

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	14/05/2010
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	21/4/2010
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Hugh Miller			2010/1235/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
58 Grafton Road Kentish Town London NW5 3DY			See decision letter		
<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 and two storey rear extension at first and second floor level to upper floor maisonette (Class C3)					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	16	No. of responses	18	No. of objections	18
			No. electronic	12		
Summary of consultation responses:	Site Noticed displayed 31/3/2010, expires 21/4/2010.					
	<p>18 letters were received and raised concerns from the following occupiers: No's 43, 47, 49, 56, 60a, 60b, 62a, 64, 66 and 70 Grafton Road; No's 39, 43, 45, 46, and 47 (from two separate occupiers) Willes Road; 2 unspecified addresses. A summary of the issues raised are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mansard roof spoil the uniform appearance of the terrace;</li><li>• 2-storey extension would set a precedent; likely that similar extensions being built in Grafton Rd. &amp; Willes Rd; / extension detract from the amenity value of the property;</li><li>• Roof extension is will be out of keeping with the street, which I believe is in a conservation area. It will also block morning sunlight to the houses on the other side of Grafton Road.</li><li>• Rear extension by reason of its bulk and height, would cause loss of sun/daylight, loss of privacy, harm outlook, cause sense of enclosure; overlook rear garden; proposals would harm the appearance of the building; being out of character with the terrace –contrary to policies B1, B3 &amp; B7also to policy DS6.</li><li>• Loss of sunlight to kitchen window &amp; blocked views;</li><li>• Loss of privacy and view from roof terrace;</li><li>• 2-storey extension would diminish the light to the gardens of the houses on both sides of the application building; proposal would create visual obtrusion for the surrounding properties;</li><li>• 2-storey extension exceeds the height of existing and neighbouring buildings. The additional storey is not in keeping with neighbouring houses.</li><li>• Light will be blocked out in the houses opposite (Willes Rd and Grafton Rd) creating heavy shadows in the gardens and on the sides of the houses.</li><li>• 2- storey extension will take away more of the already diminished light. Create a very imposing and cramped environment for the neighbours.</li><li>• Over development of a terrace house in a Conservation Area.</li><li>• Disagree with comments in DAS –mansard roof is prevalent in the area. No roof extension for most of Grafton Road &amp; none on houses in Willes Rd.</li><li>• Julliette balcony will encourage access to the flat roof which would be unacceptable.</li><li>• Mansard roof extension at no.48 was rejected because it was not in keeping</li></ul>					

**CAAC/Local groups\* comments:**  
\*Please Specify

**Inkerman Area Residents Association** – Object (in two separate submissions). The following issues are raised:

2-storey rear extension is visually obtrusive, creates overlooking to the houses and gardens at the rear.

Creates a precedent for future applications of similar nature in the C.A.

Overdevelopment of the site, making a sizable block of flats out of a modest 3-storey Victorian house.

### Site Description

A 3-storey terraced property situated on the north side of Grafton Road, south of the junction with Ryland Road. The property is divided into two self-contained residential units; a ground floor flat and an upper floor maisonette. The building is within Inkerman Conservation Area. The Inkerman Conservation Area Statement states properties nos. 26-94 makes a positive contribution to the C.A.

### Relevant History

#### 94 Grafton Road

January 2009 – PP granted- Erection of mansard roof extension together with change of use from single dwellinghouse to three self contained flats (Class C3); ref. 2007/3433/P.

#### 58 Grafton Road

September 1975 – PP granted - Change of use to one self-contained flat and one self-contained maisonette, and rebuilding rear extension; ref. G11/14/17/21125.

#### 84 Grafton Road

November 1994 - PP granted- Alterations and additions to the house including the construction of a mansard roof extension a single storey rear extension and alterations to the front elevation; ref. 9401116

### Relevant policies

#### **RUDP 2006:**

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 – General design principles

B3 – Alterations and extensions

B7 – Conservation areas

#### **CPG 2006:**

Section 19 – Extensions, alterations and conservatories;

Section 29 –Overlooking and privacy.

