



ROBINSON ESCOTT PLANNING LLP



CHARTERED TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS

DOWNE HOUSE, 303 HIGH STREET, ORPINGTON, KENT BR6 ONN, TEL:01689 836334 FAX: 01689 878091

Email: enquiries@replanning.co.uk Website: www.replanning.co.uk

HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION BY MR C. MURPHY

RELATING TO
34 HARMOOD STREET
LONDON SW5 1SY

PLANNING, DESIGN, HERITAGE AND ACCESS STATEMENT

OUR REF: PH/CM/16/248

JOHN ESCOTT BA (HONS) DipTP MRTPI JO TASKER BSc (HONS) BTP MRTPI PETE HADLEY BA (HONS) DipTP MRTPI
JOE ALDERMAN MA MRTPI NEAL THOMPSON BSc (HONS) MSc MRTPI RACHEL ESCOTT BA (HONS) DipTP
CONSULTANT: BOB MCQUILLAN BA (HONS) MCD MRTPI MRICS



1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 We have been instructed by Mr C Murphy to prepare and submit a householder planning application for the demolition and removal of an existing mansard roof extension to his property and for this to be replaced with a new mansard roof addition of a higher quality of design.
- 1.2 Prior to the preparation of this application, a site visit has been undertaken along with a review of all relevant planning policy and the recent planning history of the site.

2. THE APPLICATION PROPERTY

- 2.1 The application property comprises an end of terrace dwelling located on the eastern side of Harmond Street within the Harmond Street Conservation Area. The existing row of terraces on this side of the road comprises 11 houses numbered 14 – 34.
- 2.2 Unlike many other properties within the existing terrace, No. 34 is surrounded by mature landscaping and is positioned within a generous plot, given its corner location adjacent to the highway at Clarence Way.



Mature landscaping around site's frontage with the road with the dwelling set back from street scenes

- 2.3 The existing dwelling is one of the few properties in the area that is served by a second floor mansard roof addition. However, this is of a poor quality of design and is in urgent need of replacement. The roof is leaking at present, is poorly made and is creating leaking issues with first floor accommodation within the dwelling that can be witnessed upon completion of a site visit.



Existing poor quality mansard roof extension.

- 2.4 The only other mansard roof extension serving an existing terrace dwelling within the road is at No. 22, and this forms an attractive addition to the dwelling when viewed from the street scene. This can be seen in the photo below:



No. 22 Harwood Street

- 2.5 It is therefore reasonable to conclude that although many existing properties do not have mansard roof additions, Nos. 34 and 22 are an exception to this rule.
- 2.6 In addition to this, student accommodation has been introduced to Nos. 2 – 12 Harmond Street that was granted planning permission under Council Ref: 2013/0392/P. This development although outside the southern boundary of the Conservation Area, is read in conjunction with the adjacent terraces at Nos. 14 – 34 Harmond Street and therefore affects and forms part of the characteristic of the Conservation Area as a result. The approved development at Nos. 2 -12 Harmond Street included a mansard roof extension.
- 2.7 The site is positioned within the confines of the Harmond Street Conservation Area and therefore the Conservation Area Estate has been reviewed within the policy section of this submission.
- 2.8 With regard to relevant planning history, permission was refused for the erection of a mansard roof extension to the existing dwelling on 7th June 2013 under Council Ref: 2013/2299/P. The design is the same as that which is herewith submitted for determination, with the exception of the provision of this Statement which represents a new material consideration in this case.
- 2.9 In refusing the application in 2013, the Council’s Delegated Report concluded that there was an objection in principle to an additional storey. The report stated that “If the principle of an additional storey was considered acceptable, the detailed design of the rear profile and the retention the valley roof would be in accordance with CPG1 – Design. The proposed internal head room height of 2m is largely compliant with CPG guidelines. However, it is the principle of an enlarged roof addition which is the main concern and the precedent that this proposal would set. The Council therefore refused

planning permission on the grounds that it felt the principle of a roof extension was unacceptable and that it would create an unwelcome structural interruption in an otherwise unaltered roofscape. The Council was also concerned that the scheme would set a precedent for future additions along the terrace. The Council suggested in its report that the roof addition at No. 22 was visually dominant with it projecting above the roof.

