

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	31/07/2007		
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	16/07/2007		
Officer			Application Number(s)				
Joe Purcell			2007/2785/P 2007/2786/L				
Application Address			Drawing Numbers				
7 Ely Place London EC1N 6RY			Drawings and Plans Schedule Sheet; Site Location Plan; 06 Photo Sheets; Drawing No 001; 02; 003; 04				
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
<p>1. 2007/2785/P The erection of a mansard roof extension for additional office space and enlargement of existing opening to rear facade to flat roof. Installation of iron railings to roof.</p> <p>2. 2007/2786/L The erection of a mansard roof extension for additional office space and enlargement of existing opening to rear facade to flat roof. Installation of iron railings to roof.</p>							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission Refuse Listed Building Consent					
Application Type:		1.Full Planning Permission 2.Listed Building Consent					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	05	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		A site notice was displayed on the 25/06/2007 expiring 16/07/2007. No objections were received.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		N/A					

Site Description

The application site is a four storey building and is part of a short terrace of three similar properties, the building is used by solicitors and falls into use class B1. The building is Grade II listed and is located within the Hatton Garden Conservation Area.

Relevant History

None relevant with regard to this application.

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.

Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

S1/S2 – Sustainable Development;
SD1 – Quality of Life;
SD2 – Planning Obligations;
SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours;
B1-General design principles;
B3-Alterations and extensions;
B6 – Listed buildings
B7 – Conservation areas;

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

P49 Conservation Areas
P113 – Listed Buildings

Assessment

Proposal

The applicant seeks planning permission and listed building consent for the installation of a mansard at roof level to allow for additional office space. The principle consideration with regard to this application is the impact the extension would have on the character and appearance of the listed building, streetscene and wider conservation area.

Impact on the character and appearance of the listed building, streetscene and conservation area

This proposal is for the addition of a mansard roof to the property. This would involve the removal of the existing relatively unaltered 'M' shaped roof, which is concealed behind a parapet to the front elevation and is expressed as a two planed mansard to the rear. The proposed roof addition aims to replicate the profile of the existing roof to the rear, albeit with the retention of a section of modified wall above the existing parapet line. To the front elevation the roof addition would take the form of a traditional two-planed mansard with dormer windows.

This building forms part of a group of three similar listed buildings, all of which are currently characterised by a strong parapet line, and concealed roof structures to the front elevation. Other buildings within the immediate area do have added mansard roofs, however this group of buildings have a lower parapet line than the neighbouring properties and form a distinct group.

It is the Local Planning Authorities view that the proposed additional floor would add significant bulk to the building and would detract from the coherency of the group. To the front elevation, the introduction of a visible roof structure would undermine the characteristic strong parapet line, particularly as the buildings are highly prominent in views from Ely Place and Charterhouse Street.

To the rear, the creation of a shallow roof terrace and balustraded parapet fail to conform to the traditional mansard pattern, usually characterised by a narrow hidden gutter and sash windows partially concealed by the solid brickwork parapet. Furthermore, the modified elevation above the existing parapet line appears incongruous, particularly with the retention of a small shallow window and the uncomfortably elongated door to the roof terrace that breaks the former parapet line.

The proposed additional floor would result in the removal of the distinctive existing M shaped roof that is a feature of this mid Georgian building and a significant part of its special architectural and historic interest. This is clearly contrary to PPG 15 advice contained at Annex C27 that states "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." English Heritage guidance on Mansard Roofs also advises against the addition of a visible extra storey where the appearance of the terrace would be upset and where the existing roof structure is of interest.

The applicant states in the submitted application that the building opposite at 35 Ely Place recently had a mansard extension granted. This information is incorrect and an application at this address for a mansard extension was refused due to the proposed bulk, scale and detailed design of the proposal. The terrace from 10 Ely Street onwards is of a different type of design of building and is not listed.

Conclusion

As such, the proposal is considered damaging to both the appearance of the listed building and to the prevailing character and appearance of this part of the Hatton Garden Conservation Area. The Local Planning Authority view the proposal for an additional floor to the building is unacceptable by virtue of its bulk, height, scale and detailed design. This is contrary to policies B1, B3, B6 and B7 of the Camden Replacement UDP as well as advice contained within PPG 15 and English Heritage guidance. The application is recommended for planning permission refusal and listed building consent refusal.

