

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| Delegated Report | | Analysis sheet | | Expiry Date: | | 06/12/2011 | |
| | | N/A / attached | | Consultation Expiry Date: | | 10/11/2011 | |
| Officer | | | | Application Number(s) | | | |
| Rob Tulloch | | | | 2011/5193/P | | | |
| Application Address | | | | Drawing Numbers | | | |
| 14 Healey Street London NW1 8SR | | | | See decision notice | | | |
| PO 3/4 | | Area Team Signature | | C&UD | | Authorised Officer Signature | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | |
| Erection of a mansard roof extension to dwelling house (Class C3). | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | Refuse Planning Permission | | | | | |
| Application Type: | | Householder Application | | | | | |
| Conditions: | | Refer to Draft Decision Notice | | | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | | No. notified | 07 | No. of responses | 00 | No. of objections | 00 |
| Summary of consultation responses: | | Site notice n/a Press advert n/a No responses received | | | | | |
| CAAC/Local group comments: | | N/a | | | | | |
| Site Description | | | | | | | |
| The application site is a three storey Victorian house which forms part of a relatively unaltered, terrace of 13 buildings on the western side of Healey Street. The buildings are stucco-faced at ground level, with stock brick above and stucco dressings. At roof level, valley roofs are concealed behind stucco parapets. The site does not lie within a conservation area. | | | | | | | |
| Relevant History | | | | | | | |
| 2011/1557/P Erection of a mansard extension and installation of solar panels to roof of dwelling (Class C3). Refused 20/06/2011 "The proposed roof extension, by reason of the detrimental visual effect that this would have on the unaltered roof line of the host terrace and the wider street scene, and the proposed materials which are considered to be at odds with the appearance and character of the host building and the wider terrace and street scene." | | | | | | | |
| 2007/1873/P demolition of existing rear two storey extension and conservatory and erection of a part 1/part 2 storey extension with first floor roof terrace to rear of single family dwelling house. granted 11/06/2007 | | | | | | | |
| 31 Healey Street - PE9700083 The erection of a additional storey at roof level including terrace at | | | | | | | |

front refused 01/04/97 and dismissed at appeal 28/07/97

3B Healey Street 2011/3177/PErection of a mansard roof style extension to rear of top floor flat (Class C3). Refused 31/08/2011

3B Healey Street P9600475R1Alterations to the roof of the rear addition at second floor level including the installation of railings, in connection with the creation of a roof terrace. Granted 07/06/1996

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

1 Proposal

1.1 The proposal is for a mansard roof extension. The main issues are:

- design
- amenity

2 Design

2.1 The proposed mansard would be clad in slate tiles and have a height of 2.5m, requiring the boundary parapet walls to increase in height from 700mm to 1.6m. It is not a traditional design, and considered to be contrary to Camden Planning Guidance. The lower front slope would be set back 1.4m from the parapet with a steep 80° pitch and only rise to 1.5m, Camden Planning Guidance recommends a pitch of 60°-70°. It would largely comprise a full-width window, where traditional dormer windows would be more appropriate. The upper slope would be unduly dominant and include a projection over the window. The rear elevation would have a pitch of 88°, when Camden Planning Guidance recommends a maximum of 70° at the rear of valley roofs, and feature a clerestory window.

2.2 Camden Planning Guidance states that alterations or extension are likely to be acceptable where there is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would help to re-unite a group of buildings and townscape, or where alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form, or where there are a variety of additions or alterations to roofs which create an established pattern and where further development of a similar form would not cause additional harm.

2.3 The guidance also advises that roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable where, among other things, there is an unbroken run of valley roofs or where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions. The western side of Healey Street is largely unaltered at roof level, as only one roof has had its valley removed.

2.4 A previous proposal for a mansard at the property was refused on 20/06/2011. It was considered that "the introduction of a new storey in this location is contrary to Camden's Planning Guidance, which states that an roof addition is unlikely to be unacceptable where this would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding street scene, particularly where the host building sits

within an unbroken run of valley roofs, or on complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions.” This proposal also featured zinc cladding and aluminium framed windows which were not considered appropriate materials for a building of this age and style.

- 2.5 Although the design has been altered, largely to prevent views of the mansard from the street, it is considered that a roof extension in this location would still be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and terrace. It will be visible from the upper floors of adjacent properties on the other side of Healey Street where it would be the only mansard, and from the rear of Hadley Street from where the uniform appearance of the row of valley roofs would be significantly altered.
- 2.6 As such the proposal is considered to harm the character or appearance of the host building and terrace and would not comply with policies CS14 and DP24 of the LDF and Camden Planning Guidance.

3 Amenity

- 3.1 Due to its location at roof level, the proposal is not considered to affect daylight or sunlight to any adjoining properties. The adjacent properties are 15m away and the proposal is not considered to significantly increase existing overlooking.
- 3.2 As such the proposal is not considered to harm the amenity of adjoining occupiers and would comply with policies CS5 and DP26 of the LDF and Camden Planning Guidance.

4 Recommendation: Grant 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