

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		12/02/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		27/01/2016	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Obote Hope				1) 2015/7135/P 2) 2015/7247/L			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Third floor rear Flat, 48 Stanhope Street London NW1 3EX				Refer to draft decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
1) Erection of mansard roof extension, installation of 2 rooflights to the front elevation. 2) Erection of mansard roof extension, installation of 2 rooflights to the front elevation and associated internal alterations. .							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission Refuse Listed Building Consent					
Application Type:		1) Full Planning Permission 2) Listed Building Consent					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	04	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		A site notice was displayed between 6 th January 2016 and 19 th January 2016 and a press notice was in place between 29 th January 2016 and 27 January 2016.					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		Not Applicable					
Site Description							
The application site is located to the east elevation to the south of Drummond Street. The host building is Grade II listed building serving as a public house with bar/restaurant and the building dates from approx. 1803. The building adjoins numbers 50 and 52 Stanhope Hope Street which are also Grade II listed buildings. The building is typically four storeys (with cellars) in height and two bays wide with prominent street frontage.							
Relevant History							
N/A							
Relevant policies							

NPPF 2012**LDF Core Strategy 2010**

CS1 – Distribution of growth

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

Development Policies 2010

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbour

Camden Planning Guidance 2015

CPG1 – Design Chapter 3, Chapter 4 (para 4.12 -4.13) and chapter 5 (paragraphs 5.6-5.8)).

CPG6 - Amenities

Assessment**Proposal**

1.0 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a Mansard Roof extension above the 3rd floor flat roof.

Design/Townscape:

1.1 Camden Planning Guidance CPG 1 – Design emphasises that in assessing applications for listed building consent we have a statutory requirement to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

1.2 We will consider the impact of proposals on the historic significance of the building, including its features, such as:

Original and historic materials and architectural features;

Original layout of rooms;

Structural integrity; and

Character and appearance

1.3 Pertinent to the application is English Heritage's document "Mansard Roofs" which states that in many circumstances English Heritage (now known as Historic England) advise against adding any visible extra storey to the roof of a terraced house, particularly when (inter alia):

The existing roof structure is of historic or architectural interest.

1.4 The form of a roof is a key and integral part of the significance of terrace houses of this age and fundamental to an understanding of its architectural and historic significance and in this instance the retention of the existing roof form is key to preserving the building's significance.

1.5 It is proposed to replace the rear roof slope with a roof extension. The third floor parapet wall would increase in height by 350mm . As a result, the proposed extension would increase the scale and bulk of the host property when viewed with the neighbouring listed buildings. This terrace is currently characterised by an undeveloped roofline.

1.6 The submitted Heritage statement has undertaken a broad but limited survey outlining the condition and quality of the original composition/fabric. No evidence was submitted to demonstrate the internal fabric is modern - and any loss of historic fabric requires justification. Expanding the owners' living space is not sufficient justification in of itself. It is however acknowledged the rear elevation and much of the interior of the building has already been altered and extended.

1.7 Whilst the heritage statement suggest that the roof has been altered, this does not reduce the harm caused by the total loss of the roof form. Furthermore, this visible aspect of the roof in situ is an integral part of the significance of this listed building and fundamental to understanding its architectural and historic significance.

1.8 The proposal may also result in the loss of surviving original fabric, the heritage statement does not justify this element. The addition at roof level proposed would detract from the overall integrity of the building's special architectural and historic interest.

1.9 The proposed roof design is inappropriate and at odds with the traditional character and appearance of the simple pitched roof on the listed building.. The rear of the building has been significantly altered and added to in the past and it is considered that anything other than minor intervention in the roof form would be resisted as a matter of principle.

1.10 With regard to the wider context of the host building, the proposal would significantly alter the appearance of the building, by changing a low, pitched structure that is largely hidden from view at street level into a more bulky mansard extension, which will be more prominent. The roof addition would be prominent and clearly visible in long views from the north end of Drummond Street. The alteration proposed would have no public benefit and there is no justification that the harm would be less than substantial to the character and appearance of the neighbouring listed buildings that forms part of the terrace.

2.0 Amenity

2.1 The proposal would add an additional floor at roof level. This would not project beyond the back of the rear projecting wing and would not extend beyond the adjoining properties. As such, there would not be any significant harm in terms of loss of light, privacy or sense of enclosure. Furthermore, there is no terrace proposed therefore, there would be no impact in terms of loss of privacy.

3.0 Recommendation

3.1 Refuse planning permission and listed building consent.