



Design, Access & Planning Statement

Elly House, 205-207 Queen's Crescent, London, NW5 4DP

Mansard Roof Addition

Introduction

This statement has been prepared by 4D Planning on behalf of Tortuga Investments Limited, the owner of Elly House, 205-207 Queen's Crescent, NW5 4DP.

This document accompanies the planning application for a mansard roof addition. Prior to making this application the applicants sought pre-application advice from the Council (ref: 2016/1358/PRE) for both a mansard addition and a rear extension at second floor level. In response to the concerns raised in the pre-application advice, this proposal now only seeks to add a mansard to the property, and the proposal for a rear extension has not been pursued.

The purpose of this statement is to demonstrate that the proposal will not conflict with relevant planning policies, or have any negative impact on the neighbouring properties or character of the local area.

Existing Site

The application site is a double-fronted converted Victorian villa over basement, raised ground and first floors. There is an existing (c.1984) rear extension providing mezzanine levels on the lower ground and lower first floors. The property is accessed by a central staircase with lightwells on either side at basement level.

To the east of the property is the playground of Carlton Primary School. To the west is a single storey dwelling comprising 186A Grafton Road, which abuts the property. This is connected to 186 Grafton Road, which forms the corner building of a block of six terraces along Grafton Road.

The front façade of the property is set back some 2.5m from the street. The property stands alone on the last curve of Queen's Crescent; there are no adjoining terraces.

The property is in use as a 12 bedroom student house with shared facilities. Each of the three floors of the original terrace contains 4 bedrooms and a shared bathroom. The rear extension contains the kitchen areas and additional WCs on both storeys. Each bedroom has a washbasin but all other facilities are shared.

It is not a Statutory Listed Building or Locally Listed Building, and is not within a Conservation Area.

Proposal

The proposal is for a mansard addition in order to create three further bedrooms, a kitchen, and a bathroom.

Planning History

2016/1358/PRE Pre-application advice sought for a mansard roof extension and an upper floor rear extension to HMO building.

8401592 Rehabilitation of existing building (including replacing existing back addition with a new two storey extension) to provide a women's hostel with eight bedsitting rooms group facilities and staff accommodation. **Granted**

33696 The use as an Intermediate Treatment Centre. **Granted**

Planning Precedent

2016/0358/P 76 Fleet Road, NW3 2QT. Conversion of 1 x 2 & 1 x 1 bedroom dwellings to 1 x studio, 1 x 1 bedroom maisonette & 1 x 2 bedroom maisonette. Erection of ground and first floor infill side extension, mansard roof extension, single storey basement extension with rear lightwell and rear roof terraces on the first & second floors. **Granted**

2015/5116/P 159 Queen's Crescent, NW5 4EA. Erection of mansard roof extension to provide 1 x studio apartment. **Granted**

2015/1801/P 139-141 Queen's Crescent, NW5 4ED. Erection of mansard roof extension and creation of two 1-bed residential units. **Granted**

2015/1211/P The Mamelon Tower 149 Grafton Road, NW5 4AY. Change of use of upper floors from ancillary public house accommodation (A4) to 5 (3 x 1Bed, 2 x 2Bed) self-contained flats (Class C3); erection of 2 storey side extension on South - East (Queen's Crescent) elevation at first and second floor levels and mansard roof extension with associated fenestration alterations. **Granted**

2013/2341/P 149a Queen's Crescent, NW5 4ED. Erection of a mansard roof extension to upper floor maisonette (Class C3). **Granted**

2012/4538/P 147 Queen's Crescent, NW5 4ED. Erection of a mansard roof extension to existing maisonette (Class C3). **Granted**

Planning Policy

The following relevant policies apply:

1. National Planning Policy Framework, 2012 (NPPF)
2. Further Alterations to the London Plan 2015 (FALP), 2015
3. Camden Core Strategy, 2010
4. Camden Development Policies, 2010
5. Camden Planning Guidance SPD, 2015

1. National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF)

The National Planning Policy Framework states that there is “*a presumption in favour of sustainable development*”. Amongst the twelve planning principles set out by the NPPF (paragraph 17), it is stated that planning should “*not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives*”.

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF is committed to promoting sustainable development by maximising the re-use of previously developed and under-utilised land on sites within urban areas (such as this site) which are well served by public transport, providing that a good living environment is maintained and the land is not of a high environmental value.

The NPPF also looks to “*boost significantly the supply of housing*” (paragraph 47), and in that respect, paragraph 49 explains that “*Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development*”. Paragraphs 17 and 111 of the NPPF makes it clear Local Authorities in policy and decision making should “*encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value.*”

2. The London Plan (2015)

Policy 3.3 – Increasing Housing Supply - recognises the “pressing need for more homes in London in order to promote opportunity and provide a real choice for all Londoners in ways that meet their needs at a price they can afford.” The London Plan sets a target annual average net increase of 32,210 additional homes across London.

