

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		06/03/2007	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		12/1/2007	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Hugh Miller				2006/5751/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
208 Grafton Road London NW5 4AX				Site Location Plan; 10/11/06 Pages 1-4			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a mansard roof extension to create additional accommodation to single-family dwellinghouse (C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Refused					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	06	No. of responses	1	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		Support the proposal. Would like to erect a roof extension at no.210 Grafton Road. There is a new roof at no.210, concern that proposed roof extension would not have any impact.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		Not in C.A					

Site Description

A 3-storey mid terraced property situated on the east side of Grafton Road, west of Carlton Primary school, north east of the junction with Queen's Crescent and opposite Gospel Oak residential estate. There are 15 properties within the group, which comprises rendered painted finish, raised rendered front parapet and valley/butterfly roofs. Some properties retain their decorative pediment above the windows.

The windows vary between timber sashes to casement upvc. The building is not in a C.A. neither is it listed.

Relevant History

No.210B Pp granted December 1991 for the erection of a mansard roof extension to provide additional residential accommodation for the existing upper maisonette as shown on drawing no. 911/01, ref. 9100752. Not implemented.

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.

RUDP 2006:

SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours
B1 General design principles
B3 Alterations and extensions

SPG 2006:

Roofs and terraces –Roof alterations & extensions –general principles.

Assessment

The main issues are the design and the impact on the appearance of the building.

The application proposes the following:

- erection of roof extension to provide additional accommodation to third floor flat.

There are 15 properties within this group (198 to 226) Grafton Road. The buildings have rendered painted finish front elevation include raised parapets to the front with valley roofs and parapet at the rear. The roofscape remains unimpaired by roof alterations and roof extensions.

Policy justification states that not many streets retain the original roofline of their buildings, and it is important to preserve the roofs unaltered where this occurs. Policy B3 states that roof alterations or extensions, which cause harm to the architectural quality of the existing building, its characteristics and that of surrounding buildings, planning permission will not be granted. Paragraph 3.34 further acknowledges that some roof alterations and extensions to individual roofs need to be treated with sensitivity, such as"where the topography or alignment of the streets allow views of the rooflines, rooftops, projecting party wallsor"*where streets retain the original roofline of their buildings, it is important that these are preserved in an unaltered form*".

The policy justifications go on to amplify that *"extensions to roofs will not always be acceptable. There will be situations, which are particularly sensitive to roof extensions...such as where a street retains its original unaltered roofline. It is therefore important to preserve the roofs unaltered where this occurs"*. In principle therefore, a roof extension would be unacceptable.

The removal therefore of the valley roof and the introduction of a mansard roof extension behind the retained front parapet would be unacceptable and out of keeping with the historic form of the properties.

Furthermore the detailed design of the roof extension including the proposed materials and window types, their scale and proportions are considered unacceptable, detracting from the appearance of the subject building and those adjacent. The introduction of such a roof extension would be a discordant element, detracting from the roofscape. The new built-up side elevation to the main building would increase the buildings height from 10.0m to 11.8m; giving the building an unacceptable amount of additional bulk in both long and short views.

In addition, the removal of the valley roof profile is contrary to SPG seeking to retain such features and in this case would be especially harmful given impact on the group value of the terrace of properties.

As proposed the roof extension is unsatisfactory & would detract from the application building & those adjacent. It is contrary to policies B1 and B3.

Refusal is recommended.

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