

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		07/08/2009	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		06/08/2009	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Sara Whelan				2009/2832/P 12 Royal College Street 2009/2144/L 12 Royal College Street			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
12 Royal College Street London NW1 0TH				Please see draft decision notices			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Internal and external alterations in association with the erection of a mansard roof extension to create a new third floor to provide additional accommodation to the existing single family dwelling house at 12 Royal College Street (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse full planning permission Refuse listed building consent					
Application Type:		Full planning permission Listed building consent					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	11	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		A site notice was erected on 16 July 2009 until 6 August 2009: No response					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		None required to be consulted					
Site Description							
<p>The application site includes three grade II listed Georgian townhouses dating from the early 19th Century. Nos 6-10 are not on a map of 1806 but appear by Greenwood's Map of 1827 flanking a lane known as Upper College Grove. The buildings form part of longer terrace of 9 listed dwellings on the east side of Royal College Street. The adjoining properties - nos.22 to no. 14 - comprise brick built four storey plus basement dwellings.</p> <p>No. 12 is a more modest brick built three storey plus basement dwelling with stucco ground floor. A round-arched pedestrian passage, to the lane now known as College Grove, is found on the right-hand side of the ground floor of No.12.</p> <p>Nos. 10 and 6 form part of a symmetrical design with no. 8. The dwellings are three storeys plus</p>							

basement. The central house - No. 8 – slightly projects and includes an attic storey behind gable with lunette sash. Stone coped parapets of Nos 6 & 10, with brick modillions, sweep up to the higher parapet of No.8 in the form of a pediment.

In streetscape terms the No. 6-10 forms an important and prominent architectural compositions that terminates the vista looking east from Plender Street, which joins Camden High Street and Royal College Street.

Nos. 6 and 10, as well as no.8 are on the BAR register, nevertheless the buildings are undergoing internal and external refurbishment. The front of the buildings have recently been repaired including repointing and sensitive repair to the railings. Internally the buildings retain their original plan form and most of the original joinery, plasterwork and features of interest.

The application buildings do not lie in a Conservation Area.

The application buildings do not lie in a Conservation Area.

Relevant History

25/02/2003 LBC GRANTED - Rebuilding of the parapet wall to the front and rear, structural strengthening and extensive fabric replacement and repairs, upgrading of existing and installation of new fittings, installation of heating and electrics. Blocking in of a rear window at rear first floor and installation of external railings to the front ground floor (ref: LEX0200631)

17/03/2004 GRANTED - Internal and external alterations including a single storey extension at ground floor level and installation of front garden railings. (ref: 2004/0210/P / 2004/0028/L)

Relevant policies

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. However it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

London Borough of Camden UDP 2006:

SD1 Quality of life

B1 General design principles

B3 Alterations and extensions

B6 Listed buildings

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Assessment

Planning permission and listed building consent is sought for the erection of a mansard roof extension to nos. 6, 10 and 12 Royal College Street to provide a new third floor of residential accommodation along with associated works including extending the stair case and repositioning the existing second floor landing balustrade.

The mansard roofs have been designed to match those of neighbouring properties on the opposite side of the road. These slate clad mansards appear historic with a traditional 70 degree pitch to the primary roof-slope and then a shallower pitched, yet tall secondary pitch. The existing mansards opposite have large centrally positioned single dormer windows on the front and rear which with a hood extended from the secondary roof slope.

The main considerations in assessing these applications are;

- Impact upon the internal layout, fabric and features of the listed building
- Impact upon the character and appearance of the host building and street scene
- Impact upon the residential amenity of surrounding area

Impact upon the internal layout, fabric and features of the listed building

Removal of the existing roof

Annex C of PPG 15 is clear that a roof is nearly always a dominant feature of a building and the retention of its original structure, shape, pitch, cladding and ornament is important. In this instance all 3 roofs have double pitched roofs with a central ridge running parallel with the road, an access hatch on the rear roof-slope, and concrete roof and ridge tiles. Many of the historic timbers appear to have been replaced and the form of the roofs are not typical of buildings of their age or the existing roofs on the remainder of the terrace. Nevertheless the application documentation has not specified that the roofs are being replaced or are not part of the historic interest of the listed buildings. Furthermore I found no evidence during the site investigation of ghosting to suggest the roofs used to have a different form. In this regard, without evidence to the contrary, the presumption is that the existing roof form is in its original form and should be retained.

Internal alterations

The proposed section shows that the new roof would be supported on additional timber joists placed between the existing joists. This would preserve the existing timber at this level but will inevitably result in the loss of the front and rear room ceiling plaster. If the scheme were to be approved this should be replaced in the like for like manner.

