

101b Messina Avenue NW6 4LG

DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

The Erection of a mansard roof to form an additional bedroom to flat 101b Messina Avenue



1.0 Proposal

1.1 The Erection of a mansard roof to create an additional bedroom with ensuite bathroom to flat 101b Messina Avenue.

1.2 The following Plans form part of the application:

051_PL_201 Existing Site Plan.pdf

051_PL_200 Location Plan.pdf

051_PL_402 Existing First Floor Plan .pdf

051_PL_403 Existing Second Floor

051_PL_405 Existing Front Elevation.pdf

051_TS_214 Proposed First floor.pdf

051_TS_215 Proposed Second floor.pdf

051_TS_216 Proposed loft.pdf

051_TS_252 Proposed Front elevation.pdf

051_TS_253 Proposed Rear Elevation.pdf

051_TS_302 Section AA.pdf

051_TS_303 Section BB.pdf

051_PL_350 Proposed view1.pdf

051_PL_351 Proposed views2.pdf

101b Messina Avenue Land Surveyor.pdf

Design & Access Statement-101b Messina avenue -jan16

Letter re101b messina-planning application jan16.pdf

2.0 Planning History

Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	Status	Date Registered	Decision
2015/5684/INVALID	101b Messina Avenue	The Erection of a mansard roof to form an additional bedroom to flat 101b Messina Avenue	Withdrawn	Not applicable	Not applicable
2014/1618/P	101 Messina Avenue London NW6 4LG	Erection of mansard roof extension and glazed screen to form second floor roof terrace.	APPEAL DECIDED	02-04-2014	Refused
2014/1601/P	101 Messina Avenue London NW6 4LG	Installation of glazed screen to form roof terrace, and new rooflight.	FINAL DECISION	02-04-2014	Granted
2011/6062/P	101 MESSINA AVENUE LONDON NW6 4LG	Erection of single storey side extension at the rear, installation of new doors to rear elevation and replacement of window with door to create an internal courtyard, all at ground floor level of flat (Class C3).	FINAL DECISION	14-12-2011	Granted
H4/13/46/12579	101, Messina Avenue N.W.6.	Conversion to provide one 2-room flat and one 4-room maisonette.	FINAL DECISION	29-12-1971	Conditional

2.1 101 Messina Avenue was converted into two flats in the early 1970's. A single storey side extension was approved in 2011. In 2014 the council refused an application for a mansard roof on 101B Messina Avenue (2014/1618/P) but a new roof terrace and new roof light was approved (2014/1601/P).

2.2 Camden refused the application for the mansard roof (2014/1618/P) on the grounds of its appearance. The proposed increase in bulk and possible loss of light and the

potential increased sense of enclosure were not factors that warranted refusal. However the mansard was adjudged to be visible above the parapet wall of 101 and this was considered to erode the consistency of the appearance of the terrace:

‘The proposed mansard roof is unacceptable in principle as the terrace currently has an unbroken roofline which adds to the character of the street. The eastern side of Messina Avenue does not currently have any mansard roof extensions to the front elevation and as such maintains a consistent and symmetrical appearance. The introduction of a mansard roof to the application site would fundamentally change the roof form, as the mansard roof would be clearly visible above the original parapet level (my emphasis). This would erode the current consistency of appearance within the terrace. Hence, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable as the roof extension would be inconsistent with the appearance of the existing terrace.’

‘The proposed roof extension by reason of its location on a terrace of properties with an unimpaired roofline, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building, the terrace as a whole and the general streetscene.’

Extracts from officers delegated report, 20th May 2014

2.3 The applicants appealed Camden’s decision. The inspector dismissed the appeal (APP/X5210/A/14/2221986) on 2 October 2014. He noted:

Additionally, I note that the proposed roof extension would be set back from the front elevation and the suggestion that there would be limited views of the proposed roof extension from Messina Avenue due to the narrow nature of the street. Nevertheless, the proposed mansard roof would extend above the height of the parapet wall. Whilst I accept it would not be a dominant feature when viewed from Messina Avenue it would be visible and given the contribution that the unbroken roofline makes to the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings the proposed roof extension would appear out of keeping.

Paragraph 6 of the Inspector’s Report

2.4 In short the Inspector agreed with the council that the mansard roof peeking above the parapet would affect the character and appearance of the terrace.

Revised application

2.5 Camden Council's only concern in respect of the mansard roof is that it can be seen above the parapet wall and that it breaks the line of the parapet walls in the street. The revised application therefore proposes to remedy this problem. The front balcony has been removed from the previous application and the mansard is angled further back away from the street so that it is not visible from the street, either straight on, or at an angle from up and down the street (see photos below). It does not break the line of the parapet wall.



