

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		18/03/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		29/02/2016	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Laura Hazelton				2016/0386/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
101 Messina Avenue London NW6 4LG				Please refer to decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of mansard roof extension.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	19	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>The owner/Occupier of Flat B, 103 Messina Avenue, NW6 4LG objected to the proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction noise; and • Impact on daylight. 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		The application site is not located within a Conservation Area and therefore, there is no local Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC)					

Site Description

The application building is a three storey mid-terrace property currently in use as two residential flats. It is located on the northern side of Messina Avenue, which is characterised by a completely unbroken roofline.

The site is located south of West Hampstead Underground station. The site is not a listed building and is not located within a conservation area.

Relevant History

Application site

2011/6062/P - 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) (granted 02/02/2012).

2014/1601/P - Installation of glazed screen to form roof terrace, and new rooflight. Granted 21/05/2014.

2014/1618/P - Erection of mansard roof extension and glazed screen to form second floor roof terrace. Refused 21/05/2014 due to the extension breaking the unimpaired roofline. Appeal (reference APP/X5210/A/14/2221986) dismissed 02/10/2014.

Surrounding area

21 Canfield Place

2013/1815/P - Extension to the front roofslope to provide a mansard roof on front elevation of single dwelling house. Refused 30/05/2013 due unacceptability where group of terraces have unimpaired roofs.

98 Queens Crescent

2013/5739/P - Erection of a mansard roof extension to residential flat. Refused 28/10/2013 (mansard extension would disrupt the unimpaired roofline).

94 Queens Crescent

2012/5567/P - Roof extension consisting of mansard roof to form additional 1x bedroom flat. Refused 13/12/2013 (would harm the existing unimpaired roofline). Appeal (reference APP/X5210/A/13/2192010) Dismissed 18/07/2013.

The inspector commented that although views would be limited from street level close to the property, "The bulk and mass of the side elevations would be prominent in the longer range views along Queen's Crescent to the east and west of the site. Furthermore, the roof extension would be visible from the upper floor windows within the buildings on the opposite side of Queen's Crescent", and therefore concluded that the roof extension would harm the character and appearance of the area.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2015, consolidated with amendments since 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance

CPG1 (Design) 2015

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011

Assessment

1.0 Background and proposal

1.1 An application for a mansard roof extension at the application site was refused on 21 May 2014 (reference 2014/1618/P). The current proposal measures a maximum height of 2.3m, the same as the previous application, but has been set back by 1.1m (an additional 20cm) from the front parapet. The previous application also included a front terrace which has been removed from the current proposal.

1.2 The previous application was subsequently dismissed at appeal for the following reasons:

- The inspector acknowledged that the proposed roof extension would be set back from the front elevation and 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 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.
- The proposed mansard roof extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings, contrary to Policy CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policy DP24 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Camden Development Policies.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main planning considerations in the assessment of this application are:

- Design (the impact of the proposal on the character of the host property as well as that of the wider streetscene); and
- Amenity (the impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers).

3.0 Design

3.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions to existing buildings are proposed. Policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) aims to ensure the highest design standards from development. Policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) also states that the Council will require all development, including alterations and extensions, to be of the highest standard of design and to respect the character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties as well as the character and proportions of the existing building.

3.2 Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1: Design) states that a roof alteration is likely to be considered unacceptable in circumstances such as the presence of unbroken runs of valley roofs or where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations and extensions. It adds that a roof addition is likely to be unacceptable where the proposal would have an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene.

3.3 The application site is located within a long terrace of dwellings characterised by its consistent appearance. The dwellings are all three storeys in height and have front parapet walls which extend above the roofline, with a valley roof profile to the rear.

3.4 The property is not listed or located within a conservation area; however, the whole terrace is characterised by an unbroken roofline which is considered to make a positive contribution towards the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The addition of the proposed roof extension is considered to fundamentally alter the roof form which would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the building, the wider terrace and streetscene, setting an unwelcome precedent which would erode the current consistency of appearance within the terrace. The proposed mansard roof is therefore considered to be unacceptable.

3.5 The proposed extension is set back from the front elevation which would limit its visibility from street level along Messina Avenue, and although it is acknowledged that there are only restricted public views of the rear valley roofs along the terrace as seen from Cotleigh Road to the rear, this does not diminish the importance of retaining this feature in a well preserved terrace such as this.

3.6 The proposed mansard would be clad in slate with lead dressings and the windows would be wooden sashes, which are considered acceptable.

4.0 Amenity

4.1 Policy CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore, Policy DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting planning permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight.

4.2 CPG6 (Amenity) provides specific guidance with regards to privacy, overlooking and outlook.

4.3 The proposed mansard roof would accommodate a new bedroom with ensuite and would be set back from the front elevation. The proposed increase in bulk is not considered to result in a significant loss of light or increased sense of enclosure in neighbouring properties.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed roof extension by reason of its height, bulk, mass, design and 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, contrary to policies 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.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 Refuse planning permission