

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>13/10/2010</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>16/09/2010</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number</b>			
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin				2010/4418/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
37 Bayham Street London NW1 0AA				See 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 extension with rear roof terrace on third floor and raising front parapet wall (following removal of mansard slate tiles) to existing residential dwellinghouse (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation:</b>		Refuse planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>26</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
				No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		A site notice was displayed from 24/08/2010 to 14/09/2010.  No response from the adjoining occupiers has been received.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify		Camden Town CAAC raised no objection.					
<b>Site Description</b>							
The application site is a three-storey mid-terraced single-dwelling house on the westest side of Bayham Street in the Camden Town Conservation Area.  Bayham Street is primarily residential in character and includes mainly terrace properties.							

## Relevant History

### Application Site:

None

### Neighbouring Sites:

**35 Bayham Street** - Planning permission was granted on 23/06/2006 for the installation of safety railings at roof level of the dwellinghouse (Class C3).

**53 Bayham Street** – Planning permission was granted on 17/03/2003 at appeal for the construction of a mansard roof extension for a 1-bedroom flat, alterations to the existing elevations and the conversion of the second floor from office (B1) to 2 x 1 bed flats (ref: PEX0200143). The Council's reason for refusal was for the additional parking pressures in this area. Another planning permission was also granted on 15/07/2010 for the erection of a part two, part four storey building plus mansard roof, for office use (Class B1) (ref: 2007/4003/P).

**55-57 Bayham Street** – Planning permission was granted on 19/03/2002 for the construction of a new third floor roof extension to the existing hostel (ref: PEX0100844).

**67 Bayham Street** – Planning permission was refused on 13/05/2008 for the erection of a two storey rear extension and a mansard roof extension with front and rear dormer windows together with the change of use from a single dwellinghouse to two self contained flats and one self contained maisonette (ref: 2008/1398/P). The mansard roof extension by reason of its form, size, bulk, depth and detailed design was considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building, and the Camden Town Conservation Area (contrary to policies B1 [General design principles], B3 [Alterations and extensions], and B7 [Conservation areas] of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Supplementary Planning Guidance 2006).

## Relevant policies

### **Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006**

SD6 – Amenity for neighbours and occupiers

B1 – General design principles

B3 – Alterations and extensions

B7 – Conservation areas

### **Camden Town Conservation Area Statement**

### **Camden Planning Guidance 2006**

41. Roofs and terraces

### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

The Inspector's Report into the Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Policies Development Plan documents ("DPD"s) was published on 13th September and found the policies in the DPDs to be sound. This means "considerable weight" can now be given to these LDF policies even though at this stage they have yet to be formally adopted by the Council. Where there is a conflict between UDP policies and these LDF policies the Planning Inspectorate would consider it reasonable to follow the latter. However prior to formal adoption UDP policies should still be taken into account as the Council's adopted Development Plan.

### **LDF Core Strategy**

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

### **Development Policies Development Plan**

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 - Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

## Assessment

### Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a mansard roof extension to add an additional floor which would provide additional accommodation space of approximately 17.5 sqm and a 2.5sqm roof terrace area to the existing dwellinghouse. The existing slate mansard roof form would be removed and rebuilt with a matching brick work to the existing house at the rear. The rest of the roof extension would be tiled with slates. There would be two roof lights which would flush with the roof slope on the front elevation of the roof extension.

The rear parapet wall which would replace the slate roof section at the rear would have a 'V' shape with glass balustrade for the proposed roof terrace. The existing front parapet wall would be raised to match to the front parapet wall of No 39.

### Design and Appearance

Policy DP24 of the LDF states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to be of the highest standard of design and respect character, setting, from scale of the neighbouring properties and character and proportions of the existing building. Policy DP25 of the LDF also emphasises the importance of preserving and enhancing the local characteristic of conservation areas. The Council's supplementary guidance states that roof extensions will not be acceptable on largely unimpaired rooflines.

The application site forms part of the terrace properties (Nos 35-47) whose original roof forms are pretty much intact. Due to the sloping down streetscape the roofs of 35-37 Bayham Street were built approximately 1m below the adjoining terrace property (No 39). The existing roof forms No 35 and No 36 are a very close match to each other and they are differently built from the roofs of terrace properties at 39-47 Bayham Street. Properties at 49-53 and 53a Bayham Street have a different development pattern. Given the pattern of development and the local characteristics of this conservation area, the proposed roof extension is considered to be unacceptable in principle.

The height of the proposed roof extension would match the height of the chimneys and would be highly visible from Bayham Street and its cross section with Plender Street. The rear elevation of the property is well screened from the public views and the proposed roof extension would not be open to views from Kings Terrace. It would only be visible from the rear of properties on Kings Terrace.

The proposed roof extension would not relate to the architectural style of the adjoining properties and by reason of its size, height, bulk and prominent positioning on Bayham Street would harm the architectural composition of this terrace properties and the street scene. Furthermore the proposal would also result in loss of untouched butterfly roofline.

The projecting rear part of the roof extension beyond the roof terrace would read as an additional floor rather than a subservient roof extension. The roof terrace would be accessed via large glazed doors on the rear elevation of the proposed roof extension. The rear parapet wall detailing with glass balustrade on top would not respect the architectural form of the adjoining terrace properties. The rear part of the roof extension would appear as an incongruous form of development which would dominate the rear elevation of the property.

The fenestration detailing of the proposed roof extension at the rear would also be unsympathetic to the form, detailing and hierarchy of the windows below and architectural style of the adjoining properties. The proposed mansard roof extension is considered to be poorly detailed and would be unrelated to the design of the existing and adjoining buildings.

The proposed roof extension and associated alterations would be an incongruous and obtrusive form of development which would impair an unbroken roofline, harm the appearance and character of the existing building and the wider conservation area and fail to enhance and preserve the conservation area. The proposal is contrary to policies B1, B3 and B7 of the UDP, policy CS14 of the LDF Core

Strategy and policies DP24, DP25 and DP26 of the LDF Development Policies Development Plan.

**Amenity**

Given the relationship between the existing building and the neighbouring properties, and the fact that the proposed roof extension and terrace would be positioned between the party walls the proposal would not raise any materials considerations in terms of loss of daylight, privacy and overlook to the neighbouring residential properties. The proposal complies with the aims of policy SD6 of the UDP, CS5 of the LDF Core Strategy and policy DP26 of the LDF Development Policies Development Plan.

**Recommendation:** Refuse planning permission

**Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613***