

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	04/06/2009
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	01/06/2009
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Jennifer Walsh			2009/1315/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
65 Spencer Rise London NW5 1AR			Please refer to draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Extensions to single family dwelling house (Class C3) including erection of mansard roof, ground floor rear infill extension and first floor rear extension.				
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	08	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 06/05/2009 – 27/05/2009</p> <p>67 Spencer Rise has objected on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In contrary to the design and access statement, we are not in support of the application. - The proposed extension will considerably increase the length of the wall between us. - It will also involve filling in an air brick which currently ventilates the pantry, but is not a major concern. - The potential for noise will be considerably increased. If the application is improved we would like to see sound proofing included as a condition. - Also concerned that the foundations for the extension be constructed appropriately and that provisions for movement is made. - Concerned about the increase movement to their own property. - Preference would be for the extension not to be attached to the wall of their house. - General concern about the disruption that the works would cause. 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>Chetwynd and Twisden Roads Residents Association Committee objected on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The erection of a mansard roof would entirely destroy the rhythm and uniformity of the intact butterfly roofs and the integrity of this group of three dwellings (61-65) and their wider streetscape setting. - Inconsistent/misleading drawings submitted. - Viewed from Dartmouth Park Hill and Spencer Rise east, the proposed mansard would rise above the pitched hipped roof of no 67 and would appear entirely incongruous with its roof profile. - The proposed mansard if approved would add to the piecemeal pre-CA 'Shanty Town' effect and would add to the deterioration of the townscape. - They object to the unsympathetic windows proposed to the rear elevation. - The return infill conservatory should accord with building regulations. <p>Dartmouth Park CAAC objected on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no possible basis for seeing the present application as representing an appropriate exception for the section which relates to Roof Alterations and Extensions within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement. - The Statement was adopted after the grant of no 57 and this represents a major change to the planning context which precludes use of no 57 as a 'precedent'. - If no. 65 was to be granted permission it would be impossible to resist applications from nos. 63-59 and the historically important traditional roofline would be lost. - The vertical wall at the rear, even if clad with slate, would be even bulkier and would reduce the likelihood of light catching the token valley roof particularly since it would appear to be less than a metre in depth. - In regards to the rear extension, the drawings provided lack the contextual information required and do not accurately present the existing position particularly with regard to the neighbours extension. - The consent should impose by condition a requirement that the doors and windows should be appropriate and in keeping with the Victorian tradition. 					

Site Description

The application site is a two storey mid terrace house, located on the north side of Spencer Rise. The site is not listed but is located within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

Relevant History

57 Spencer Rise

2007/4644/P: Erection of a mansard roof extension with two front dormer windows to existing single dwelling house.

GRANTED 21/12/2007

41 Spencer Rise

2006/3883/P: Erection of a single storey rear extension and roof extension to single family dwelling house (Class C3).

REFUSED 19/12/2006

Relevant policies

London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2006

- S1 & S2 – Strategic policy on sustainable development
- SD1 – Quality of life
- SD6 – Amenity for occupiers & neighbours
- B1 – General design principles
- B3 – Alterations and additions
- B7 – Conservation Areas

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement (adopted 22.1.2009)

Assessment

Proposal

The application seeks for the erection of a mansard roof extension, a rear first floor extension, and a ground floor infill rear extension.

There is an existing single storey rear projecting wing. It is proposed to raise this to form a room above with pitched roof to reflect the adjoining 2 storey rear wing at no.63. This room would have two windows, one looking over the rear garden and one looking over the existing patio. The neighbouring properties both have two storey projecting wings; the proposed rear extension would not project any further than the existing building lines along the neighbouring properties.

The ground floor extension would infill the patio area between the existing rear wing and the longer one adjoining at no.67.

A mansard roof is also included within the application. Two dormer windows are proposed to the front elevation and 2 veluxes to the rear elevation. The rear butterfly roof would be maintained. It is proposed to use slate for the roof of the mansard and London stock brick with replica sash windows.

