

Delegated Report	Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	11/07/2014			
	N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	19/06/2014			
Officer			Application Number(s)				
Sally Shepherd			2014/3410/P				
Application Address			Drawing Numbers				
17 Shorts Gardens London WC2H 9AT			Refer to decision notice				
Proposal(s)							
Variation of condition 3 (approved plans) of planning permission 2013/7185/P dated 07/03/2014 (for the erection of a mansard roof extension with front and rear dormer windows), namely to replace the front mansard windows with folding doors, add rooflight and increase size of rear mansard windows.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Variation of Condition					
Application Type:		Variation or Removal of Condition(s)					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	30	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		A site notice was displayed from 28/05/2014 to 18/06/2014 A press notice was published on 29/05/2014 The Covent Garden Community Association: No objection					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		Covent Garden CAAC: No comment					

Site Description

The application site comprises a six-storey (plus basement level) mid-terrace property located on the North-west side of Shorts Gardens near to the junction with Neal's Yard. The ground floor is in use as A1 (retail) and the upper floors are in office use.

The site is not listed but is located in the Seven Dials Conservation Area.

Relevant History

Application site:

8800602 – Planning permission granted on 05/04/1989 for the erection of a new balustrade and cantilevered escape landing at roof level.

9200134 – Planning permission granted on 16/04/1992 for the erection of a new glass roof to lightwell and alterations to a window.

2013/7185/P – Planning permission granted on 07/03/2014 for the erection of a mansard roof extension with front and rear dormer windows.

2013/7866/P – Planning permission refused on 27/06/2014 for erection of a single storey rear extension at 2nd floor level to provide additional office space.

Reason for refusal:

- The proposed second floor rear extension, due to its location and scale would result in a harmful loss of outlook and result in an increased sense of enclosure to the neighbouring properties at no.15 Shorts Gardens, contrary to policy CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

19 Shorts Gardens

8500259 – Planning permission was granted on appeal on 30/04/1985 for 'The erection of a residential unit at roof level.'

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012 London Plan 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance 2011/13

CPG1 (Design) – Chapters, 1, 2, 4

CPG6 (Amenity) – Chapters 1, 6 & 7

Seven Dials Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 1998 - all

Assessment

Proposal

Planning permission was granted in March 2013 for the erection of a mansard roof extension with front and rear dormer windows. The application seeks a minor material amendment to amend the following:

- Replace approved front dormer windows in mansard with a set of 6 folding doors to the front elevation to provide a small front roof terrace. The doors would measure 2.5m (h) x 4m (w) and would be set back 0.6m behind the front parapet. A 1.25m high balustrade would be erected in front of the doors.
- Installation of a rooflight on the mansard measuring 4m in length and 1.4m wide. The rooflight would project 0.5m above the roof of the mansard.
- Enlargement of approved dormer windows on rear elevation

Assessment

The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Design (visual impact)
- Amenity (impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers)

Design

Front roof terrace

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1 Design) provides the following guidance regarding roof terraces in paragraph 5.25:

- A terrace will only normally be acceptable on the rear of properties. It is normally inappropriate to set back a mansard to provide a terrace;
- A terrace provided at roof level should be set back behind the slope of a pitched roof and any handrails required should be well set back behind the line of the roof slope, and be invisible from the ground.

The proposed roof terrace would be on the front of the property and the mansard would be set back to allow for the roof terrace which is contrary to Camden Planning Guidance. The doors would be only be set in 0.11m from the roof ridge which is also contrary to Camden Planning Guidance which states that roof alterations such as new terraces and dormer windows should be set in by 0.5m from the roof ridge and the party walls. It is acknowledged that public views of the proposed roof terrace would be limited due to the height of the building; however the proposed railings are not set back from the front elevation and the terrace would be visible from longer views down Shorts Garden and from the upper stories of 8-24 Shorts Gardens on the south side of Shorts Gardens.

The dormer windows approved with the mansard extension were slightly smaller in size than the windows below and maintained the symmetry of the front elevation. The introduction of a large set of folding doors and a roof terrace is considered to be an incongruous feature which does not relate to, or respect the host building or wider group of buildings. The proposed front roof is considered to be unacceptable in terms of its design, size and siting and would be contrary to Local Development Framework policies CS14 and DP24 and DP25.

Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a roof terrace at the neighbouring property (no. 19). Planning permission was refused for the proposal and it was later granted on appeal. As the permission was granted in 1985, it is a historic case which is given very little weight as planning policy has been substantially amended since then. The roof terrace at no. 19 is set back a lot further than the

proposed roof terrace; however it is visible from the street and is considered to be a harmful addition in the conservation area. Existing developments that cause harm to their environment should not be used as a precedent for new proposals.

Rooflight

A large rooflight is proposed which would project by 0.5m above the roof of the mansard so that it is level with the top of the party wall which is contrary to Camden Planning Guidance 1 which states (para. 5.15) that a 0.4m gap should be left between the roof of a mansard and the party wall. The rooflight is considered to project too far above the roof, rather than sitting flush with the roof profile and is considered to be unacceptable and contrary to the Local Development Framework policies CS14 and DP24 and DP25.

Rear mansard windows

It is proposed to enlarge the rear dormer windows by 0.5m in height and 0.4m and 0.2m in width. The proposed windows are not aligned with the windows below (as was the case previously) and do not match in terms of proportions. The windows would result in a mansard which is at a 90° angle from the roof and would no longer be of a true mansard design. The windows are considered to be an incongruous addition which would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the host property which would be contrary to the Local Development Framework policies CS14 and DP24 and DP25.

Amenity

Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design) paragraph 5.23 states that balconies and terraces can provide valuable amenity space. However, they can also cause nuisance to neighbours. Potential problems include overlooking and privacy, daylight, noise, light spillage and security. Due to the size of the balcony, it is unlikely that it would be used on a regular basis as outdoor amenity space. In addition, the property is used as an office and so even if the balcony was used, it is unlikely to cause harm to neighbouring residential amenity due to the time restrictions. The increase in the size of the front opening would lead to a greater potential for overlooking into neighbouring properties, however the building opposite the site would be full storey lower than proposed mansard and so views into this property would be limited.

The increase in the size of the rear windows is not considered to exacerbate any existing amenity issues assessed under the parent permission (2013/7185/P) for the mansard roof extension.

Recommendation

Refuse Planning Permission