

<b>Delegated Report</b>	<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>07/09/2015</b>
	N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>07/08/2015</b>

<b>Officer</b>	<b>Application Number(s)</b>
Nanayaa Ampoma	2015/3859/P

<b>Application Address</b>	<b>Drawing Numbers</b>
49 Hartland Road London NW1 8DB	See draft decision notice

<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.

<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	<b>Refuse Householder Permission</b>
---------------------------	--------------------------------------

<b>Application Type:</b>	<b>Householder Application</b>
--------------------------	--------------------------------

<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>10</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		

<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>The application was advertised via a Site Notice for a period of 21 days between 007/07/2015 to 07/08/2015.</p> <p>Neighbouring properties were also notified via direct letters. No neighbour objections have been received.</p>
---	--

<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify	The application site is not in a conservation
--	---

<b>Site Description</b>
-------------------------

The application site relates to a three storey Victoria terrace comprised of eleven properties. The surrounding area is mostly residential with commercial uses on Chalk Farm Road located at the end of Hartland Road to the west of the site. The site is not listed and is not in a conservation area.
---

## Relevant History

### Site: 49 Hartland Road

**2005/0753/P:** Erection of a first floor rear extension - **Granted 03/06/2005**

### 30 Hartland Road

**2013/6622/P:** The erection of a roof extension, including the installation of two sash windows to the front and a fully glazed rear elevation with doors opening onto a balcony for the existing dwelling house (Class C3). **Granted 27/11/2013**

**2009/3327/P:** The erection of a roof extension, including the installation of two sash windows to the front and a fully glazed rear elevation with doors opening onto a balcony for the existing dwelling house (Class C3). – **Granted 30/09/2009**

### 31 Hartland Road

**2011/5667/P:** The erection of 1st floor rear extension for the provision of an additional bedroom to existing residential dwelling (Class C3). **Appeal Dismissed 31/10/2012**

### 32 Hartland Road

**2005/3230/P:** Erection of roof extension including roof terrace at the rear of dwelling house (class C3). **Granted 15/09/2005**

## Relevant policies

**National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**

**London Plan 2015 consolidated with alterations**

**LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010**

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

**Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG1 Design (2014) Chapters 2 and 3

CPG6 Amenity (2011) Chapters 6 and 7

## Assessment

### **Proposal**

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a mansard roof extension. The new space would be used as a bedroom.

The main areas for consideration are:

- Design
- Amenity

### **Design**

Camden policies CS5 of the Core Strategy and DP24 of the Development Policies states that the council will require all developments to be of the highest standards in terms of design, respecting the character, siting, context, form and scale of existing buildings and the surrounding area. Supplementary design guidance contained within CPG 1(Design) provides details on how the above policies will be applied for extensions and roof developments. This states that roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable if they would have an adverse impact on the skyline, the

appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene. This includes:

1. Those developments in an unbroken roofline that are largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions
2. Buildings designed as a complete architectural composition and the proposed development would undermine the style or roof level.
3. Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by an additional roof extension.

The proposed mansard roof fails to comply with points one and two above. Although not all the properties appear to have been built at the same time, their height and external appearance suggests that they are all of the same Victorian period. What results is a uniform architectural composition and character to the terrace. There are no roof dormers or extensions on the adjoining terrace properties and the proposed roof extension would disrupt this unbroken and unimpaired roofline; undermining the architectural composition of the host building and the terrace. This disruption would be visible in views from the street and surrounding properties and is considered to result in demonstrable harm contrary to DP24 and supplementary planning guidance. It would also set an undesirable precedent for future roof works in the terrace.

The applicant has drawn attention to the approvals for similar development at no. 30 (2013/6622/P) and no. 32 (2005/3230/P) Hartland Road. With respect to these two permissions, the 2005 application at 32 Hartland Road was decided under superseded policy. The 2013 application at 30 Hartland Road was granted on the basis that the roof line was already disrupted by the extension at no. 32, and the symmetry between the buildings would be restored by the extension at no. 30. Nos.30 and 32 form a pair of attached buildings only and do not form part of a larger terrace.

The present case is concerned with an entirely separate terrace and is assessed on its merits. The subject terrace benefits from a clear uninterrupted original roof line and the principal of roof extensions in these circumstances is not supported.

### **Amenity**

Under planning guidance CPG6, all developments are required to have some regard for the amenity of existing and future occupants. Policies CS5 (Core Strategy) and DP26 (Development Policies) state that the council will protect the quality of life of existing and future occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for those developments that would not have a harmful effect on amenity. Such issues include overlooking, overshadowing, outlook, sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels.

It is considered that the proposal would have no impact on neighbour amenity. This is because the two proposed front facing windows would look towards the main road and are in positions where there are several windows already.

**Recommendation: Refuse planning permission**