

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet N/A / attached		Expiry Date: 16/06/2016			
				Consultation Expiry Date: 20/05/2016			
Officer			Application Number(s)				
Kristina Smith			2016/1536/P				
Application Address			Drawing Numbers				
74 Hadley Street London NW1 8TA			Refer to Decision Notice				
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of roof extension with associated terrace to front and second floor rear extension.							
Recommendation(s):		Refused					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	29	No. of responses	05	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>No's. 60, 72 have written in support of the application on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality 'barely-there' design which will raise the standards on the street. • Roofline and view spoiled by school extension • Sensitive design <p>No's. 45, 70 Hadley Street have made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask that the principles from the Council's observations concerning the Architectural and Townscape Significance of the area are taken into consideration as well as the previous refusal • Ask that full recognition is given to the special characteristics of the southern end of Hadley street • Similar scheme to previous refusal 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		None					

Site Description

The application property is a house at the end of Hadley St which is part of a characterful terrace of three houses. It is a two storey property with a small existing rear two storey closet wing that projects at an angle from the rear of the house. To the rear the property abuts the playground of Holy Trinity School.

The building is not listed and it does not stand in a conservation area.

Relevant History

No.74 Hadley Street

2012/2376/P - Erection of mansard roof extension and erection at rear second floor level on existing wing all in connection with existing dwellinghouse (Class C3). **Refused 15/08/2012.**

Reason for refusal

- The proposed mansard roof extension by virtue of its height, bulk, form and location on a terrace with an unimpaired roofline, would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the host property and the terrace to which it belongs, thereby contrary to Policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the Camden Core Strategy and Policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the Camden Development Policies of the Camden Local Development Framework.

2015/5273/P - Erection of roof extensions at no.72 and no.74 Hadley Street. **Withdrawn 15/12/2015**

72 Hadley Street

PEX0000634 Erection of a mansard roof extension. **Refused 19/09/2000**

8701150 Addition of a roof-extension at second-floor level **Grant with Conditions 21/08/1987**

60 Hadley Street

2009/5033/P - renewal of planning permission (2004/3978/P) for erection of an additional floor at roof level and build up of the wall around flat roof of back addition. **Granted 04/01/2010**

2012/5655/P - Erection of an additional floor at roof level and formation of a rear terrace at second floor level at existing residential dwelling (Class C3). **Withdrawn**

No's 32-50 Hadley Street

9401783 - Redevelopment of the site to provide ten houses with mansard roofs. **Granted 20/07/1995**

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Paragraphs 12, 14, 17, 56-66, 126-141.

London Plan 2016

Policies 3.4, 3.5, 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8

Local Development Framework

Core Strategy (2011)

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS6 – Providing quality homes

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

Development Policies (2011)

DP2 – Making full use of Camden’s capacity for housing

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG 1 – Design (2015) – Section 4 & 5

CPG 6 – Amenity (2011) – Section 6 & 7

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1. The applicant seeks planning permission for:

- Erection of roof extension with associated terrace to front
- Erection of second floor level rear extension on existing closet wing

1.2 The main issues to consider in this case are as follows:

- Design and heritage;
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;

2.0 Design and Heritage

2.1 Policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) requires that all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, will be expected to consider:

- a) the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;
- b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed.

Roof Extension

2.2 Paragraphs 5.7 and 5.8 of CPG 1 (Design) provides guidance on general principles of roof extensions. It states, that a roof addition is unlikely to be acceptable where there is likely to be an adverse impact on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the streetscene. It lists a set of criteria in assessing this, including where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions; there is an unbroken run of valley roofs; the building is designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level; and where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.

2.3 No. 74 is one in a group of three characteristic two storey properties in a small terrace that truncates the southern end of Hadley St. The properties in have been rendered in pastel colours and retain a number of their original features such as the window surrounds, sash windows and distinctive parapets. The main difference is that the valley roof of the application site has at some point been replaced with a flat roof, the top of which can be seen in some angles. Although noticeable it is considered to be a subtle difference which doesn’t significantly detract from the attractive terrace which is visible in long views along Hadley St. None of the properties have carried out roof extensions (though one was permitted but not constructed in 1987 at no.72 and has since been refused in 2000 and 2015) and therefore remains unimpaired. Since the previous refusal (2012/2376/P) an extension to Holy Trinity School has been erected which, it could be argued, has caused some harm to the previous unobstructed skyline with views of the listed Holy Trinity Church.

2.4 The section of Hadley Street closest to the application site, south of the junction with Lewis Street, has few examples of roof extensions and is generally a well maintained ‘cul-de-sac’ of two storey

properties. Further away from the application site however, towards the north of Hadley Street mansard roof extensions are a more common characteristic of the roofscape. Several extensions were permitted prior to the adoption of the current CPG (2011) and future permissions have been granted on the basis of it not being an unimpaired roofscape and being located outside of a conservation area. Unlike the terrace of which the application site forms an important part of, the rest of the properties on Hadley Street display some variations in their style and architectural detailing and therefore the roof extensions have not caused harm to a uniform building group. Furthermore, they have limited visibility from both close and long views by reason of the width of the street.

2.5 Although the extension has been set back further since the previous refusal, it would still be visible over a long distance and serve to unbalance an attractive terrace which is currently unimpaired by extensions. Furthermore the inclusion of a terrace to the front of the extension would be an incongruous addition that would serve not in-keeping with the terrace. Paragraph 5.25 of CPG1 (Design) states that a terrace will normally only be acceptable to the rear of the property and it's unacceptable to set a mansard back in order to provide a terrace. Although not shown on the plans, the terrace would require a 1.1m balustrade across the full width of front elevation which would further harm the appearance and character of the property.

2.6 The detailed design is also considered to be unacceptable. The use of mirrored glass cladding to the extension is considered to be at odds with local materials which generally tend to be more traditional. The proposed full length double doors to the front would also appear disproportionate with the style and hierarchy of the existing fenestration.

Second floor rear extension

2.7 Paragraph 4.13 of CPG1 (Design) discourages rear extensions that are higher than one full storey below the roof eaves to reduce their prominence. The proposed extension would be the same height as the projecting rear parapet wall and therefore finish above the eaves level which is poor design. At this height, the extension would appear excessively bulky and out of proportion with the size of the host dwelling.

2.8 From rear views the extension would be highly visible from across the school playground although it is not considered harmful to the appearance of this elevation which is an unattractive, uniform brick wall that forms the boundary wall of the school playground. In the absence of the roof extension, which is unacceptable on principle, the depth of the flat roof would be visible from longer views from the front elevation and would therefore be harmful to the unimpaired roofscape.

2.9 On the wider terrace, two storey rear closet wings are a typical feature with evidence of additional single storey ground floor extensions on a few properties. There is, however, no evidence of rear extensions at second floor level. By reason of the application site being more constrained, with a relatively small rear courtyard space, there isn't the option of extending further at ground floor level.

3.0 Impact on amenity of adjoining occupiers

3.1 The roof extension and second floor rear extension may cause some loss of sunlight to no.72 at certain times of day however this is unlikely to be significant and not sufficient grounds upon which to refuse the scheme.

3.2 The proposed front terrace would not lead to any new opportunity for overlooking as it would face an area of the street already overlooked by front windows of nearby properties. The proposed window on the rear extension would not lead to further overlooking as there is an existing window below it and the window opposite at no.72 is obscure glazed.

4.0 Recommendation

4.1 Refuse planning permission

