

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>19/05/2010</b>	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>05/05/2010</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Jennifer Walsh				2010/1393/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
4 Kings Mews London WC1N 2HY				Please refer to 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 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor roof extension to incorporate a rear roof terrace and external alterations to front including a new balustrade to front balcony and new doors to garage on front elevation.							
<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>16</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
				No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<b>2 Kings Mews comments on the application as follows:</b> - This end of the mews may look a little lopsided with this development, since this end of the mews is two storey. They are not in principle opposed to this extension but have worries about the strength of the walls to support this. - The roof extension would be more in keeping with the rest of the mews if it was set back a little. - At present the two mews houses share a common design of balcony railings, which is central to the common design of the buildings. - They hope that the designs for the garage doors are in keeping with the overall design of the two houses.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>		No response has been received from Bloomsbury CAAC					

### Site Description

The application site is two storey mews property, located on the west side of Kings Mews. It is a modern mews development built in 1999 and backs on to the listed buildings along St Johns Street. The application site is not a listed building, but it is located within the Bloomsbury Conservation area.

## Relevant History

**PS9804394:** Works of alteration and extension to create a two bedroom house at No.2 Kings Mews and three bedroom house at No.5 Kings Mews, including change of use of ground floor from parking to residential use. **GRANTED 02/08/1999**

## Neighbouring sites

**23-30 Kings Mews 2009/0710/P:** Redevelopment of the site following the demolition of the existing 2 and 3 storey storage buildings at 23-30 Kings Mews including the erection of a new part 3, part 4 storey building to accommodate 18 private residential flats (10 x 1 bed, 5 x 2 bed, 3 x 3 bed), and erection of rear extension at first to third floor levels and mansard roof extension at fourth floor level at 43-45 Gray's Inn Road and provision of a new shopfront associated with the retained retail use at ground and basement floor levels, and change of use of the upper floors from part offices and part residential to a wholly residential use to accommodate 7 affordable flats (3 x 1 bed, 3 x 2 bed, 1 x 4 bed). **GRANTED subject to a Section 106 Agreement 13/05/2009**

**5 John Street, & 7/8 King's Mews, 2004/4713/P:** Change of use of 5 John Street from offices (Class B1) to residential (Class C3) to provide 2 bed self contained basement flat and 3 bed maisonette on upper floors and rear garden with enclosed pool at basement level including the erection of a 3 storey building to 7/8 Kings Mews to provide 2x 2 bed flats and garage following the demolition of the existing office building. **GRANTED 07/06/2005**

## Relevant policies

### Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

- SD6 – Amenity for neighbours and occupiers
- B1 – General design principles
- B3 – Alterations and extensions
- B6 – Listed buildings
- B7 – Conservation areas

### Camden Planning Guidance 2006

### Bloomsbury Conservation Area Statement

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

*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.*

- CS1 – Distribution of growth
- CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development
- CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
- DP24 – Securing high quality design
- DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage
- DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

## Assessment

### Proposal

The proposed roof extension would take the form of a mansard roof to the front elevation, with a sheer rear elevation opening up onto a roof terrace. The front elevation would have four small dormer windows and a natural slate roof. The rear elevation is proposed to have a large window and a set of sliding doors opening up onto a terrace which is to be surrounded with a glazed balcony.

To the front elevation it is also proposed to replace the existing balcony with a new steel structure with obscured glass detailing. The existing garage door to the front elevation is also proposed to be replaced with a glass door unit, to match the existing property, as well as the change of use of the existing garage area to create additional habitable accommodation.

### Revision

Revisions have been received to omit the previously submitted existing sheer roof extension with two windows to the front elevation, and amend the plans to incorporate a mansard roof proposal which incorporates four windows.

### Main Considerations

- Impact of design and bulk on host building, mews and conservation area
- Transport
- Neighbourhood Amenity

### Impact on the host building and the surrounding area

Policy B1 states that the Council will grant permission for development that is designed to a high standard; Policy B3 states that the Council will not grant permission for alterations that it considers to cause harm to the architectural quality of the existing building; and Policy B7 states that the Council will only grant planning permission for development in a Conservation Area that preserves or enhances the special character and appearance of the area.

Camden Planning Guidance states; *That 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.*

There are 2 issues to be considered here- principle of a roof extension and its detailed design.

The application property forms a pair with No. 2 Kings Mews and whose roof line is unimpaired. The two buildings were built at the same time around 1999 and have similar design features including fenestration details. It is considered that the introduction of a mansard roof to the application site would appear incongruous and detract from the consistency of the roof line. The additional height would mean the application property would read as a 3 storey building in a short terrace of 2 storey dwellings. Therefore, the mansard roof alteration proposed would create an unfortunate visual interruption in the roofline and introduce a different roof form. The proposed mansard roof extension would be contrary to Camden Planning Guidance which states that a roof extension would be unacceptable where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions.

Kings Mews has a generally consistent streetscape character although it has been altered over time; essentially most buildings are 2 storey high traditional mews type buildings, including nos 12-17 and 20-22 as white painted 19thC workshops, nos 28-29 as 1950's commercial buildings and nos 1-4 as postwar houses. No 7 is a more recent 3 storey house with setback top floor, effectively freestanding between 2 gap parking lots; nos 23 and 30 are 1950's blocks with mansard roof extensions.

