

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		25/12/2015	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		18/12/2015	
Officer				Application Number			
Tessa Craig				2015/6097/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
21 Healey Street London NW1 8SR				Design and Access Statement, 147/01, 147/01a, 147/01b, 147/02, 147/03, 147/04, 147/05, 147/06, 147/07 and 147/08.			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal							
Erection of a mansard roof extension. Demolition of existing part single, part two storey rear extension and erection of ground floor rear extension with roof terrace above (at first floor) and erection of first floor part width rear extension.							
Recommendation:		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	28	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	00
						No. of supports	03
Summary of consultation responses:		Three comments in support of the proposal were received from 11, 19 and 23 Healey Street.					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		N/A					

Site Description

The subject site is located on the east side of Healey Street and has a rear garden which has access from Grafton Crescent. The property is a three storey Victorian building which is stucco-faced at ground level, with stock brick above and stucco dressings. At roof level, valley roofs are concealed behind stucco parapets. The building is not listed and nor is it located within a conservation area.

The terrace on the east side of Healey Street, which the property forms a part of, has a largely unimpaired profile of valley/butterfly roofs. Due to the site being located between Healey Street and Grafton Crescent, there are public views from the streetscene of the property from both the front and rear.

Relevant History

There are no records for other planning applications at the subject site, however a summary of all applications for mansard roofs within Healey Street is given here:

2011/1557/P - 14 Healey Street, west side of street – refused on 20/06/2011 for the following reason: *The proposed roof extension, by reason of the detrimental visual effect that this would have on the unaltered roof line of the host terrace and the wider street scene, and the proposed materials which are considered to be at odds with the appearance and character of the host building and the wider terrace and street scene. This is contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) and DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework 2010, and to Camden Planning Guidance (2011).*

2011/3177/P - Flat B, 3 Healey Street, east side of street, in group of four buildings of different style to subject property – refused on 31/08/2011 for the following reason: *The proposed roof extension, by reason of its design, bulk, scale and location, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.*

2011/5193/P - 14 Healey Street, west side of street- Granted on 02/12/2011 at appeal. The Inspector considered “*there is not an unbroken run of valley roofs. Nor is there an established form of roof addition or alteration*”, however, this is not the case in relation to the subject site where no roof alterations exist on the east side of Healey Street. The mansard proposed at 14 Healey Street which was granted at appeal, was much lower in height and more lightweight as noted by the inspectorate.

2014/4400/P - 16 Healey Street, west side of street- Granted on 16/09/2014.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Paragraphs 14, 17, 56-66 and 126-141

The London Plan March 2015

Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8

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)

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

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for a mansard roof extension with a front elevation maintenance terrace with full width glazed windows and two access doors to the terrace, with high level strip windows in the rear elevation. The side parapet walls would be raised for the mansard to be erected in the roof. The mansard would be constructed from natural slate with render on the rear façade and aluminium framed double glazed windows.
- 1.2 The existing ground floor full-width and first floor part-width extension would be demolished and replaced with a slightly deeper ground floor extension and a first floor part-width extension which is also deeper and has a roof sloping in the opposite direction to the existing closet wing. Additionally, a first floor roof terrace would be formed over part of the ground floor extension. The ground and first floors would be rendered with aluminium framed windows.

2.0 Assessment

- 2.1 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are design and the impact of the development on amenity.

Design

- 2.2 The Council's design policies seek to achieve the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy DP24 states that development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings and the quality of materials to be used.
- 2.3 CPG1 Design guidance advises mansard roof extensions are acceptable where it is the established roof form in a group of buildings. As mentioned in the site description, the property is within a terrace on the eastern side of Healey Street where the roofline is unaltered (with the exception of a historic rooftop box structure at number 23 which does not appear to have received formal planning permission). There are no mansard roof extensions on this side of Healey Street and the terrace retains the traditional butterfly/valley roof profile from the rear, which is highly visible along Grafton Crescent, and the traditional parapet in the front elevation.
- 2.4 The addition of the mansard roof on this side of the terrace where the roof profile is unaltered would be harmful to the host building, the terrace and the streetscene particularly due to its visibility both from Healey Street and Grafton Crescent. The design of the mansard design would be harmful due to its large size and unsympathetic fenestration details which are inconsistent with the Victorian terrace.
- 2.5 CPG1 design guidance recommends alterations take into account the character and design of the property and surroundings, windows, doors and materials should complement the existing building. It states that rear extensions that are insensitively designed can spoil the appearance of a property or group of properties. Extensions should respect original design and proportions of a building and historic patterns.
- 2.6 The proposed ground floor extension would be modest in scale and subordinate to the host building. The proposed first floor extension, however, would project beyond the established pattern in the terrace of closet wings at first floor (by 0.9m) and would also slope in the opposite direction at roof level. It would be widely visible due to its high level location from views on Grafton Crescent and would be detrimental to the host building and the Victorian terrace which

the property is part of, ignoring the pattern of the terrace.

2.7 The proposed terrace at first floor level would also be out of character with the traditional appearance of the rear elevations of terrace. The glass balustrade would not be sympathetic to the host building and the terrace would be visible from the streetscene to the detriment of the host building and wider terrace. It is noted that 23 Healey Street has a large, modern style extension at the rear, however no planning history can be found for this development and such a feature is uncharacteristic within the surrounding area.

Amenity

2.8 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG6 seeks for developments to be "designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree" and that the Council will "aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight caused by a development on the amenity of existing occupiers."

2.9 The proposed mansard roof extension is not considered to harm the amenity of neighbouring properties due to its location within the roofslope. The proposed first floor roof terrace would also be between two closet wings and would look out onto the rear garden of the subject site and therefore no overlooking into residential windows would occur. Similarly, the ground and first floor extensions would not overlook neighbouring properties and would only include windows facing the rear garden of the subject site.

2.10 The ground floor extension would be 1.8m deeper than the existing ground floor on the south side of the extension. The ground floor extension would be 0.8m deeper on the north side of the ground floor. The first floor extension would be 0.9m deeper than the existing first floor closet wing. Given its siting in relation to neighbouring properties and the proposed depth of the extensions, it is not considered the extensions would harm neighbours in terms of loss of outlook or light.

3.0 Recommendation

3.1 Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed first floor part-width rear extension and roof terrace, by reason of their detailed design and depth, would harm the character and appearance of the host building, the terrace of which it forms part and the street scene, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
2. The proposed mansard roof extension, by reason of its design, bulk, scale and location, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.