3. THE APPLICATION PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application continues to propose the removal of the existing mansard roof extension which currently serves No. 34 Harwood Street, and for this to be replaced with a new mansard roof addition of a higher quality of design. The roof addition has been designed to not be materially larger than that which it replaces, and would be set back from the building's front and rear facades with the property continuing to be surrounded by mature landscaping.
- 3.2 The submission of the application is motivated by the significant issues with the design of the existing roof addition which is of a poor quality and is causing damp and leaking into the main house itself. It is therefore essential that the existing mansard roof addition is replaced as a matter of urgency. A case officer is invited to inspect these issues upon completion of a site visit.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 Relevant planning policy is contained within the Council's Core Strategy and its Development Policies document along with the Camden Planning Guidance that was adopted in 2011. The Harmood Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy is also relevant to the determination of this application.

Core Strategy

- 4.2 Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy concerns managing the impact of growth and development and requires all proposals to be of a high quality of design that has regard to its surroundings.
- 4.3 Core Strategy Policy 14 refers to promoting high quality places and conserving the Borough's heritage. It requires for any development affecting heritage assets to respect and enhance their appearance.

Development Policies

- 4.4 Policy DP24 concerns securing high quality design and requires all new development proposals to be of the highest quality of architectural merit. Policy DP25 concerns conserving Camden's heritage and reaffirms the thrust of Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy.
- 4.5 Camden Planning Guidance Note 1 concerning design contains a section on roof terraces and balconies, and in determination the previous application in 2013, the Council was satisfied that compliance with this policy was achieved.

Harmood Street Conservation Area Statement

- 4.6 The Conservation Area Guidance for Harmood Street confirms that the application property is within the confines of this area. The guidance notes state that Nos. 14 – 34 Harmood Street contribute to the character of the Conservation Area, but acknowledges that the row of houses is interrupted by “the occasional roof extension”. The roof extensions at Nos. 22 and 34 therefore form a characteristic of the Conservation Area as it is defined.
- 4.7 In terms of design guidance relating to the Conservation Area, this states that “roof alterations are more likely to affect the character of the Conservation Area, particularly the addition of mansards. However, the guidance does not state an objection in principle to these being introduced.

5. PLANNING MERITS AND CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 In determining the previous application in 2013, the Council was satisfied that the design of the replacement mansard roof extension would comply with the Council's design guidance, and that no harm would be caused to the residential amenities of previously surrounding properties.
- 5.2 The Council's sole concern appeared to be an in principle objection to the introduction of a dormer feature on the roof and that an altered terrace of valley roofs was of greater importance to the Harmond Street Conservation Area and therefore an objection in principle was raised to the application.
- 5.3 From reviewing the design guidance, this does not raise an in principle objection to roof alterations of this type, although it does comment on that there are many examples of properties which have not had such roof additions.
- 5.4 In determining the 2013 application, the objection was raised in principle to the roof addition, but the fact of the matter in this case is that No. 34 Harmond Street is served by such an addition at present (making it unique in this regard in conjunction with No. 22).
- 5.5 Given the design, faults and issues with the existing mansard, it is essential for this to be replaced and there can be no objection in principle to the replacement of the feature on a like for like basis as no material change to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be caused.
- 5.6 The plans provided demonstrate that when viewed from the public domain, the mansard roof addition would not comprise a substantial or overbearing addition to the roofspace, and the proposed elevations show the dotted overlay of the existing feature to be removed. The new feature would not be noticeably materially larger than this and it is

therefore requested for the Council to take this into account when determining this application.

- 5.7 It is essential for the existing mansard roof to be replaced which is of a poor quality of design in order to address problems with the roof leaking at present. The Council is asked to visit the site in order to inspect these issues as part of its determination.
- 5.8 It is noted that the Council previously refused planning permission for a roof addition with concerns that granting consent for an addition at No. 34 Harwood Street could set an unacceptable precedent for other roof additions within the road. However, this would not be the case. As the Council's Conservation Area Guidance acknowledges, Nos. 14 – 34 include a couple of examples of existing roof additions that were added to properties prior to the adoption of its Conservation Area Guidance. These examples are at Nos. 22 and at the application property. The application does not seek permission for a new mansard where there is none at present and solely seeks to replace the existing with one of a better design. Therefore, the application would raise no precedent to support any case for neighbouring homes to have similar additions where there is none at present.
- 5.9 The application should therefore be determined on its own individual merits and the replacement of the existing mansard roof extension with one of a better design should be afforded significant weight.
- 5.10 Taking these material considerations into account, it is respectfully requested for planning permission to be granted.