Nevertheless the buildings on the west side of the mews are mainly two storeys in height with a consistent parapet line, and nos 1-4 form a contiguous and consistent grouping. No.7 Kings Mews is the exception in the mews. This building was granted approval on the 7th June 2005 (before the replacement UDP was adopted in 2006) and was assessed as an isolated building in a former carpark, where a recessive setback top storey was considered acceptable, although in design terms it does appear somewhat topheavy in reality. It should be also noted that mansard storeys have also been permitted in the past, but not built, at nos 14-17 Kings Mews. However the context of no 4, the application site is different as it reads as a pair with no 2. Although a mansard or setback storey may be acceptable on both sites here, it would appear inappropriate in isolation on one half of a pair of buildings with an uninterrupted roofline. Consequently it is considered that the proposed additional storey at 4 Kings Mews, by reason of its scale and height would also fail to respect the character and appearance of this part of the mews. The applicant refers to the neighbouring site (opposite the application site) throughout their submission. This site has recently been granted permission for 2-3 storey mews houses. It is considered that the site opposite 23-30 Kings Mews is a much larger overall site and as such forms its own 'group' or unity which will be read as one. The application site has different context and the proposed extension would be read as a dominant addition unbalancing the pair of houses and is therefore unacceptable.

Whilst it is accepted that mansard roofs are a traditional means of incorporating additional floorspace into a building, the roof extension itself is considered unacceptable in detailed design terms also, and, although revisions have been received to show a somewhat more traditional design, the detailed design is considered to be contrary to Camden Planning Guidance. Although there is a proposed setback of 0.5metres from the front elevation as well as an angle of 70°, there is no parapet wall from which the mansard should be set behind. It is considered that the principal traditional design features of a traditional mansard are not incorporated into the proposal- as there is no parapet wall proposed, the four windows appear as high and dominant additions; the size of the dormer surrounds are excessively thick and heavy-looking; the roof above the dormers also appears very high due to the lack of a secondary roofslope found on traditional mansards. These problems cumulatively result in a top floor which over-dominates the building and has a bulky top-heavy appearance which would be at odds with the general proportions of the mews. There is no direct correlation between the windows on the lower storeys and the dormers proposed, and therefore the four dormers would be read as a dominant addition. To the north of the application site there is a vacant site which is currently used as car parking. As this is a vacant site, the dominance of the proposed roof extension in its side elevation is exaggerated. It is considered that the pitch, the profile and the proposed windows are not considered to preserve or enhance the character of the wider conservation area

The proposed roof addition would have a flat roof leading along the whole of the side elevation to the rear elevation with a sheer drop-down onto a proposed roof terrace. The existing rear elevation of the application site is modern in fenestration details, and similar windows are proposed for the additional floor. The rear elevation would not be visible from the public realm, although it would be visible from the rear of the listed buildings which face John Street. As the proposal replicates the design idiom of the lower floors, with almost fully glazed walls, it would result in an overpowering 3 storey rear elevation with no breaks in facade treatment and without the normal recessive or subordinate treatment to be expected on an attic/top floor; the result is a bulky and dominant roof addition to the mews house, so that the original proportions of the mews house would be lost. Although an additional storey is not objectionable here the detailed design at the rear is not respectful of the host building nor its context.

It is thus concluded that there is an in-principle objection to the roof extension as well as to its detailed design; the scheme would create a dominant addition, due to its height, bulk and design and therefore it would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host property, the neighbouring mews property as well as the wider conservation area.

In relation to design alterations to the existing elevations, it is also proposed to replace the existing balcony with a new steel and glazed structure. The existing balcony is a steel structure which matches that of the neighbouring mews property, No. 2 Kings Mews. The installation of a glazed and steel construction is not considered to integrate well with the pair of buildings and would be read as a

dominant addition which detracts from the original design of the two buildings. Although No.2 is smaller in width than the application site no.4, they are read as a pair when looking at the front elevation and the streetscape. The introduction of steel and glass to this property is not considered to be sympathetic to the appearance of the house nor preserve that of the wider conservation area.

Alterations to the existing garage doors are also included within the application. The existing garage doors are solid grey doors and it is proposed to change the doors to incorporate glazed doors to match that of the existing situation. Due to them matching the existing fenestration details of the application site and that of the neighbouring property, it is not considered that this part of the application would have a detrimental impact on the host property nor that of the wider conservation area.

## **Transport**

UDP policy T3 requires development to sufficiently provide for the needs of cyclists, which includes cycle parking and UDP policy T7 states development must comply with Camden Parking standards. The London Plan also adopts the Transport for London cycle parking standards.

Camden's Parking Standards for cycles (Appendix 6 of the Unitary Development Plan), states that 1 storage or parking space is required per residential unit, however for larger residential units (3+ beds), the London plan requires 2 cycle parking spaces per unit. The proposal is for 1 residential unit (3+ bed); therefore 2 cycle storage/parking spaces is required. The applicant has not included provision for the required amount of cycle storage/parking in the proposed design.

However, the proposals are for a large single dwelling house with ground floor access and a cycle can easily be stored within it if required, and therefore it is considered that Camden's parking standards for cycles has been met.

There is currently vehicular access to the site and it is proposed to convert this existing garage into a utility space. Currently, the garage is not in use because it is too narrow to accommodate a standard car. As the existing garage has not been used since occupation of the property due to its size, as well as there not being an increase in the habitable accommodation, it is not considered that the property could be car-free. It is not considered that the proposal would not result in any increased pressure on street car parking. Therefore, the proposal is acceptable in transport terms.

## **Amenity**

The proposal would not have any adverse impact on the amenities of the adjoining residents in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook or privacy.

Although the proposed extension would incorporate a terrace, there is an existing terrace to the first floor of the mews house as well as extensive raised courtyard at rear ground floor which allow views to the rear of John Street houses. Therefore, although the proposal would be close to the shared boundary with the properties in John Street, they would be located approx. 10metres away and it is considered that it would not significantly worsen the impact of the existing house on the residential amenities of such properties. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with policy SD6.

**Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission on design and bulk grounds**

## **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***