

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		27/04/2010	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		06/04/2010	
Officer				Application Numbers			
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin				1) 2010/1249/P & 2) 2010/1250/L			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
56 Albert Street London NW1 7NR				See draft decision notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposals							
1) Erection of mansard roof extension with two front dormer windows and rear roof terrace to add new floor to existing single family dwelling (Class C3). 2) Erection of mansard roof extension with two front dormer windows and rear roof terrace to add new floor to existing single family dwelling along with associated internal alterations (Class C3).							
Recommendations:		1) Refuse Planning Permission 2) Refuse Listed Building Consent					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	19	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		A site notice was displayed from 16/03/2010 to 06/04/2010. The occupiers of 61 Arlington Road commented that they would prefer the design of the scheme detailed in the previous application (ref: 2010/0678/P).					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		Camden Town CAAC raised no objection to the proposal in principle but they made the following comments: The cheeks of the dormers are too wide in comparison with those at 54 and 52 Albert Street. They should be the same so as to form a set. The cheeks of the dormers at no. 54 are shown in accurately in the drawing, PL 206.					
Site Description							
56 Albert Street is a grade II listed single family dwellinghouse which forms part of a long terrace dating from c1845 on the east side of Albert Street, between Mornington Street and Delancey Street in the Camden Town Conservation Area. The buildings in the terrace comprise basement plus three upper storeys, built in London stock brick with stucco basement and ground floors, stucco mouldings and cast iron first floor balconies. Valley roofs are concealed behind straight parapets, a number of which have been replaced by mansard roofs or set-back roof extensions.							

Relevant History

Application site:

2004/2691/P – Planning permission was granted on 11/02/2005 for the erection of an additional floor in mansard form at roof level. The associated listed building consent was also granted on 11/02/2005 for the erection of an additional floor in mansard form at roof level and associated internal alterations (ref: **2004/3287/L**).

2010/0678/P – Permission was granted on 24/03/2010 for the renewal of planning permission granted on 11/02/2005 (ref no. 2004/2691/P).

2010/0686/L – Permission was granted on 24/03/2010 for the renewal of listed building consent granted on 11/02/2005 (ref no. 2004/3287/L).

Neighbouring sites:

52 Albert Street – Permission was granted on 14/01/1977 for the erection of a part two-storey, part single storey rear extension and the construction of a mansard roof extension at third floor level to provide three self-contained flats and a self-contained maisonette (ref: 22860(R1)).

54 Albert Street – Planning permission was granted on 01/05/2003 for the erection of a third floor mansard roof extension (ref: PEX0200692). The associated listed building consent was also granted on 01/05/2003 (ref: LEX0200737)

92 Albert Street - Planning permission was refused on 17/02/2010 for the alterations and additions including erection of mansard roof extension and raising of party walls and chimney stacks, excavation to create rear extension at basement and ground floor levels, installation of staircase in front light well and replacement of front windows at lower ground and ground floor levels, to dwelling house (ref: 2009/5728/P). The reason was:

The proposed roof extension and ground floor element of the rear extension, by virtue of the inappropriate detailed design, would be harmful to the appearance and special architectural and historic interest of this Grade II listed building and the appearance and character of the conservation area, contrary to policies B1 (General Design Principles), B3 (Alterations and Extensions), B6 (Listed Buildings) and B7 (Conservation Areas) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.

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

41. Roofs and terraces

Camden Town 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.

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
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 with two dormer windows on the front elevation and a vertical glazed section with roof terrace and a large rooflight (0.85m x 1.55m) on the sloped roof section on the rear elevation. The proposed roof terrace would have an area of approximately 4.5sqm and would be secured by glass balustrade fixed behind the rear parapet wall.

The front elevation of the proposed mansard roof extension would be similar to the existing mansard roof extension at no.54 (adjoining property). However it is noted that the submitted drawings do not accurately show the detailing of the existing front dormers at no. 54.

The associated internal alterations would be limited to the second floor level. They would include new staircase to the new floor (continued from the existing staircase), repositioning of the bathroom closer to the centre, hand swing of the door to the front bedroom and removal of built-in cupboards.