Design

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.

This application seeks to introduce a mansard roof to a Victorian terraced property. There are three houses within this terrace of houses on the south side of the road, which have a slightly reduced parapet wall line, creating a uniform group. The fenestration details of these three houses are also different, further enhancing and segregating the three as a 'group' within the terrace. Mansards roof extensions with dormers exist further uphill at nos.51-57 including one permitted at no.57 in 2007. The latter was approved on the basis that it adjoined three two-storey buildings, which have already had roof extensions. Although these extensions were built before the area was designated a CA and cannot be taken as precedents, the proposed extension was considered to not appear out of place or discordant with the streetscene and would not unduly dominate the roofscape or the neighbouring buildings.

In the case of the current application, the circumstances are different in that the property is a lower 2 storey house than the ones further uphill, it is within a group of houses with unaltered rooflines and that a new CA statement has been adopted which explicitly states that roof extensions are likely to be resisted, except on the south side of Spencer Rise where previous mansards have been allowed. (note- this application property is on the northern side). The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement (CAAMS) was adopted in January 2009 and superseded the earlier draft one in force at the time that the mansard was approved for no.57 in 2007. Spencer Rise is within SubArea 3. The CAAMS states that this street is one of the few streets in the conservation area which is marred by isolated mansard roof additions which have made their host building too prominent in the street. Moreover the negative features listed for this subarea include mansard roof additions in Spencer Rise. Therefore, this proposal is in contrary to the newly adopted Conservation Area Appraisal.

The mansard roof alteration is considered to create an unfortunate visual interruption in the roofline and introduce a different roof form. The proposed mansard roof extension would be contrary to both Camden Planning Guidance and the new CAAMS 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.

The design in itself of the mansard is acceptable; however it is unclear from the plans submitted if the rear roof form is a mansard one or a sheer wall above the butterfly roof parapet, as the plan, section and elevation do not match. It would be preferred to have a mansard profile here. Nevertheless although the detailed design and materials of the proposed mansard are not unacceptable in themselves, the principle of a roof extension in this location as discussed above is considered unacceptable.

As proposed the roof extension is unacceptable and would harm the appearance of the application building, the character of the overall terrace of buildings particularly nos 61-67, and the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is contrary to policies B1 and B3 and B7.

The proposal also includes a rear first floor extension. The rear elevations of the properties within the terrace have been altered in the past and it is not considered that the proposal would detract from the appearance of the building or harm the character of the area. The extension proposes a sloping roof which is considered appropriate to the character of the terrace of properties along this road which have sloping roofed rear wings, and would maintain the original butterfly roof feature which the rear elevation boasts.

A single storey rear infill is also included within this application. This extension would sit in line with the existing rear projecting wing and would have a set of timber glass doors opening up onto the garden. Due to the extension maintaining the building line of the other extensions either side of the application site, it is not considered that the infill extension will have a detrimental impact on the host property or the wider conservation area.

An objection has been received in regard to noise from construction. The hours of construction on site are subject to control under the Control of Pollution Act 1974. An issue has also been raised by the neighbouring property relating to the subsidence of their properties, as well as the increase on the internal wall and the buildings foundations. These are not considered to be planning issues and are covered under Building Regulations.

The proposed roof extension, by reason of its bulk, height, and form, would be a discordant feature, which would harm the appearance of the building, harm the integrity of the terrace of buildings at nos 61-65 which have an unaltered roofline, and harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Amenity

Although the rear extension is on the second floor, the property and neighbouring properties have an existing projecting wing. As the proposed extensions do not extend beyond the existing rear building lines of the neighbouring properties, and they adjoin blank flank walls of adjoining extensions, there is no perceived loss of amenity on the neighbouring properties.

The works would not adversely impact on the amenity of the adjacent properties with regard to access to sunlight, daylight, privacy or sense of enclosure, and thus is considered to be consistent with Policy SD6 of the UDP.

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