

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		12/10/2015	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		17/09/2015	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Carlos Martin				2015/4700/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
21 College Lane London NW5 1BJ				Refer to 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>		Refuse planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<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>14</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
				No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Press notice published from 27/08/2015 to 17/09/2015 Site notice displayed from 21/08/2015 to 11/09/2015  No response.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify		Dartmouth Park CAAC: No objection.					



## Site Description

The application site relates to a two-storey property fronting College Lane, located within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The lane is a narrow path with mostly 19<sup>th</sup> Century two and three storey flat-fronted cottages on the west side, with hedges and high walls lining the other side of the lane, outside the conservation area. The site is not listed but has been identified as a building that makes a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area along with nos. 1-15 and 18-23. No. 21 has a painted brick front elevation and is part of a group of four houses in the terrace that share architectural style, parapet lines and roof forms.

## Relevant History

### Application site

**2006/5447/P:** pp **refused** for the erection of a roof extension including raising the ridge height and rear mansard extension with dormer windows to **21 College Lane**. 26/03/2007

### Reasons for refusal

1. The proposed raising of the ridgeline and change to the roof pitch would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling, the terrace which it forms a part and the surrounding conservation area.
2. The proposed rear mansard extension by reason of its bulk and design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling, the group of four similar dwellings in the terrace, the terrace overall and the surrounding conservation area.

### Neighbouring sites

**2014/4012/P:** pp **granted** for the erection of mansard roof extension at **18 College Lane**. 21/08/2014

**2013/7376/P:** pp **refused** for the erection of mansard roof extension with associated dormers to front and rear of **18 College Lane**. 04/02/2014

### Reasons for refusal

1. The proposed mansard roof, by virtue of its height, bulk, mass and design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the cottage and fundamentally change the historic form of the terrace to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.
2. The proposed rear dormers by reason of their proximity to neighbouring residential properties would cause unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy.

**2013/1645/P:** pp **granted** for the erection of a mansard roof to form a new bedroom and bathroom, with dormer windows to the front and rooflights to the rear to **17 College Lane**. 17/05/2013

**2011/3211/P:** pp **granted** for the erection of new second floor with mansard roof with front dormer window and one velux window to the rear elevation and erection of single storey extension at rear first floor above existing addition to **16 College Lane**. 30/08/2011

**2006/5341/P:** pp **refused** for the erection of a roof extension including raising the ridge height and rear mansard extension with dormer windows at **21A College Lane**. 26/03/2007

### Reasons for refusal

1. The proposed raising of the ridgeline and change to the roof pitch would be detrimental to the

character and appearance of the dwelling, the terrace of which it forms a part and the surrounding conservation area.

2. The proposed rear mansard extension by reason of its bulk and design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling, the group of four similar dwellings in the terrace, the terrace overall and the surrounding conservation area.

**8903558:** pp **granted** for the renovation of existing single family dwelling including installation of dormer to the rear of **22 College Lane**. 17/01/1990

**8802363:** pp **granted** for the conversion of a loft for residential purposes including the insertion of a dormer window at the rear of **20 College Lane**. 19/10/1988

**18839:** pp **refused** for the erection of a roof extension at **22 College Lane**. 05/07/1974

An almost identical proposal is currently being considered on the adjoining property at no. 21A. (ref. **2015/4688/P**)

### **Relevant policies**

#### **NPPF 2012**

#### **The London Plan 2015**

#### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010**

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) 2015, chapters 3 (Heritage) & 5 (Roofs, terraces and balconies).

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011, chapters 6 (Daylight and sunlight) & 7 (Overlooking, privacy and outlook).

**Dartmouth Park conservation area appraisal and management strategy 2009** (page 55-56)

### Proposal

1. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a mansard roof extension with 2 dormers at the front and 2 dormers at the rear. The proposed mansard would be built with natural slate tiles to match existing and traditional timber sash windows, also to match. The boundary walls and chimneys would be raised with London stock bricks to match existing.
2. The pitch of the proposed mansard would involve a rise of the ridge height of the house by approx. 1.3m while the slopes would change from the existing 26 degree angle to approx. 70 degrees. The extension would provide an additional bedroom and bathroom to the property.
3. The proposal is a resubmission of a similar scheme refused in 2006 (see history section above).

### Main planning considerations

4. The main planning considerations relate to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building, the streetscene and the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and the impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the surrounding residential properties.