The new stair would be located above the stair-compartments in each property and simply extend the staircase to match, as well as reuse the existing balustrade at second floor level to terminate the stair at the new third floor level. The existing stair has standard square section balustrades which can appropriately be extended to an upper level without impacting on the important hierarchy of the properties. The only form or fabric to be lost would be the ceilings and section of the joists above the existing staircase at second floor level. This is considered to be the correct approach in this instance.

The layout of the new third floor comprise a typical front and rear room with central spine wall and is considered appropriate. However the proposed door and architrave for the third floors have been based on the decorative joinery and 6 panel door found at ground level. This is considered to be overly grand for an upper floor where simple 4 panelled doors and architrave would be more appropriate. The new skirting, cornicing and dado is only annotated on the drawings 'to match the floors below'. This could be acceptable if it matches the existing second floors.

Impact upon the character and appearance of the host building and street scene

The subject buildings, along with no. 8 form an important group of listed building whos special character and appearance largely derives from their architectural composition and distinctive and unusual parapet line created at 6-10 Royal College Street.

The installation of the mansard roofs is considered to impact on the group by reducing the ability to recognise and appreciate the distinctive and unusual roof line – which should be seen against the sky. Moreover the height of the secondary roof-slope would terminate above the eaves line of the gable of no.8 which would fail to respect the architectural prominence of the feature, This is considered particularly sensitive in oblique views north and south along Royal College Street.

Furthermore the proposed pitch of the primary roof slope would be approximately 85 degrees, with only a narrow drainage channel rather than typical parapet gutter. This results in the mansard roofs appearing more prominent by encroaching on the front elevation, the existing sweeping parapet at nos. 6 and 10 and the gable of no. 8. This is considered to fail to allow the existing roofscape to properly appreciated and recognised, especially important at 6-10 Royal College Street.

In my view the existing roof forms are visually subservient - allowing the distinctive parapet to be and gable to be the prominent element of the buildings. By increasing the overall height of nos. 12, 6 and 10 the roofs would gain inappropriate visual prominence, especially in long view east from Plender Street, that would detract from the historic and architecturally important group of building and predominance of the main front façade.

Detailed design

In this regard the mansard roofs would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic features and appearance of the building and would thereby fail to also preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

It is noted above that the mansard roofs are design to match those on the neighbouring properties opposite, in the words of the design and access statement, “to make these 3 houses look like all the other houses on Royal College Street.” Notwithstanding the fact that the 3 subject properties are not the same as the other properties on the street for a varying number of reasons including, height, scale and design, the proposed mansard roofs do not match those on the opposite side of the road. In detailed terms the hip roof shown on the end of terrace property (no.10) should be more expressed – reducing the mass and prominence of the roof - and the design and size of the dormers are unsuitable. The pitch and proximity of the front roof slope to the parapet has already be explained above.

The front dormer to no. 12 looks undersized and should probably be more like the wider single dormers on the neighbouring buildings opposite. In this regard the small window opening is not conducive to having 6 over 6 sash units installed as it would result in inappropriately small pane sizes. This is also the case for the size of panes shown on the front dormers at nos. 6 and 10, which would be more appropriate as 1 over 1 or 4 over 4. The detailed design of the dormers also shows overly large glazing bars for the size of window and incorrectly orientated window. Moreover, the detail section through the windows does not correspond with the elevation drawings and has the mid rail in the top third of the window.

The rear dormers match those found at the rear of no.8 which are mixture of inappropriately designed casements one of which appears to breach the junction of the first and secondary roof slopes. Designing the dormers to match windows which are inappropriate, albeit adjoining, is not considered to be the appropriate solution in this instance. The dormer windows in the roof slopes of the remaining properties within the terrace are centrally located dormers with sash windows which is likely to be more appropriate.

In this regard the detailed design of the mansard roof and dormers windows is not considered to

preserve the special character of the listed building contrary to ppg15 guidance and the English Heritage London terrace houses guidance.

Impact upon the residential amenity of surrounding area

The proposed extensions would be to the roof of the existing buildings. The proposed location of the roof extensions would have no detrimental impacts of dominance or loss of light upon the surrounding residential properties.

The proposed extensions would provide an additional bedroom and bathroom to each of the family dwellinghouses. The additional accommodation would include a double bedroom. This double room would comply with the minimum floorspace standard for a double bedroom as laid out in the Camden Planning Guidance. The new bedroom and bathroom would each have a window on the external elevations which would provide adequate light and ventilation to the new accommodation.

The proposed extensions would increase the size of the existing properties and would therefore not create any new residential units.

Recommendation

To refuse listed building consent and full planning permission at 12 Royal College Street.

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