Section 41 – Roofs and terraces

### Inkerman Conservation Area Statement

Roof Extensions: Ink24; Ink25; Ink26 & Ink27. Rear extensions/Conservatories –Ink19 –Ink23.

#### **Draft LDF Core Strategy**

*The following policies in the draft LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies documents have been taken into consideration*

*CS1 – Distribution of growth*

*CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development*

*CS6 – Providing quality homes*

*CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving heritage / conservation areas*

*DP24 – Securing high quality design*

*DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage / conservation areas*

*DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours*

*As the draft LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies documents have now been published, they are material planning considerations. However, as a matter of law, limited weight should be attached to them at this stage.*

## **Assessment**

The application proposes the following:

- Erection of mansard roof extension (incorporating the provision of two dormer windows on the front elevation and one dormer window on the rear elevation);
- Erection of two storey rear extension at first and second floor level for the upper floor maisonette (Class C3)

## **Background**

Within the terrace of properties, nos.48-98, only four properties (nos. 84, 94, 96 and 98) have mansard roof extensions plus dormer windows. Numbers 96-98 was granted approval in February 1989 (21 years), no.84 November 1994 (16 years) and no.94 January 2009. Notwithstanding, officers considered that these roof extensions do not set a precedent for reasons to be discussed below.

Properties in Willes Road rear of the application site are of a similar period and design to the host building. When viewed from the application site, it is shown that mansard roof extensions and 2-storey rear extensions are not characteristic of these properties and; where 2-storey rear extension exist (such as at no. 39 for example) it is the exception and not a characteristic feature of this terrace.

## **Design**

### Mansard roof extension plus dormer windows

The proposed extension would in terms of its design itself be in general accordance with SPG roof extension guidelines as it would appear to be set behind the raised front parapet and at the rear would retain the valley parapet profile. This is however not certain owing to a section through the proposed mansard not being provided by the applicant (therefore an informative is recommended to be added denoting that the applicant would need to provide existing and proposed side elevation/sections in any future submission). Generally however, officers raised no objections to the design of the proposed roof extension in itself, but the concerns relate to the principle of an extension at this location.

Policy B3 states that the Council will not grant planning permission for roof alterations or extensions, which cause harm to the architectural quality of the existing building and that of surrounding buildings. Policy B3 justification para. 3.31 states *“Development should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street. Past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations or extensions”*. Paragraph 3.34 further acknowledges that some roof alterations and extensions to individual roofs need to be treated with sensitivity, such as ....”where the topography or alignment of the streets allow views of the rooflines, rooftops, projecting party walls ....or .....”*Where streets retain the original roofline of their buildings, it is important that these are preserved in an unaltered form”*.

Section 41 (Roofs and terraces) 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”*:

- a) there is an unbroken run of valley roofs;
- b) complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a co-ordinated design;
- c) buildings or terraces which already have an additional storey or mansard;
- d) buildings or terraces which have a roof profile that is exposed to important views from public spaces;

The Inkerman Conservation Area Statement (ICAS) raises similar reasons to points a-d above as to why the proposed mansard roof extension in this particular location is considered unacceptable.

In this case, the roofscape within the terrace is largely unaltered (between No's 48 and 98 Grafton Road), with the few examples noted above being a significant distance to the north of the application site building. In-fact for the vast majority of the terrace (No's 48-82) the terrace is completely unaltered at roof level. The introduction of a mansard roof extension behind the retained front parapet would be unacceptable and out of keeping with the historic form of the terrace of properties.

On the basis of the above, the proposal would be unacceptable in principle; the roof extension would significantly increase the building's height, giving the building an unacceptable amount of additional bulk in both long and short views; the new built-up side elevation to the main building would be a discordant element, detracting from the roofscape. In terms of height, location and setting, the proposed roof extension would not be subordinate to the host building and is thus unacceptable.