Design and Conservation

Roof extension:

There are only few properties within this terrace without roof extensions/additions. The majority of properties in the terrace have some form of alteration/extension at roof level, some taking the form of modern style set-back extensions, others with mansard roofs, including the adjoining property at no.54. Therefore, a mansard roof style extension to the application property is considered to be acceptable in principle provided that it respects the traditional appearance of the existing house and development pattern in the immediate area.

The site benefits from both planning permission and listed building consent to erect a traditional style mansard roof extension which would be identical to the existing mansard roof extension at no.54 (refs: 2010/0678/P and 2010/0686/L). Although the front elevation of the proposed roof extension would appear as a traditional mansard roof style with two dormers, the rear elevation of the proposed roof extension by reason of its large glazing and design would have a modern appearance.

The Council guidance states additional storeys and roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and the character of the building and have a similar form to the established pattern of development in the area. The Council's guidance also gives advice on the form, scale, size and positioning of dormer window extensions in relation to the roof area and the windows on the lower levels of the existing building. In summary, paragraph 41.23 (d) of the guidance sets out that dormer window extensions should:

- relate to the façade below and the surface area of the roof in number, form, scale and pane size;
- appear as separate small projections from the roof surface; and
- generally be aligned with windows on the lower floors and be of a size that is clearly subordinate to the windows on the lower floors, with the overall width and height no greater than the windows below.

The design and size of the proposed front dormer windows are acceptable as they would be in accordance with the Camden Planning Guidance and similar to the existing front dormers at no.54. Although the dormer cheeks would be slightly wider than those at no. 54 that would not compromise the overall appearance and character of the existing house and the streetscene.

The use of traditional materials such as natural slate to the roof slopes, timber windows and lead cladding around the roof top and cheeks of the front dormers are considered to be suitable to the age and character of the existing building. However, the detailing of the rear elevation of the proposed roof extension would be inappropriate to the traditional appearance of this listed house and contrary to the Camden Planning Guidance.

It is proposed to create a roof terrace at the rear which would be accessed via largely glazed doors on the rear elevation of the proposed roof extension. Those doors are considered to be out of scale with the fenestration on the floors below – dormer windows are intended to light a roof space and should be no wider or taller than the window on the floor below, in order not to appear out of scale with the roof or over-dominant on the elevation. Also, the proposed glass balustrade with steel handrail would be fixed right behind the rear parapet wall and detract from the butterfly appearance of the original roof and harm the appearance of the building and the rest of the terrace. Moreover, the proposed rooflight on the rear roof slope would increase the glazed area on the roof profile.

The rear elevation of the proposed roof extension would not match with the rear elevation of the rear dormer windows at nos. 54 and 52 and therefore the proposal would not continue the established pattern of development that would help to re-unite this group of terrace houses. It is noted there are unsympathetic roof additions/extensions at this terrace (eg. nos. 60, 74, 82, 84, 86, etc.). However, they are mainly concentrated towards the north end of the terrace and were permitted more than 10 years ago prior to 2006 adopted UDP policies and Camden Planning Guidance.

Internal Alterations:

The relocation of the bathroom on the second floor level would require demolition of the partition walls and would irreversibly cut through the central spine wall, which is likely to be load bearing. The new insertion would fail to respect the features of the front room by uncomfortably intersecting the chimney breast. The proposals, while improving the size of the accommodation in the rear room, would be unsympathetic and harmful to the historic plan form of the front room. This element of the proposal is considered to be unacceptable due to the harmful effect on the building's historic plan form and room volumes, and therefore the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. The rest of the other minor alterations are considered to be acceptable and would not harm the historic interest of this listed house.

Residential Amenity

The proposal would not raise additional amenity issues in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook or privacy to neighbouring properties and complies with policy SD6 of the adopted UDP.

There is no roof extension with dormer windows at the adjoining property, no. 58 that could be affected by the proposal. The existing raised party wall between the proposed roof terrace and no. 54 would provide adequate screening to prevent unacceptable overlooking from the proposed roof terrace to the rear dormer windows at no. 54.

It is considered that the proposal would not have any amenity impact on occupiers of the adjacent properties and is satisfactory.

Recommendation: Both planning permission and listed building consent should be refused as the proposal would be harmful to the special architectural interest of the building and the appearance and character of the wider Conservation Area.

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