

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		21/10/2016	
				Consultation Expiry Date:		28/09/2016	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Helaina Farthing				2016/4754/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
34 Harmood Street London NW1 8DJ				Refer to decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a mansard roof extension to existing dwelling (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		1. Refuse Planning permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	5	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		A site notice was displayed from 07/07/2016 and a public notice was published in the Ham & High from the 02/07/2016.					
CAAC/Local groups comments: N/A		No CAAC					

Site Description

The application site is a two storey end of terrace property with a second floor roof extension located on the eastern side of Harmood Street. At the rear a two part single storey ground floor extension exists.

The surrounding area primarily consists of residential development. In particular, No's 14-34 along Harmood Street forms a terrace of two-storey houses on the east side of the street at the junction with Clarence Way and Harmood Street.

The property is not listed; it is located in the Harmood Street Conservation Area and listed as a positive contributor.

Relevant History

34 Harmood Street

June 2013 – **PP Refused** – Erection of Mansard Roof Extension to residential house (Class C3); 2013/2299/P.

Nb: The proposed application (2016/4754/P) is for the same scheme as that refused in 2013. No changes have been made to this scheme; however, further information was put forward in the design and access statement.

2- 12 Harmood Street

The Design and Access Statement made reference to the planning permission at 2-12 Harmood Street ref: 2008/2981/P (as amended by planning permission ref: 2012/4135/P) as an established precedent to be taken into consideration. In particular, reference was made to the Section 73 variation of condition application ref: **2013/0392/P**, which was required to remedy breaches in planning control that resulted from an enforcement investigation. The variation of condition application was refused by the Council and subsequently appealed. The appeal was dismissed whereby the inspector supported enforcement action to remedy the breach in height and design of the built roof extension.

No changes to the relevant policy have occurred since the 2013 application.

April 2013 – **PP Granted** - Erection of a single storey rear extension as a replacement of existing to single dwelling house (Class C3); 2013/0730/P.

18 Harmood Street

September 1992- **PP Refused**– Erection of a mansard roof extension with dormer windows at front and rear together with the provision of rear roof terrace at second floor level; ref. 9200399 for reason as follows:

The proposed roof extension would have an adverse effect on the appearance of the building and terrace by reason of its bulk and detailed design and would therefore be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.

The decision was appealed and dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 1st July 1993 (reference T/APP/X5210/A/93/220659/P2). The Planning Inspector concluded that the mansard would “significantly increase the height and mass of the house, which would harmfully detract from the predominant continuity of line and uniformity of design in this attractive terrace.”

May 2013 – **PP Refused** - Erection of a mansard roof extension with front and rear dormer windows

to dwelling house (Class C3); ref. 2013/2127/P

22 Harmood Street

October 1982 - PP Granted - The construction of a roof extension; ref. 34752

Relevant policies

National and Regional Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan (2016) (Sections 7.4 Local Character and 7.6 Architecture).

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's Heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

CPG1 Design (2015; Section 2, 3, 4 and 5)

CPG2 Housing (2015; Section 4)

CPG6 Amenity (2011; Section 2,3,4,5,6 and 9)

Harmood Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2005)

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a mansard roof extension. The proposal does not differ from the refused application in 2013 and no changes in policy

2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main planning considerations relate to:

- Design (principle of development and detailed design);
- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

3.0 Design

3.1 Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within policy DP24 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the quality of materials to be used. Policy DP25 'Conserving Camden's Heritage' states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.

3.2 CPG1 design guidance advises roof alterations are likely to be acceptable when: there is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would help to re-unite a group of buildings and townscape; and that alterations will be unacceptable where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the

whole terrace or group as a coordinated design. The Harmood Street Conservation Area Statement also strongly discourages roof additions, in particular mansards, as having an impact on the character of the conservation area (pg. 10).

3.3 On the east side of Harmood Street lies 11 terraces houses nos. 14 – 34. With the exception of host building (no.34) and no. 22 with roof extensions, the roof of the houses remain largely unimpacted by roof extensions. Whilst the existing roof form on the host building is largely obscured from view due to its low height, the mansard extension at no.22 is visually dominant as it projects above the roof. The pattern of the predominantly unaltered valley roofs is replicated within the terrace of houses. This is an important feature within the roof- and town-scape of the wider area and it is considered vital to ensure this original pattern of development is retained. It is considered that the largely unaltered terraces of valley roofs are feature which is of even greater importance in Harmood Street Conservation Area.

3.4 The roof extension has been designed in order to limit its scale and bulk by being set behind the front, side and rear parapet and retains the valley/ butterfly parapet profile. If the principle of an addition storey was considered acceptable the detailed design of the rear profile, retaining the valley roof would be in accordance with CPG1 - Design. The proposed internal head room height of 2.0m 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 roof extension has been designed in an attempt to reduce its visibility bulk from the public realm. It is considered however that the roof addition would be visually dominant in both short and long views from the wider public realm and exposing an unwelcome structural interruption in an otherwise unaltered roofscape. Furthermore this scheme would set a precedent for future additions along the terrace which would be increasingly visible from the wider conservation area in both long and short views.

3.6 The roof extension would be visible from the rear of the site, although it is proposed to retain the valley parapet profile it is considered that the mansard roof would interrupt a largely unaltered roofscape, particularly when compared to the existing roof addition. The detailed design of the rear elevation of the roof addition comprises slate plus new PPC aluminium double glazed French doors onto the existing reduced roof terrace floor space. The proposed French doors would be located close to the roof hip and unlike a dormer window would be overly large and is considered unacceptable. The addition would be visible from the private views from neighbouring gardens and the properties along Harmood Place. The rear elevation of each property within this terrace is not fully visible from the public realm due to mature trees and their position stepped along the terrace. Furthermore the resulting precedent and the cumulative impact of any additions at roof level within this terrace and the wider street would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

3.7 The proposed roof extension would result in the loss of a largely unbroken run of valley roofs and would be considered an unsympathetic alteration that would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building, the wider terrace and the conservation area. The Conservation Area Statement specifies that development proposals should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Harmood Street Conservation Area. It is considered the mansard roof extension would neither preserve nor enhance the wider conservation area.

'Precedent'

3.8 The applicant has made height comparisons of the mansard roof with the contemporary development at 2-12 Harmood Street in the Design and Access Statement. The two developments share few relevant characteristics in common and the two sets of buildings are not directly comparable. Whereas nos14-34 Harmood Street is a complete Victorian terrace of houses which remain largely unaltered at the roof level, the development at nos.2-12 is a redevelopment and therefore its height would not necessarily mirror the more established height of the terrace of houses. Moreover, the two sets of buildings are not comparable. The development at 2012 has been the subject of enforcement action on matters of height and design.

It is evident from examining the 22 year old mansard roof at no.22 that intervention in the terrace would be visually dominant and it upsets the unbroken roofscape of the terrace.

3.9 Section 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013 requires for buildings in conservation areas that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. It is considered that this proposal would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and this heritage asset.

4.0 Amenity

4.1 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG6 seeks for developments to be "designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree" and that the Council will "aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight caused by a development on the amenity of existing occupiers."

4.2 Given the host building being an end of terrace, including an existing roof terrace that provide views over a wide area, There would be no additional harm through loss of privacy or overlooking from the existing roof extension.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is considered to detract from the appearance of the host building. It would be out of keeping with the terrace buildings within this group of properties and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Harmood Street Conservation Area and is subsequently harmful to the Conservation Area.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 Refuse planning permission