

<b>Delegated Report</b>	<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>15/10/2014</b>
	N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>23/10/2014</b>
<b>Officer</b>		<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Obote Hope		2014/5405/P	
<b>Application Address</b>		<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
110 Mansfield Road London NW3 2JB		Refer to Draft Decision Notice	
<b>Proposal</b>			
Erection of a single storey rear extension at second floor level to provide additional residential floorspace.			
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Refuse Planning Permission		
<b>Application Type:</b>	Full Planning Permission		
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	Refer to Draft Decision Notice		
<b>Informatives:</b>			

## Consultations

Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>09</b>	No. of responses	<b>05</b>	No. of objections	<b>04</b>
Summary of consultation responses:			No. electronic	<b>03</b>		
CAAC/Local groups comments:						

A site notice was displayed from 26/09/2014 to 17/10/2014  
A press notice was published from 02/10/2014 to 23/10/2014

One objection was received from a tenant at 112 Mansfield Road:

- I would like it to be noted that we value our sunlight on this terrace in particular because the garden faces north-west and is shaded by the house for much of the day. In the evenings the roof terrace is the only place to catch the sun.
- It would also spoil the view along the back of the terrace for our neighbours

One comment was received from a tenant at 2 Rona Road:

- The second floor extension will seriously affect the light in my garden and house and also encroach on my privacy.
- Noise of building work is going to intrude into my office at top where I see clients for psychotherapy

The Mansfield CAAC objected twice to the application:

- The 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor extension would not be within a floor of the original roof;
- The proposed cladding is not a material in keeping with the conservation area.

## Site Description

The application site comprises of a three storey property located on the north side of Mansfield Road towards Rona Road, the site is located within a row of 12 houses (namely numbers 106-128 consecutive).

The site is located within the Mansfield Road Conservation Area.

## Relevant History

### Application site:

**2014/5282/P**- Planning permission for: The erection of an infill extension and the erection of a single storey rear extension, following the demolition of the existing single storey extension. **Granted**

**2014/5227/P**– LDC (Existing) was granted on **02/10/2014** for: The use of the ground floors as 1 x 1Bed self-contained flat.

**2014/5229/P**– LDC (Existing) was granted on **02/10/2014** for: The use of the second and third floors as 1 x 2bed maisonette with roof terrace to the rear.

**2014/6156/P** – LDC (Proposed) was granted on 03/10/2014 for: The use of the first floor as 1 x 1Bed self-contained flat.

### Associated Sites

**128 Mansfield Road**

**E10/3/13/34401(R1)** - Conversion into four self-contained flats including the formation of a rear dormer window and rear extensions. Granted **04/10/1982**

## **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

## **Mansfield Road Conservation Area Statement and Management Strategy 2008 (Page 29)**

### **Assessment**

#### **1.0 Proposal**

1.1 Planning permission is sought to erect a rear single storey extension at second floor level to provide 11sqm of residential floorspace for the house plus retention of the remaining roof terrace on the rear wing. The extension would measure 3.5m (d) x 3.1m (w) x 3m (h) and would be constructed using natural slate, tiled cladding and standard-seam zinc.

#### **2.0 Assessment**

2.1 The main planning considerations material to the determination of this application are:

- the visual impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building
- the visual impact of the proposal on the Mansfield Conservation Area
- the impact on the amenities enjoyed by occupiers of the surrounding properties

#### **2.2 Visual impact (design)**

2.3 The rear extension would be one storey in height and would be located at second floor level, the proposed extension would be in line with the roof eaves, and as such would be contrary to planning guidance. Camden Planning Guidance 1 (CPG 1) stipulates that "In most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged" and as such, the proposed extension would not be acceptable. Furthermore, the proposed extension would sit on the existing terrace and would result in half of the terrace being used for ancillary residential floorspace.

2.4 CPG 1 further advises that the Council expects extensions to respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style and also respect and preserve the historic pattern and not cause harm to amenity of adjacent properties (paragraph 4.10, P27). Although the proposed extension would not be visible from street level, the extension would be visible within the public views from the rear. Notwithstanding, the Mansfield Conservation area appraisal makes specific reference to rear extensions as it stipulates that "*Within the Mansfield Conservation Area there are many interesting examples of historic rear elevations and as such, the original historic pattern of rear elevations within a street or group of buildings is an integral part of the character of the area and as such rear extensions will not be acceptable where they would diverge significantly from the historic pattern*" This is especially relevant to the application as the extension would be at second floor level.

2.5 There is an element of uniformity to the rear elevation above ground floor level and as such, the twelve properties within the terrace consist of 2 storey high rear extensions with roof terraces above and there are three rear extensions at second floor level as observed by the applicant. However, records suggest that

no's 112 and 114 do not have planning consent; no 128 was granted planning consent in 1982 and therefore cannot be used as precedent as the permitted extension at second floor level was prior to the Mansfield Conservation Area being adopted. Notwithstanding, the rear of the properties are otherwise uniform in design and In isolation the proposal is not acceptable as it would disrupt this uniformity of the existing property within its setting.

2.6 Taken as a whole, the proposals is considered to be inappropriate in design and bulk and would be harmful to the architectural integrity of the building and setting of the wider group of buildings of which it forms a part. Furthermore, the extension would also fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park CA. This is contrary to policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 and the guidance set out in CPG1

### **3.0 Amenity**

3.1 It is considered that the proposed amenities of the neighbouring properties would not be compromised. The proposed extension would be facing north thus sunlight to neighbours would not be affected in terms of loss of sunlight. The 3.5m long extension immediately abuts the rear terrace and doors of no.112 to the east which serve a staircase/landing. Hence as this is not a habitable room, there would be no serious impact on daylight or outlook to no.112, despite the absence of a daylight or sunlight study.

3.2. Therefore it would comply with policies DP26 and CS5 of the LDF.

**Recommendation:** Refuse planning permission