### Design and conservation

5. The existing building has been identified as making a positive contribution to the character of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The conservation area appraisal identifies roof extensions and additions as an area of concern that may erode the attributes of the character and appearance of the conservation area. The appraisal advises that roof extensions are not acceptable where they would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building, where the property forms part of a group or terrace that remains largely but not necessarily completely unimpaired and where the roof would be visible in long views.
6. The site forms part of a subgroup of four houses in the terrace that share architectural style, parapet lines and roof forms. The wider terrace is contemporary with Little Green Street but the properties are humbler in architectural style with simpler elevations. There are some examples of roof extensions in the terrace but overall it is largely unimpaired. Nos. 21 is two storied in height and the front roof plane is visible in long views from Little Green Street and Ingestre Street, as well as from elevated pedestrian passes of the neighbouring Ingestre Estate. The rear roof plane was not visible through the gaps between the buildings of Highgate Road at the time of the site visit due to the summer foliage but are visible from surrounding dwellings.
7. The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area has a variety and complexity that charts the history of domestic architecture from the late 18th century to the present day. Large mansion blocks and Victorian villas contrast with cottages that contribute a semi-rural character to the area. The conservation area benefits from a number of interesting views. Highly important are the roofscapes, to which the original roofing materials make a significant contribution. In College Lane, the variations of façade treatment and articulation, and mix of eaves lines are considered to provide valuable interest. The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area appraisal advises that *“development proposals will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area”* and that *“proposals for additional storeys will generally be resisted”*. The conservation area retains its clear historic rooflines, which are important to preserve, consequently the appraisal advises that *“additional storeys, fundamental changes to the*

*roofline and insensitive alterations can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will be resisted. Alterations and extensions to the front roof pitch can be particularly damaging to the appearance of the conservation area”.*

8. It is considered that both raising the height of the ridge and the detailed design of the proposed mansard roof extension are unacceptable as they would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace and subgroup of properties of which it forms part and the conservation area generally. Furthermore, the detailed design of the mansard extension, by virtue of its height, bulk and mass would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the house.
9. As mentioned above, the terrace has a largely unimpaired roofline, which contributes to the character of the area. The introduction of a mansard roof with dormers to the application site would fundamentally change the roof form, as the mansard roof would be clearly visible above the parapet level. This would erode the current consistency of appearance within the terrace. The application site is also prominent in long views. Hence, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable as the roof extension would be inconsistent with the appearance of the existing terrace and would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
10. In the recent past similar proposals for mansard extensions at nos. 21 and 21A were refused on grounds of harmful impact on the host building and the conservation area. More recently, the Council approved mansard extensions with front dormers at nos. 16 and 17. However, this approval was justified because these two buildings are not identified as positive contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area in the CA appraisal and they are set back from the principal elevation when considered in context with the rest of this terrace. These 2 properties also featured flat roofs of not architectural interest. Due to the width of College Lane and the height of surrounding properties to the north and south, these extensions were not considered to be read as a dominant addition. A further mansard extension was approved in 2014 at no. 18. However, this property is unique within the terrace, as does not form part of any subgroup of properties. Furthermore, the height of the approved mansard here matched the height of the adjoining properties at either side, thus appearing as a discreet addition within the terrace. The proposed mansard at no. 21 on the other hand would stick out of the predominant roofline of this part of the terrace and would break the existing cohesion between the subgroup of properties of which they form part.
11. Notwithstanding the recent approvals, mansard roof extensions are not part of the character of this part of the CA and would add significant bulk that would be overly dominant in the terrace detrimental to this part of the CA. It is acknowledged that an almost identical proposal has been submitted at the adjoining property No. 21A College Lane (reference 2015/4688/P). However, this does not alter the assessment above or the identification of harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as a result of the proposals. The proposal is therefore considered unacceptable as it would not preserve the character and appearance of the host building, the terrace and subgroup of which it forms a part of, and the wider Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, thereby the proposal is in conflict with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of the LDF as well as policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015.

### **Amenity**

12. The proposed increase in bulk is not considered to be such as to result in a significant loss of light and increased sense of enclosure in neighbouring properties. In terms of overlooking, the proposed rear dormer at no. 21 would face the rear windows and gardens of the properties along Highgate Road, specifically no. 118. The distance between the rear building lines of College Lane and Highgate Road is approx. 16m, which is 2m below the minimum 18m general requirement and therefore the proposal is unacceptable on loss of privacy grounds. The

proposed rear dormers could be installed with frosted glass, as they serve a bathroom and a staircase. However, as this is not specified in the submitted drawings, the proposal fails to comply with policy DP26 of the LDF.

**Recommendation**

13. Refuse planning permission