

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		29/12/2011	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		29/11/2011	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Hugh Miller				2011/5006/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
65B Chalton Street London NW1 1HY				Refer to draft decision notice.			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of extension to existing mansard roof, including creation of roof terrace and associated raised parapet at rear third floor level, to provide additional accommodation to existing flat (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	09	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		Site Notice displayed 9/11/2011, expires 30/11/2011.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		N/A.					

Site Description

A basement 3-storey end of terrace property situated on the west side of Chalton St. at junction with Churchway footpath. The property has been divided into self-contained flats on all the floor levels.

The application building forms a bookend comprising a 3-storey rear closet wing that abuts 2-storey terraced buildings along Churchway, a narrow footpath linking Chalton St. and Doric Way.

The building has an existing mansard roof extension comprising a 1 bedroom flat, which is set back from the 3-storey closet wing. The mansard roof and conversion was granted on appeal.

The roof heights between nos. 57-65 vary in detail design, form, sizes and use of materials. Some mansard extensions have rooflights whilst others have dormer windows within the front which also vary in detailed design. Nos. 67-69 and 71 vary in their roof design and height.

To the rear of the application building is located a 2-storey flat roof building accessed from Churchway a narrow footpath linking Doric Way & Chalton Street.

The application site is within a designated Neighbourhood shopping & service centre. The street is characterised by commercial, retail & residential uses. The site is not within a C.A.

Relevant History

May 1989 – PP Refused - Change of use from retail (A1) to financial and professional services (A2); ref. PL/8800513.

February 1990 – PP Granted on Appeal for:

- Change of use from retail to financial and professional services (A2) at ground floor and basement.
- Erection of a third floor Mansard extension.
- Provision of 3no. Self contained residential units on the existing first and second floors and within the mansard.

March 1989 – PP Refused - Change of use of the ground floor from retail use (Class A1) to use for financial and professional services (Class A2) works of conversion to provide one, one bedroom unit and two studio units and the erection of a mansard roof extension as shown on drawing numbered MA88/1 and 2. Appeal received against refusal of permission; ref. PL/8900103.

May 1989 – PP Refused - Change of use of the ground floor from retail use (Class A1) to use for financial and professional services (Class A2) works of conversion to provide one, one bedroom unit and two studio units and the erection of a mansard roof extension as shown on drawing numbered MA88/1 and 2. Appeal received against refusal of permission; ref. PL/8900104.

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)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

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

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

Assessment

Proposal

- Erection of extension to existing mansard roof with associated roof terrace to rear elevation of dwelling.

Design and Appearance

Within the terrace of nos. 57-65, the height and the roofs of the buildings vary in detail design, form, sizes and use of materials. Similarly there are variations in roof design and building height at nos. 67-69 and no.71 that lies to the northwest of the application building. The most regular roof extensions within the terrace of buildings are mansard roof extensions and these vary in detailed design, pitch/slope, materials and height; some roof extensions have rooflights and some with dormer windows at the front elevation. In principle therefore, a mansard roof extension is considered acceptable given their predominance within the terrace of buildings.

The host building is end-of-terrace comprising a 3-storey return/ closet wing that abuts 2-storey terraced buildings along Churchway. It is thus visible from the public realm as well as neighbouring rear gardens in long views. No.63 has valley/ butterfly roof extending out beyond the main building of no.65 but not as far as its rear wing. No.65 has a mansard roof extension that occupies the main building's roof excluding the 3-storey rear closet wing and this reflects generally how mansard roof extensions are added to buildings to increase their floorspace, in that they do not include the subsidiary rear wing. It is noted that this mansard roof has a steep almost vertical slope that dominates the appearance of the building when compared to the neighbouring mansard extensions within the terrace.

It is considered that the proposal to extend the mansard roof to cover the building's entire footprint would be overly bulky and out of scale and proportion with the application building; it would create an incongruous form of development and be very dominant in long and short views. The introduction of such a roof extension would be a discordant element, detracting from the general roofscape and the application building. The roof extension would give the building an unacceptable amount of additional bulk and would dominate the smaller terraced buildings in Churchway and its more intimate scale and character.

The proposed roof extension is considered unacceptable for reasons as follows:

- the proposed enlarged mansard roof extension would result in the creation of a disproportionately larger mansard roof that would fail to comply with CPG guidelines which require that mansard roof extensions should not be highly visible and relate well to the main building, be subordinate and well proportioned.
- the roof extension would add significant bulk and massing to the host building and unbalance the architectural composition. In terms of design, scale, and proportions, the proposed mansard roof extension would not be subordinate to the host building. It is noted that the roof extension at nos. 67-69 is fairly large and it fails to respect the architectural and urban grain of the main building. However, it does only cover the main part of the building and does not extend over the rear wing leaving this as a subsidiary element. In contrast, the proposal seeks to extend beyond the established pattern and grain of roof additions in this terrace. Furthermore the solid raised parapet to enclose the roof terrace would add to the visual bulk and dominance of the roof.
- the design is also unorthodox in that it is set back from the rear building line to include a roof terrace and it would include an incongruous design detail at the junction of the slate hanging and raised parapet on the side elevation of the building. The detailed design of the roof extension with large picture rear windows is also considered unacceptable, detracting from the appearance of the subject building and those adjacent

- the existing mansard roof of the host building is exposed to views from the wider public realm, Chalton Street (front), Churchway and Doric Way (rear); and so the proposed enlargement of the mansard would be unduly visually prominent and dominant and is considered unacceptable.

Paragraph 24.7 of Policy DP24 states that development should consider:

- The character and constraints of its site;
- the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development;
- the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape;
- the composition of elevations;
- the suitability of the proposed design to its intended use;
- its contribution to public realm, and its impact on views and vistas; and
- the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value.

Para. 24.12 states that: “... *alterations and extensions, should respect the character and appearance of the local area and neighbouring buildings. Within areas of distinctive character, development should reinforce those elements which create the character. Where townscape is particularly uniform attention should be paid to responding closely to the prevailing scale, form and proportions and materials*”.

Para. 24.13 states that: “*Development should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street or ignore patterns or groupings of buildings. Overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions. Extensions should therefore be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation, unless, exceptionally, it is demonstrated that this is not appropriate given the specific circumstances of the building. Past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations and extensions*”.

Camden Planning Guidance, Section 5 (Roofs, terraces and balconies), para. 5.8 of the CPG states “*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 street scene*”:

- Buildings or terraces which already have an additional storey or mansard;
- Buildings already higher than neighbouring properties where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural composition;
- Buildings or terraces which have a roof line that is exposed to important London-wide and local views from public spaces;
- 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.

Neighbour amenity

The proposed roof terrace would lie due north of buildings of mixed uses in Doric Way and south-west of no.63 Chalton Street with residential uses on all the floors. The adjoining building no.63 is somewhat setback from the rear wing of no.65 but not sufficiently to allow any overlooking from the proposed roof terrace as the line of sight would be too acute. No windows exist in roofs along Churchway to be affected. It is thus considered that the proposed roof terrace would not cause harm to the residential amenity through overlooking.

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