

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		03/11/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		03/10/2016	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Kristina Smith				2016/4729/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
23 Healey Street London NW1 8SR				Refer to Decision Notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of mansard third floor roof extension to create additional accommodation							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	02	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		No responses received					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		N/A					

Site Description

The application site is located on the east side of Healey Street and has a rear garden which can be accessed from Grafton Crescent. The property is a mid-terrace three storey building with an original valley roof. The building is not listed, nor is it located within a conservation area.

The terrace on the east side of Healey Street, which the property forms a part of, has a largely unimpaired profile of valley/butterfly roofs. The site is visible from public views on Healey Street but even more so from Grafton Crescent which bounds the terrace immediately to the rear. Properties between No 31-19 Healey Street are clearly visible and prominent from Grafton Crescent.

Relevant History

23 Healey Street (Application site)

2016/1596/P - Erection of a third floor roof extension to create additional accommodation. **Refused 22/07/2016** on the grounds that:

- The proposed roof extension, due to its bulk, height, detailed design and location within a terrace of unbroken rooflines, would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building and streetscene

Appeal Dismissed on 09/09/2016

The Inspector commented that the proposed mansard roof extension is not an appropriate form of development for this location and the need to provide a larger family home is not sufficient to outweigh the harm identified. The Inspector drew attention to the pattern of valley roofs which are visually exposed within Grafton Crescent.

2016/1593/P - Demolition of existing single storey extension, creation of two storey rear extension, and addition of timber sash window in the closet wing. **Granted 23/05/2016**

2015/6912/P - Erection of a two storey rear extension, first floor rear terrace, insertion of roof lights, replace the second floor rear UPVC window with a timber frame and converting the first floor rear window to a door. **Granted 03/03/2016**

EAST SIDE OF HEALEY STREET (Same side of the street)

21 Healey Street

2015/6097/P - Erection of a mansard roof extension. Demolition of existing part single, part two storey rear extension and erection of ground floor rear extension with roof terrace above (at first floor) and erection of first floor part width rear extension. **Refused 04/02/2016** on the grounds that:

- The design, bulk, scale, visibility and location, detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, contrary to policy 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.

Granted on Appeal on 19/07/2016

The Inspector considered that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area and was of the opinion that the rear of Healey Street is not prominent in wider views and therefore the proposed development would appear "neither dominant nor incongruous", but would form "one of a number of subordinate changes to the rear of the terrace"

3 Healey Street

2011/3177/P - Erection of a mansard roof style extension to rear of top floor flat. **Refused 31/08/2011**

on the grounds that:

- The proposed roof extension, by reason of its design, bulk, scale and location, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, contrary to policy 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.

WEST SIDE OF HEALEY STREET (Opposite side of the street)

14 Healey Street

2011/1557/P – Erection of a mansard extension and installation of solar panels to roof of dwelling, **Refused 20/06/2011** on the grounds that:

- The proposed roof extension, by reason of the detrimental visual effect that this would have on the unaltered roof line of the host terrace and the wider street scene, and the proposed materials which are considered to be at odds with the appearance and character of the host building and the wider terrace and street scene, contrary to policy 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.

2011/5193/P - Erection of a mansard extension to dwelling house. **Refused 02/12/2011** on the grounds that:

- The proposed roof extension, by reason of its scale, location and design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider terrace contrary to policy 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.

Granted on Appeal on 13/03/2011

The Inspector considered “there is not an unbroken run of valley roofs. Nor is there an established form of roof addition or alteration”. However, officers consider this is not the case in relation to the subject site where no roof alterations exist on the east side of Healey Street.

16 Healey Street

2014/4400/P - Erection of a mansard roof and rear extension at ground floor level, installation of glazed balustrade and glazed screening, and replacement of existing window with door for the provision of a roof terrace at first floor level. **Granted 16/09/2014**

2016/4604/P - Erection of a mansard roof and extension at ground floor and first floor level to the rear of the existing dwelling house. Installation of a glazed balustrade and glazed screening to create a terrace at first floor level to the rear of the existing dwelling house (Class C3). **Granted 07/10/2016**

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

NPPF 2012 (National Planning Policy Framework)

London Plan 2016

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development
CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
DP24 – Securing high quality design
DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2015

CPG1 – Design 2015 sections 5.1 – 5.25
CPG6 – Amenity 2011 sections 6.1 – 6.18 & 7.1 – 7.11

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought to convert the valley roof and erect a mansard roof extension to create a fourth floor. The proposed roof extension would be set back approximately 1.3m from the principal parapet wall creating a roof terrace accessed by large glazed sliding doors. The second floor ceilings would be lowered permitting a lower rear slope with two roof lights inserted and natural slate materials used on the roof.