The new mansard will not be visible from eye level in the street-the road is narrow and the mansard is hidden by the parapet wall. The unbroken roof line will be maintained.



The new mansard will not be visible from Street level from the top of the street looking downwards



The new mansard will not be visible from Street level from the bottom of Messina Avenue looking up.

2.6 The mansard in this revised application is contained by and covered by the front parapet wall and the party wall ridges and chimneys. The revised mansard cannot therefore be seen at street level. (Note that the front elevation plan-051_TS_252 Front elevation.pdf is not drawn from street level to give an indication of materials and scale). The Mansard can be seen from the rear as it sits close to the back boundary wall but this is not a public view. Moreover it does not alter a design characteristic that is worthy of protection like the continuous parapet wall along the terrace at the front of the house. The proposals do not lead to a broken roof line.

2.7 The applicants submitted an application on this basis in 2015 (2015/5684). On November the 10th 2015, the council e-mailed the applicants planning agent as follows,

‘...I have reviewed the previous refusal and the current application and consider that the application is not materially different to the previous proposal. I concur with the previous officer’s recommendation that the proposed mansard extension is unacceptable in principle and therefore any extension at roof level is unlikely to be acceptable. I consider there have been no material change in circumstances that would alter this view. Could you confirm that you still wish to proceed with this application given the above information. ‘

2.8 It is the applicant’s view that the application is materially different from the 2014 appeal scheme. However, the application was withdrawn to provide further evidence that the mansard did not cause any material harm. The applicants therefore engaged surveyors who confirmed that the mansard could not be seen nor did it break the line of the parapet wall. The applicants have enclosed a letter and plans generated by AMU Surveys Ltd information with the new application. They confirm that the proposed Mansard Roof cannot be seen nor breaks the roof line from public views in Messina Avenue. At points E to T along Messina Avenue. they confirm that the proposed new mansard structure cannot be seen at eye level (1.8m high). This was confirmed using the local grid system, Leica TCRP1205 5” Total Station, where all points were processed and calculated with LISCAD Surveying & Engineering Field & Office Software.

2.9 The applicants will also erect a wooden structure on the roof that sets out the outline of the proposed mansard so that the council can see this to be the case during their site visit. A site visit has been requested in the covering letter to the application.

Planning Policy

2.10 Policy DP24 of Camden Council’s Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010 requires that the character and proportions of the existing building, should be respected where alterations and extensions are proposed. The new application achieves this by not making the mansard visible from the street effectively hiding the mansard behind the parapet wall of the terrace.

Other considerations

2.11 The proposal provides an additional bedroom to a family home. This does not give rise to additional requirements such as car parking, waste collection or other matters that would give rise to a refusal of this application.

Access Considerations

2.12 The additional bedroom forms a fourth storey. The current apartment is accessed via a staircase. It would not be feasible or viable to significantly improve disabled access as a result of this application.

Meeting Camden Guidance

2.13 Since the 2014/1618/P application, the council has adopted additional supplementary guidance, known as Camden Planning Guidance 2 on Housing. This was adopted in July 2015. In terms of attic rooms the council seeks a headroom of 2.3m over half the floor area of that room. CPG2 notes that these dimensions will be applied flexibly depending on circumstances. The application proposals achieve this 2.3m headroom over a half of the floor area. It therefore meets the council's guidance.

2.14 The overall floor area created by the mansard is 29m² so the proposals meet Camden's room space standards.

Materials

2.15 The front and rear face of the mansard is proposed in slate with lead dressing where required. This matter can be conditioned and samples agreed with the lpa. The windows will be wooden sash windows to match the style of the original house. These materials can be controlled by Camden by the use of conditions. The materials proposed are quality materials required by policy DP24 of Camden Council's Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010. This is in contrast to the current roof which is in extremely poor condition and needs replacement according to an Inspection performed by a Camden Council subcontractor on 4 January 2016.

3.0 Conclusions

3.1 The mansard in this new application has been angled and set back so that it cannot be seen above the front parapet wall at street level. It does not therefore affect the

character and appearance of the front of the building, notably the line of the parapet wall which will remain unbroken. As such, and not raising amenity or other problems, the proposal should be approved.

3.2 The applicants have had the street views verified by a Land Surveyor who confirms that the front mansard cannot be seen and does not break the line of the parapet wall. The applicants are proposing to demonstrate that this is the case by building a wooden structure on the line of the Mansard for consideration by the council's planning officer at their site visit.