The applicant has referred to the mansard roof extension at no.94 Grafton Road as setting a precedent. However, as noted above (para. 3.31 of the UDP), such extensions should not be regarded as such. Moreover, the justification for the mansard at no.94 was due to the fact that nos.96-98 already had mansard extensions and the mansard extension at no.94 would have provided uniformity and visual cohesion within the group of three properties. Such a context is not considered to be the case at this point within the terrace, where the roofscapes are instead unaltered.

With regards to nos.96-98 and no.84, these were dealt with under different planning policies and guidelines and prior to the conservation area designation.

In overall terms therefore, as proposed, the roof extension is unsatisfactory in terms of its bulk, height and location and would detract from the appearance of the application building and terrace of which it forms part. The proposed mansard roof extension is therefore contrary to policies B1 and B3 and CPG roof extension guidelines.

The detailed design of the roof extension, including the proposed materials and window types, is however considered to be appropriate in general design terms.

#### Two-storey extension at first & second floor level

Within the terrace (nos. 48-98) rear extensions at first floor level is limited to three houses, nos. 52, 68 and 70. The first floor rear extension at no.52 was granted in November 1972 (38 years) and those at nos. 68 (January 1973) & 70 (November 1982). Again these extensions all pre dated the conservation area designation not to mention the changes to Council's policies and guidelines, therefore whilst first floor extensions does not set a precedent, second floor additions would clearly be unacceptable to current policies and guidelines.

The proposed 2-storey rear addition is considered to be unacceptable and would be contrary to policies B1, B3 and B7 also CPG guidelines and Conservation Area guidelines. Specifically, the proposed rear extension is not in compliance for reasons as follows:

- a) it would not be subordinate to the building in terms of location, form scale and proportions;
- b) it would not respect the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;
- c) it would not respect the historic pattern and established grain of the surrounding area;
- d) it would not be one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level;
- e) it would detract from the largely unimpaired rear elevation, characteristic of the terrace and the character and appearance of the Inkerman C.A.

The ICAS states "...Some rear extensions, although not widely visible, adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached, such that the character of the Conservation Area is prejudiced. Rear extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or the Conservation Area. In most cases such extensions should be no more than one storey in height, but its general affect on neighbouring properties and Conservation Area will be the basis of its suitability".

Moreover, CPG at paragraph 19.16 states that "In most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged". In this case the rear extension is at both first and second floor level. The proposed extension would evidently not be a full storey below roof eaves level. As such, the bulk of the proposed extension would mean that it would not be subordinate to the host building. The location and height of the proposed rear extension would thus be to the detriment to the appearance of the building. Moreover, the proposed extension is not considered to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area at this point.

With the above in mind, the proposed rear extension at first and second floor level cannot be supported owing to policies within the UDP, CPG guidelines and conservation area statement guidelines.

### ***Neighbour amenity***

#### ***Mansard roof extension***

The proposed roof extension would not have any impact on neighbour amenity, owing to its position at roof level and is therefore considered to be satisfactory in this regard.

#### ***2-storey rear extension***

At the rear, the windows of the properties are orientated due north-east and so the windows of the additional 2-storey would only overlook the rear gardens and not habitable rooms. Notwithstanding this, the proposed 2-storey extension has a depth of approximately 4.9m and height 5.5m. Whilst it would not cause loss of privacy or overlooking of the occupiers of the host and the neighbouring houses, it is considered that it would cause an increased loss of outlook and heightened sense of enclosure to the occupiers of the separate residential unit at ground floor level of the host building. At present, there is a single storey rear extension at the host property and another single storey side extension, albeit set off from the boundary, at no. 60. It is considered that the effect of the two storey extension would significantly worsen the levels of outlook and create an increased sense of enclosure for occupiers at ground floor level of the host building, with a 'tunnelling effect' being exacerbated to the detriment of residential amenity (contrary to UDP policy SD6).

It is also considered that the rear extension may worsen levels of daylight and sunlight. However, this is unlikely to be to such a level to warrant a sustainable reason for the refusal of the application.

#### ***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***