

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>05/05/2015</b>
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>09/04/2015</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Tony Young			2015/0946/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
31A Edis Street London NW1 8LE			See 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>				
Installation of a rooflight in the front roof slope.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission		

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>8</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	No responses received					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>	<p>The site sits within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.</p> <p><u>Primrose Hill CAAC – objection to proposals:</u>          “We note our advice of 17 December 2014 on 2014/7586/P, and appreciate the effort to come up with an acceptable solution here, but object to the current proposal.</p> <p>Our starting point is the recognition of the 4 houses, 28-31, as a distinct group in Edis Street, and the significance of the roof form in determining that distinctive character. That is, the roofs on these 4 houses, with eaves and simple slopes to central ridges are visible from the street, not located behind front parapets as in the other houses in Edis Street. The significance of this distinctive character is given particular importance by the fact that the visible roofs are substantially unimpaired. On the front elevation this is true of the roofs not only of the individual houses, but also of the group of four. It is for this reason that the 'Primrose Hill conservation area statement' at PH18-19 specifically identifies these 4 houses in Edis Street as a group where any roof extension or alteration which changes the shape or form of the roof is unlikely to be acceptable. This statement was endorsed by the Planning Inspector when he dismissed the appeal against refusal of a rear roof extension at 30 Edis Street (neighbour to 31) in 2009 (APP/X5210/A/08/2086723).</p> <p>The slopes of the roof on this house, no 31, have even greater significance within the group, because it is the end house, and the roofs form a symmetrical hip, with eaves to three sides. Each of the three hipped roof slopes is substantially unimpaired, reinforcing the importance of the group, as well as of no 31 itself. Its significance in the conservation area is even further strengthened by the visibility of all three roof slopes, the front, side and rear, from the public street (Chalcot Road and Princess Road).</p> <p>The current proposal would still change the form of the front roof slope, disrupting the unimpaired continuity of the roofs to the front elevation of the distinctive group of 4 houses, and to the three-sided hipped roof. Given the visibility of these slopes from the public street, the proposal would harm,</p>					

	rather than preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.”
--	---

## Site Description

The site comprises a 3-storey plus basement Victorian terraced property on the south east side of Edis Street. The building is in residential use and this application relates to the existing upper flat (Flat A).

The unlisted property is located within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area and sits as part of a distinct group within the terrace (nos. 28-31) recognised as making a positive contribution to the conservation area.

## Relevant History

2004/0435/P - Alteration to rear 2nd floor window to provide french door onto roof terrace. Granted planning permission dated 25/03/2004

2014/7586/P - Replacement of existing rear window and doors with new set of doors at basement level. Granted planning permission dated 17/02/2015.

## Wider area

2008/0977/P – no. 30: Erection of roof extension to rear roof slope, installation of two rooflights on the front roof slope, erection of rear basement level extension with terrace over at ground floor level and replacement of existing window at ground floor level with french doors all in connection with change of use of basement flat and upper floor maisonette to a single-family dwelling house. Refused and dismissed on Appeal (APP/X5210/A/08/2086723) dated 17/03/2009.

2007/5006/P – no. 30: Erection of mansard roof with 2 dormers each on the front and rear roof slope, single-storey rear extension at basement level with roof terrace over accessed from new french doors at rear ground floor level all in connection with the conversion of the basement flat and upper maisonette to a single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3). Refused planning permission dated 20/02/2008.

8198 – no. 29: Formation of an additional room at roof level. Granted planning permission dated 12/03/1970.

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

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

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 (Design) 2014 – chapters 1 - 5

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011– chapters 1, 6 and 7

London Plan March 2015 (consolidated with alterations since 2011)

Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013

NPPF 2012

## Assessment

Planning permission is sought for the installation of a rooflight in the front roof slope. The proposed rooflight is a 'conservation type' Velux window (measuring 780mm wide by 980mm long) and would be located 500mm below the ridge of the existing roof and sit in a raised position 81mm above the roof slope.

**Revisions:** Drawings were received showing a repositioned front rooflight with the original dimensions reduced (measuring 550mm by 780mm), level of protrusion above the roof slope reduced to 52mm, and frame confirmed to be grey in colour with tinted grey glass.

The Primrose Hill CAAC reiterated their opposition to the proposals following consideration of the revisions to the scheme.

