

Delegated Report (Refusal)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		04/07/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		15/06/2015	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Conor Healy				2016/2582/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
1 st & 2 nd Floor Flat 153 Leighton Road London NW5 2RB				Refer to Decision Notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Roof extension to create a third floor							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	05	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		No responses received.					

Site Description

The application site is a 3 storey building located on the prominent corner of Leighton Road and Torriano Avenue. It contains a shop (A1) at ground floor with a 2 bedroom residential flat above. This application relates to the upper floor unit.

The host building forms an attached pair with the building at 151 Leighton Road which project together beyond a 2 storey terrace along Leighton Road (no's 139-149). To the rear of the building on Torriano Avenue are two storey buildings (plus basement) which lead to a 3 storey terrace along the remainder of the street.

The two buildings at 151 and 153 (host building) Leighton Road have the appearance of a semi-detached pair and are unaltered at roof level. Both maintain their original parapets and butterfly roofs.

The buildings along the adjacent Leighton Road terrace are largely unaltered at roof level and also retain their original parapets and butterfly roofs. They are considered to contribute to the architectural and townscape significance of the surrounding area through the retention of these features along with their heavy stucco window architraves, parapet wall cornices and rusticated stucco to basement and ground floor front elevations. Some of these feature on the host building. The adjacent building and terrace on Torriano Avenue are also largely unaltered at roof level.

The site is not subject to a statutory listing nor is it within a designated conservation area.

Relevant History

Planning Permission (PEX0200667) was refused in November 2002 for the construction of a Mansard Roof extension as shown on drawing no(s). 02/SKP/2, 02/SKP/721/3 and 02/SKP/721A. The proposal was very similar than the current scheme here and was refused for the following reason:

“The proposal, by reason of its scale, size, location and design, is unsympathetic and detrimental to the character and appearance of the property, its adjoining terrace and the streetscene. The proposal is considered to be contrary to policies EN1, EN13, EN22 and EN24 of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2000 and guidance on Roofs and Terraces in the Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance”

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan 2016

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

CS5 - Managing the impact of growth and development

CS6 - Providing quality homes

CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP22 - Promoting sustainable design and construction

DP23 - Water

DP24 - Securing high quality design

DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (2015)

Chapter 2 - Design excellence
Chapter 4 - Extensions, alterations and conservatories

CPG6 Amenity (2011)
Chapter 6 - Daylight and sunlight
Chapter 7 - Overlooking, privacy and outlook
Chapter 9 – Access for all

KENTISH TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Policy D3: Design principles

Assessment

1. Proposal:

1.1 Planning permission is sought for a roof extension to form a new bedroom. The proposed extension would have a depth of 6.56m, a width of 3.95m and a maximum height of 2.55m.

2. Impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area:

2. Policies CS14 of the Core Strategy and DP24 of the Development Policies state that the Council will require all developments including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest design standard in terms of the character, sitting, context, form and scale.

2.1 The supplementary design guidance CPG1 (Design), states that roof alterations or additions will be considered unacceptable if they are likely to have an adverse impact on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene. This includes:

1. Those developments in an unbroken roofline that are largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions
2. Buildings designed as a complete architectural composition and the proposed development would undermine the style or roof level.
3. Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by an additional roof extension.

2.3 The application building forms a pair with the attached structure at 151 Leighton Road which together project forward of the adjacent terrace and lie on a prominent corner site. The proposed roof extension would be unacceptable in principle as it would detract from the appearance of the host building, unbalance the pair which are both unaltered at roof level and would break the largely unaltered rooflines along Leighton Road and Torriano Avenue. The proposed mansard roof would be viewed within a visually distinct, uniform and intact character section of terrace where no such features exist. Due to the site's prominent siting of the proposal on the corner of Leighton Road and Torriano Avenue it would lead to a visually incongruous addition to the surrounding street scene.

2.4 The proposed roof extension would have a poor detailed design due to its narrow width with substantial setbacks from the side walls. It would appear as an awkward form of development that would be out of place. The proposed windows, particularly on the front elevation, would result in further harm. The front windows are very narrow and resemble no relationship to those below in the main façade of the building.

2.5 Within this context and due to the roof extensions scale, height and detailed design, the proposal would protrude above the existing parapet level and in doing so significantly disrupt the unbroken and unimpaired roof line of this section of terrace, thereby undermining its

architectural composition and that of the host dwelling. Such visual disruption would be compounded by the site's corner location which would be readily apparent within the street scene of Leighton Road and Torriano Avenue.

3. QUALITY OF LIVING ACCOMMODATION.

3.1 The proposal would convert the existing 2x bedroom property into a 3x bed property. In terms of size CPG2 (Housing) states that a bedroom should have enough space to function as a bedroom. Despite the lack of furniture detail within the plans and the pitched roof of the mansard the space is considered acceptable in terms of functionality. CPG2 also goes on to state that 2.3m is a minimum ceiling height with exceptions being made for basement habitable rooms. The proposed bedroom would have an internal ceiling height of approximately 2.3m.

4. HIGHWAYS

4.1 The council's traffic and transport team have been consulted on the application and have raised no objection to the works.

Car Parking

The proposal does not result in an additional unit and would not introduce any on-site parking so would be in keeping with policy DP18.

Cycle Parking

Development Policy DP18 (Paragraphs 18.12 and 18.13) requires development to provide cycle parking facilities in accordance with the minimum requirements of our cycle parking standards (Refer to Appendix 2 of Camden Development Policies document) and the minimum requirements of the London Plan.

The proposed development would extend an existing unit resulting in a 3 bedroom flat. Therefore, 2 cycle parking spaces are required to meet the London Plan's minimum cycle parking requirement. No details of cycle parking spaces have been provided however this could be secured as a condition if the development were deemed acceptable.

CMP and Highways Contribution

Due to the nature and scale of the proposal a Construction Management Plan and Highways Contribution would not be required.

5. Impact on Residential Amenity

5.1 Policy DP26 notes that the Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. Given the siting and scale of the proposals they are not considered to cause undue harm to nearby and neighbouring properties with regards to loss of light or outlook, or overlooking.

The proposal is sited at the end of a terrace which has large parapet walls between each property, the proposed mansard would not rise above this parapet wall. The proposed windows would not lead to a substantial increase in overlooking as there are windows at second floor level at present.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission