

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		05/03/2015	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		29/01/2015	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Jennifer Chivers				2014/7785/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
145 Malden Road London NW5 4HT				see draft decision			
<b>PO 3/4</b>		<b>Area Team Signature</b>		<b>C&amp;UD</b>		<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Erection of mansard roof extension and two storey rear extension at first and second floor levels.							
<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>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>17</b>	No. of responses	<b>2</b>	No. of objections	<b>1</b>
				No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>The owners/occupiers of 2 Quadrant Grove have objected to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overshadowing</li> <li>-Privacy</li> <li>-Dominance</li> <li>-Amenity</li> <li>-Sense of enclosure</li> </ul> <p><i>Officer Comment: These elements are discussed as part of the report below.</i></p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify		There are no relevant local groups.					

## Site Description

The application site is a three storey terraced property located on the north-east side of Malden Road near the corner of Malden Road and Quadrant Crescent.

The property is within a terrace of twenty properties on Malden Road. It is not within a conservation area and is not a listed building. The property has an unaltered valley roof to the rear and a parapet wall on the front elevation. The property comprises four flats, with a flat at each level.

## Relevant History

9401459 – Change of use from retail and works of conversion to provide 1 x 1-bedroom flat on the ground floor as shown on drawing nos. 548.01B 02B 03A. Granted planning permission on 12/01/1995

## Other Relevant sites

### **143 Malden Road**

CTP/F10/29/1/29749 - Change of use of ground floor from shop to residential accommodation in conjunction with the formation of three flats and one maisonette, including works of conversion, the erection of an additional storey and the enlargement of the first floor rear addition Conditional approval granted 07/02/1980

### **88C Malden Road**

2012/1894/P - Erection of 2 storey rear extension at 1st and 2nd floor levels, and erection of 3rd floor roof extension with associated front roof terrace, in connection with the creation of an additional self-contained residential unit (Class C3). Refused

## Relevant policies

### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

National Planning Policy Framework

The London Plan March 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011.

### **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**

CPG1 (Design) 2014 Chapter 1, 2, 4, 5

CPG 6 (Amenity) 2011 Chapter 1, 6, 7

## Assessment

### Proposal

The applicant seeks permission for the erection of a mansard roof extension to increase the size of the top floor flat and a two storey rear extension to extend flat 2 and 3. There are no new units being created as a result of the extensions.

The new mansard roof would be located behind the parapet at the front of the building. It would be lead lined with two windows at the front and two doors and a window with associated terrace at the rear.

The material considerations in assessment of this application are:

- Design
- Amenity

### Design

#### *Mansard*

Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design) 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.

The application site forms part of a terrace of 20 properties, each with three storeys. With the exception of 143 Malden Road, the entire terrace comprises a run of unaltered valley roofs with all parapet walls to the front intact and valley roof profile at the rear. The adjacent property at 143 Malden Road is the only building which has lost its original valley roof form with the addition of a mansard roof extension. The roof parapet line of the terrace is unimpaired by alterations or extensions.

The applicant has referenced the mansard roof extension at 143 as justification for the proposed changes at 145 Malden Road. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a roof extension on the adjacent property, Council records indicate that this extension was granted in 1980 prior to current LDF policy and CPG guidance. In addition, this is a corner plot and often viewed and treated differently to a mid-terrace property. The extension at 145 Malden Road is not considered to set a precedent for the remaining 19 properties.

The proposed roof extension would be 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 as well as substantially visible from the rear along Quadrant Grove.

If the principle of the mansard extension was acceptable, then Camden Planning Guidance (Design) provides specific guidance on the design of mansard roof extensions. In this case the principle as discussed above is not acceptable and the design of the mansard is also contrary to CPG1. The number, form, scale and pane size of the dormer windows should relate to the façade below. The proposed windows are not aligned with the windows on the lower floors and are much larger and not sufficiently subordinate to the windows below. The proposed internal height of the mansard exceeds the guidance specified in paragraph 5.15. Additionally the butterfly roof does not retain the rear parapet profile, and proposes to build up the rear wall to create a safety barrier for a roof terrace. The guidance also states that terraces and railing are generally not acceptable.

The property is not listed or 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 generally valley roofs to the rear, that is largely unimpaired. 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 unwelcomed precedent.

### *Rear Extension*

Camden Planning Guidance states that rear extensions should be subordinate to the building being extended, respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, and respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area. 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.

The property has an existing ground floor extension, which covers the majority of the rear of the property. It is proposed to erect a two storey extension on top of the existing ground floor element. The extension would be half the width of the building and terminate below the existing a floor below parapet level. It would have a flat roof and be built in brick to match the existing building.

There have been alterations at the rear of the majority of the properties with the predominant alterations to the rear of the terrace at first floor level, including 143 Malden Road. Therefore, when viewed within the surrounding context the proposed extension would be much larger than its surroundings. As such the proposal would not respect the established appearance of the surrounding area and would appear unacceptably bulky, insufficiently subordinate and would dominate the host building.

### Amenity

Policies CS5 and DP26 seek to protect the amenity of the Borough's residents from the harmful aspects of new development.

### *Sunlight/Daylight*

The applicant has provided a daylight sunlight report that assesses the impact to the greatest point of impact on the neighbouring property at 143 Malden Road. The report states that the window will still receive an acceptable amount of sunlight and daylight within the guideline criteria. In addition, the window located closest to the extension services the internal staircase for the units.

The report states that the rear bedroom in the ground floor flat will only receive adequate light with the inclusion of the proposed rooflight. The rooflight is not considered to cause any overlooking, privacy or dominance effects and is therefore considered acceptable.

Given the setback of the properties at Quadrant Grove, it is not considered that the rear extension will cause an unacceptable reduction in daylight and sunlight to these properties.

The additional floor at roof level, due to its location on top of the building, is not considered to affect daylight or sunlight to neighbouring properties.

### *Privacy and Overlooking*

The proposal includes a half width two storey rear extension at first and second floor level.

The occupier of no. 2 Quadrant Grove has raised concerns over potential loss of privacy and enclosure of their garden. The proposed rear extension will project closer to the boundary of 145 Malden Road. However there are no windows located along the along the northern elevation of 2 Quadrant Grove. In addition, the proposal is set back approximately 8 metres from any windows at 4 Quadrant Gove. Therefore, it is not anticipated that there would be a loss of privacy to habitable windows.

**Recommendation:** Refuse Planning Permission

