

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Delegated Report | | Analysis sheet | | Expiry Date: | 28/02/2008 | |
| | | N/A | | Consultation Expiry Date: | 20/02/2008 | |
| Officer | | | Application Number(s) | | | |
| Jenny Fisher | | | 1. 2007/3995/P 2. 2007/3996/L | | | |
| Application Address | | | Drawing Numbers | | | |
| 52 Stanhope Street London NW1 3EX | | | Refer to draft decision notice. | | | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signature | C&UD | Authorised Officer Signature | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | |
| 1. Erection of mansard roof extension to provide additional floorspace to existing first/second floor maisonette (Class C3). 2. Works associated with the erection of mansard roof extension to provide additional floorspace to existing first/second floor maisonette (Class C3). | | | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | Refuse permission and 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 | 09 | No. of responses | 00 | No. of objections | 00 |
| | | | No. electronic | 00 | | |
| Summary of consultation responses: | A site notice was displayed from 04/02/08 to 25/02/08. Adjoining owners/occupiers No reply to date. | | | | | |
| Local groups comments: | Local Groups No reply to date. | | | | | |

Site Description

This Grade II listed building forms one of a pair of properties dating from c.1804. The building is constructed of yellow stock brick and stands 3 storeys tall with a basement. It is situated on the east side of Stanhope Street between Drummond Street and William Road.

The site in question forms part of a small group – 50 and 52 are a pair of Grade II listed houses, a later 20th century infill block is located at 54-56, and a further pair of early 19th century non listed properties stand at 58 and 60. None of these buildings have mansard roofs and all are characterised by their lack of visible roof forms and strong parapet lines. To the rear, nos. 50 and 52 have matching traditional valley roofs. The site is not located within a conservation area. The building is in use as 2 self-contained flats.

Relevant History

No relevant planning history.

Relevant policies

Replacement UDP 2006: S1/S2; SD1; SD6; H1; B1; B3; and B6

Camden Planning Guidance Dec. 2006: conservation areas; daylight; design; extensions; listed buildings; roofs

Assessment

Proposed is a mansard roof at 3rd floor level. This would be a traditional two planed structure with two modest dormer windows to the front and rear elevations.

Land Use

The extension would provide space (3rd floor) for an additional two bedrooms and an extra bathroom for the existing 2 bedroom self-contained flat that currently covers first and second floors. Provision of additional residential floorspace is considered to be acceptable.

Design

It is considered that the proposal is unacceptable 'in principle'. Annex C27 of PPG 15 is clear that "The roof is nearly always a dominant feature of a building and the retention of its original structure, shape, pitch, cladding and ornament is important." Whilst traditionally designed and proportioned mansard roofs may be acceptable in some locations, this is rarely the case where an original roof form would be lost as a result.

The proposed mansard would appear as an incongruous feature within this small group of buildings, projecting above the prevailing parapet line and introducing prominent and visually intrusive brick party walls. Camden Planning Guidance 2006 outlines several situations in which roof alterations might unacceptably impact upon the skyline and a building's immediate context. This includes where there is an unbroken run of valley roofs, where the building is listed for its historic or architectural interest and where terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions.

Given that the listed building retains its traditional valley roof, and that the wider group of buildings are characterised by a lack of visible roof forms, this proposal is considered unacceptable. The proposed mansard roof, by virtue of the loss of the existing traditional valley roof form, would undermine the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

Amenity

The extension is unlikely to harm amenity of adjoining occupiers by reason of loss of daylight/sunlight or loss of privacy.

Recommendation: Refuse permission and listed building consent.

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