

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		06/06/2014	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		08/05/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Mandeep Chagger				2014/2238/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
13 Doughty Mews London WC1N 2PG							
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a roof extension to create 2nd floor accommodation with inset balcony to existing flat.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	14	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		Site notice 23/04/2014 – 14/05/2014 Press advert 24/04/2014 – 15/05/2014 No comments received.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		<u>Bloomsbury CAAC</u> We cannot see how the proposal would 'preserve or enhance' the Conservation Area and would lose one of the few (apparently) original roofs.					

Site Description

The application site is a two storey, mid-terraced building and relates to the first floor flat. The building is located on the north-east side of Doughty Mews.

The property is not listed, but is located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

Relevant History

An application (2014/2239/P) for a similar proposal has also been submitted at the adjoining building No.14 Doughty Mews.

Relevant policies

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

DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2011/2013

CPG1 (Design): Section 4: Extensions, alterations and conservatories.

CPG6 (Amenity): Sections 1-7 & Section 11.

The London Plan 2011

National Planning Policy Framework (Adopted March 2012)

Assessment

1. Proposal:

1.1 The applicant proposes:

- The erection of an additional storey in the form of a mansard roof located at 2nd floor level for the provision of additional accommodation to the existing upper floor level residential unit. The mansard roof would be clad in zinc and natural slate and would feature parapet walls and a terrace to the front accessed by bi-folding doors.

1.2 This application is one of two simultaneously submitted, proposing mansard roofs at Nos. 13 and 14 Doughty Mews.

1.3 The main issues for consideration are:

- The impact of the proposal upon the character or appearance of the building, the terrace of which it forms part or the surrounding conservation area and;
- The impact that the proposal may have upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

2. Impact on the host building and conservation area:

2.1 Camden Planning Guidance 2011 states that a roof alteration is likely to be considered unacceptable in circumstances such as the presence of unbroken runs of valley roofs or where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations and

extensions. It adds that a roof addition is likely to be unacceptable where the proposal would have an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene.

2.1 Roof extensions are characteristic of most of the mews houses and they vary in their design, scale and proportions and also use of materials. Similarly, roof terraces are common features of some mews houses, particularly those with roof extensions. On the west side, between nos.18-23 there are no roof extensions; there are roof extensions at nos. 23-29.

2.2 Whilst pressure for change has led to many of the original mews buildings being replaced, Doughty Mews and the northern end of Brownlow Mews arguably contain the best surviving examples of original mews buildings although many have been altered. Nos.13-14 Doughty Mews appears to be a run of two properties with unaltered roofs.

2.3 The proposed extension is set back from the front elevation which would limit its visibility; however, it is considered that an addition of this nature would be partially visible in long and short views. Although it is acknowledged that the visibility of these roofs along the terrace is limited, this does not diminish the importance of the feature to the character of the building or the conservation area.

2.4 The property is not listed but located within a conservation area; however it is located within a terrace of buildings which have a roof line, with parapets to the front and a roof, that is largely unimpaired. Additional storeys would add significantly to the bulk and unbalance the architectural composition. The addition of the proposed roof extension by reason of its design, size and position is considered to have a detrimental impact on the appearance on the wider terrace and the streetscene and would set an unwelcome precedent.

3. Neighbour amenity

3.1 Due to the location of the proposed extension, it would not have any impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers with regards to loss of sunlight, daylight or overlooking.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission on grounds of bulk, design and impact upon the surrounding Conservation Area.