The main issues are:

- design and impact on the host building, the wider street scene and the conservation area
- amenity and the impact on the adjoining occupiers

### Wider context

The host building is positioned at the end of a long terrace on the corner of Edis Street and Chalcot Road and is part of a group of properties within the terrace (nos. 28-31) which remain largely unaltered. This group of properties have pitched roofs, with the host building having a hipped roof being the end property in the terrace, and are located in a visually prominent position, with the front, side and rear roof slopes all visible from the public realm in both Chalcot Road and Princess Road.

The Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement identifies this group of four buildings as ones that make a positive contribution to the conservation area.

The exception within this group of buildings is at no. 29 which has a rear dormer permitted in 1970, However this permission significantly predates the designation of the conservation area, and indeed current policies and guidance, and is an isolated example in this group of buildings which otherwise appears to have a basically unaltered roofscape characterised by a distinctive roof form by virtue of their common ridge heights, similar front roof pitches, and an absence of facing brickwork on the front elevations, unlike other properties on the same side of Edis Street that have roofs set behind front parapet walls and various alterations at roof level.

It should also be noted that the opposite side of the street also has a different characteristic to nos. 28-31 with its variety of modern roof extensions and alterations which are very different to the largely unimpaired and highly visible roof slopes of the host building and the group of buildings of which it is part.

### Design

The host property forms part of a distinct group of buildings within the terrace (nos. 28-31) with largely unaltered roof slopes. There is only one example within this group at no. 29 (noted above) where this consistent pattern has been lost and this is at the rear. Policy DP25 of the LDF states that the Council will take account of conservation area statements. The Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (sections PH18 and PH19) identifies this group of four buildings as ones that make a positive contribution to the conservation area by virtue of their symmetrical composition and prominence and states that "roof extensions and alterations which change the shape and form of the roof are unlikely to be acceptable". The Planning Inspector recognised the importance of sections PH18 and PH19, to which he attached "substantial weight", when considering proposals to alter the roof slope in dismissing an appeal for a rear roof extension within this group of buildings at no. 30 (APP/X5210/A/08/2086723 dated 17/03/2009).

Policy DP24 of the LDF states that all alterations should consider the existing character of the site and the prevailing pattern of the surrounding development, including the impact of proposed alterations on any existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities. While recognising that the type of conservation style rooflight that is proposed would normally be acceptable within conservation areas, it is considered that the installation of the proposed rooflight in the front roof slope in this particular group of buildings is inappropriate as it would break up the existing regular composition and symmetry of the front roofs, undermining the existing uniformity and pattern, and so producing a visually disruptive effect on the group as a whole. Further, both the host property and the group of buildings of which this is part are located in a visually prominent position with the front roof slopes clearly visible from the public realm in Chalcot Road.

As such, and giving due consideration to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area (under s.72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by ERR 2013), it is considered that the proposed front rooflight would harm the appearance of the building and, bearing in mind its prominent position and visibility from the street, would fail to preserve or enhance the character and special appearance of the conservation area contrary to policies DP24 and DP25.

Furthermore, if the principle of the rooflight addition was considered acceptable, both the position of the rooflight and the degree of protrusion above the roof slope is also considered to be inappropriate in both the original and revised schemes. The proposed roof light would be tucked high up within the left-hand corner of the roof slope so creating an imbalanced and incongruous appearance, and further, the degree of protrusion of the rooflight above the roof surface would also be detrimental to the appearance of the roof by virtue of its raised profile within this shallow pitched roof slope. Camden planning guidance CPG1 states that rooflights should be proportioned so as to be significantly subordinate and should be fitted flush with the roof surface. As such, it is considered that the position and degree of protrusion of the rooflight within this prominent front roof slope would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the building within the conservation area.

While it is recognised that the proposals are attempting to provide light to a mezzanine level sleeping area, it is also noted that a rooflight (whether at the front or the rear) would add light to a space which is part of a bedroom area that already has large openable window/doors which provide both light and ventilation.

The proposed front rooflight is therefore considered to be contrary to policies CS5, CS14, DP24 and DP25 as well as Camden planning guidance CPG1.

#### Amenity

It is considered that the proposals would not have any impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers with regards to loss of sunlight, daylight or overlooking. The proposal therefore complies with policy DP26 of the LDF and the advice set out in CPG6 on this basis.

#### Recommendation

It is recommended that planning permission is refused on design grounds.