

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>17/09/2007</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>06/09/2007</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Alex Bushell				1) 2007/3681/P; and 2) 2007/3685/L			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
53 Arlington Road London NW1 7ES				See 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>							
1) The erection of a mansard roof with rear balcony as an extension to the existing single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3); and 2) Works associated with the erection of mansard roof, alterations to windows at rear second floor level, addition of rainwater pipes to front and rear elevations and internal alterations at second floor level all in connection with existing single-family dwellinghouse (C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		1) Grant Planning Permission subject to Conditions; 2) Grant Listed Building Consent subject to Conditions.					
<b>Application Type:</b>		1) Full Planning Permission; and 2) Listed Building Consent.					
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>32</b>	No. of responses No. Electronic	<b>02 01</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Site notice displayed 16/8/7  2x letters of support from occupants of 51 and 57 Arlington Road on grounds that it would replace unsightly 70s alterations with a roofline in the style of the original terrace.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>		The Camden Town CAAC objects in the following grounds: the addition of a mansard would compound insensitive 70s permissions for roof extensions; the mansard dormers are poorly detailed and the neighbouring example should not form a template (this has been revised); the false parapet to the front should be retained (revised drawings show the parapet to be retained); new front rwp would detract from the terrace as a whole by introducing clutter and vertical emphasis (revised drawing has removed this from the scheme); the chimney stack and pots rising from the back is characteristic of the terrace and should be retained (the revisions show the stack to be retained but not the pots); the large window on the new mansard floor would be over dominant and the reinstatement of the tiling below should have a 'sweeping tilt' (the revisions show a set back to the top floor, although the reintroduced tiling is vertical).					

## Site Description

3-storey mid-terrace late Georgian town house. The building is grade II listed and is considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Camden Town Conservation Area of which it forms a part. The existing use is a single family dwellinghouse.

## Relevant History

Versions of the current scheme were submitted and subsequently withdrawn following officer advice - the current applications were submitted to address negotiations.

## 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.

UDP: B1, B3, B6, B7, SD6

SPG: Camden Town CA Statement

CPG: Roofs and terraces

## Assessment

The application proposed the erection of an additional floor to provide additional habitable accommodation for the existing single family dwelling house. The proposed extension would take the form of a traditional mansard at the front with a more modern glazed approach at the rear. The scheme includes a reinstatement of the characteristic hanging tile arrangement on the floor below (the existing top floor) and various other works subject to LB control.

Following negotiation, the following revisions have been submitted:

- The retention of the existing front parapet;
- The redesign of the front mansard window to match to height and proportions of the neighbour;
- The removal of the proposed rwp on the front elevation;
- The retention of the rear chimney stack; and
- Consequential modifications to the rear of the roof extension behind the parapet.

The material considerations are as follows:

- The presumption is to retain all original roofs as features of architectural and historic interest which add to the building special interest of the building. In this instance the upper (2nd) has been severely modified - the internal partitions have been removed and it contains a very large aluminium rear window - although the skirting and fireplace do survive. The original roof form has also been lost and the building currently has a flat roof. In streetscape terms the general guidance is to only allow roof extensions where they, amongst other things, do not interrupt an unbroken group of roofs. The application site is adjacent to a group of buildings with mansard roof extensions and would continue the pattern of development along the terrace. As such the principle of a mansard roof on this property is considered acceptable subject to the detailed design.
- Following amendments requested by the Council, including retaining the parapet cornice, removing the front elevation RWP and adjusting the position of the dormers and the retention of the chimney with associated changes at the rear, the Council's concerns have been addressed and the design of the mansard roof is considered acceptable. The design would be architecturally sympathetic with the building and adjacent existing mansard extensions.
- Internally the proposal would retain the surviving features of interest - re-establish subdivision on the 2nd floor and provide a stair to match the exiting original stair. At the rear the proposal would reinstate the slate hung tiles and the design mansard at the rear would match the recently approved extension next door.
- The works comply with policies B1, 3, 6 and 7 of the UDP would not harm the special architectural or historic interest of the grade II property or be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such the proposal is considered acceptable.
- The new mansard introduces a built relationship to the block of flats at the front (opposite - 30m + away) and the terrace at the rear (over 100m separation) that is the same as the neighbour and would not materially worsen the existing situation in terms of residential amenity. Consequently, the development is acceptable in this regard.

It is accordingly recommended that planning permission and listed building consent be granted.

