considered expedient to impose a condition requiring this in this particular instance.

## **Conclusion**

It is concluded that the proposed development would be an acceptable form of development that would accord with the relevant policies of the Local Development Framework and in this regard no objection is raised.

Planning Permission is recommended subject to conditions

## **DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2012.  
For further information please click [here](#).