1.2 The new scheme is exactly the same as the previous scheme previously refused permission here ref 2016/1596/P, except that it differs only in respect of the rear roofslope- previously it had a shallow slope, whereas now it has a steeper more traditional mansard roofslope.

1.3 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:

- Design
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

2.0 Design and Appearance

2.1 The Council's Development Plan Policy DP24 requires all developments to respect the character, setting, context and proportions of the existing buildings when considering extensions. Section 24.7 continues this theme stating that development should respect:

- Character and constraints of its site;
- The prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development;
- The impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape

2.2 CPG1 Design guidance advises mansard roof extensions are acceptable where it is the established roof form in a group of buildings. Mansards are not an established roof form on Healey Street and particularly not on this side of Healey Street (east side), which is a rare example of an unbroken run of valley roofs that contribute to the character and appearance of Healey Street and Grafton Crescent. The Council consider it particularly important to preserve the roofline of this terrace given its visibility from Healey Street and Grafton Crescent. Roof additions on the west side of Healey Street have significantly less visibility and therefore cannot be understood as precedent.

2.3 The previous appeal decision of 19.9.16 refused permission for a roof extension here in support of the Council's stance, and this decision remains a valid and material consideration. Circumstances have not changed since here in terms of the policy or site context. It is thus considered that the scheme remains unacceptable and should be refused again for the same reasons as before.

2.4 An earlier appeal decision of 19.7.16 at neighbouring property 21 Healey Street granted permission for a mansard roof extension, despite it being contrary to Camden's planning policy as outlined above. At the time of writing this remains unbuilt. It is important to emphasise, however, that the most recent appeal decision for this street is for the application site and is the only one for that site; it refused the mansard roof extension on the grounds that it is not an appropriate type of development for this location despite the permission granted on appeal next door. The Inspector's report rightly points out the visibility of the terrace from Grafton Crescent and the disruption the proposal would have on the consistent pattern of valley roofs. The Council have queried the

inconsistency in decision making with PINS but received little guidance in response.

2.5 Paragraph 5.7 of CPG1 Design states that “*Additional storeys and roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where:*

- a) *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;*
- b) *Alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form;*
- c) *There are a variety of additions or alterations to roofs which create an established pattern and where further development of a similar form would not cause additional harm.”*

The Council would argue that- a) there is not an established form of roof addition and the erection of a mansard roof would further serve to disrupt rather than re-unite the building group; b) the integrity of the roof form derived from the distinctive valley roof would be lost; and c) there are currently no other visible additions or alterations and further development would certainly cause additional harm.

2.6 If the mansard roof extension at no.21 were to be built, it is not considered that the resultant harm to the unimpaired roofline can be used as a justification for further harm which would undoubtedly result from another mansard extension next door. CPG1 (para 5.8) states that a roof addition is likely to be unacceptable where complete terraces have a roof line that is *largely unimpaired* by alterations or extensions. The Council would argue that the terrace would remain *largely unimpaired* even in the event that the mansard extension is constructed. Furthermore, if permission was granted, then future applications for mansard roofs would have to be granted permission in the interest of consistent decision making.

2.7 In reaching the decision to allow the mansard roof extension at no.21 Healey Street, the Inspector refers to roof alterations at no.15 and no.25 Healey Street. The Council would disagree that these alterations set a precedent for a mansard roof extension given that they are of such a small scale to not be visually prominent from Healey Street or Grafton Crescent. Furthermore, their form and location has not served to harm or impair the original valley roofs. The Inspector who dismissed the previous appeal at the application site agrees with the Council’s viewpoint on this matter.

2.8 In terms of detailed design, there is considered to be an excessive amount of glazing which from the ‘above ground’ windows of adjacent properties would appear as a large void at high level and would subsequently disrupt the size hierarchy of windows which should decrease up the building. Furthermore the large glazed panels are not centred which further unsettles the fenestration of the host building. The design to the rear is more traditional and appropriate to the host building, and indeed more appropriate than it was proposed under the previous refused scheme; however this does not overcome the unacceptability of the mansard in principle, and furthermore the steeper roofslope now makes the extension even more prominent and visible from the street than previously.

3.0 Neighbouring Amenity

3.1 The proposed mansard roof, on account of its size and location, would not cause any reduced daylight and sunlight or outlook to the surrounding dwellings. The terrace to the front of the mansard would be set behind the existing principal parapet wall meeting building regulations and is not considered to represent a decrease in the privacy conditions of occupiers of the dwellings opposite.

4.0 Recommendation

4.1 Refuse planning permission on inappropriate location, bulk and design