Policy 3.5 Quality and Design of Housing Developments - *“Housing developments should be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to their context and to the wider environment, taking account of strategic policies in this Plan to protect and enhance London’s residential environment and attractiveness as a place to live.”* It goes on to states that *“LDFs should incorporate minimum space standards that generally conform with Table 3.3.”*

Policy 3.14 Existing Housing - *“The Mayor will, and boroughs and other stakeholders should, support the maintenance and enhancement of the condition and quality of London’s existing homes. Boroughs should promote efficient use of the existing stock...”*

Policy 7.4 Local Character – states that *“Development should have regard to the form, function, and structure of an area, place or street...”* and *“Buildings, streets and open spaces should provide a high quality design response that ... has regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces and streets in orientation, scale, proportion and mass...”* and *“allows existing buildings and structures that make a positive contribution to the character of a place to influence the future character of the area”* and *“is informed by the surrounding historic environment”*.

Policy 7.6 Architecture – states that *“Buildings and structures should: be of the highest architectural quality... comprise details and materials that complement, not necessarily replicate, the local architectural character... not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings,... and “optimise the potential of sites”*.

3. Camden’s Core Strategy

Policy CS1 - Distribution of Growth - states that *“the Council will focus Camden’s growth in the most suitable locations, and manage it to make sure that we deliver its opportunities and benefits and achieve sustainable development, while continuing to preserve and enhance the features that make Camden such an attractive place to live, work and visit. We will promote: ...appropriate development at other highly accessible locations, in particular Central London and the town centres of Camden Town, Finchley Road / Swiss Cottage, Kentish Town, Kilburn High Road and West Hampstead;”*

“The Council will promote the most efficient use of land and buildings in Camden by: d) seeking development that makes full use of its site, taking into account quality of design, its surroundings, sustainability, amenity, heritage, transport accessibility and any other considerations relevant to the site.”

Policy CS3 - Other highly accessible areas – *“The Council will promote appropriate development in the highly accessible areas of: b) the town centres of Camden Town, Finchley Road / Swiss Cottage, Kentish Town, Kilburn High Road and West Hampstead, including appropriate edge of centre locations. These areas are considered to be suitable locations for the provision of homes, shops, food, drink and entertainment uses, offices, community facilities and are particularly suitable for uses that are likely to significantly increase the demand for travel.”*

Policy CS6 – Providing Quality Homes – makes clear that housing is the priority land use. Paragraph 6.5 of the Core Strategy confirms that Policy CS6 does apply to various forms of housing including HMO’s and student housing.

Policy CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage *“The Council will ensure that Camden’s places and buildings are attractive, safe and easy to use by: a) requiring development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character...”*

4. Development Management Polices (2010)

Policy DP2 - Making full use of Camden’s capacity for housing

The Council will seek to maximise the supply of additional homes in the borough, especially homes for people unable to access market housing, by: a) expecting the maximum appropriate contribution to supply of housing on sites that are underused or vacant, taking into account any other uses that are needed on the site...

Policy DP 9 - Student housing, bedsits and other housing with shared facilities

The Council will support development of housing with shared facilities (other than housing designated for older people, homeless people or vulnerable people) and student housing provided that the development:

- a) will not involve the loss of permanent self-contained homes;*
- b) will not prejudice the supply of land for self-contained homes, or the Council's ability to meet the annual target of 437 additional self-contained homes per year;*
- c) does not involve the loss of sites or parts-of-sites considered particularly suitable for affordable housing or housing for older people or for vulnerable people, particularly sites identified for such provision in our Camden Site Allocations Local Development Framework document;*
- d) complies with any relevant standards for houses in multiple occupation (HMOs);*
- e) will be accessible to public transport, workplaces, shops, services, and community facilities;*
- f) contributes to creating a mixed and inclusive community, and*
- g) does not create an over-concentration of such a use in the local area or cause harm to residential amenity or the surrounding area.*

Policy DP 18 – Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking

The Council will seek to ensure that developments provide the minimum necessary car parking provision. The Council will expect development to be car free in the Central London Area, the town centres of Camden Town, Finchley Road / Swiss Cottage, Kentish Town, Kilburn High Road and West Hampstead, and other areas within Controlled Parking Zones that are easily accessible by public transport.

Policy DP19 - Managing the impact of parking

19.14 *“In order to promote more sustainable modes of travel, the Council generally welcomes proposals to reduce the amount of off-street parking in the borough, provided that the removal of spaces would not: • lead to a shortfall against minimum parking standards relating to bicycles, people with disabilities, service vehicles, coaches and taxis (see Appendix 2); • cause difficulties for existing users, particularly if the spaces are used by shoppers, by nearby residents, or for the operational needs of a business; or • displace parking to controlled parking zones, particularly in identified areas of parking stress.”*

DP24 – Securing high quality design

“The Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider: a) 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; c) the quality of materials to be used...”

24.12 *“Designs for new buildings, and alterations and extensions, should respect the character and appearance of the local area and neighbouring buildings.”* 24.13 *Development should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street or ignore patterns or groupings of buildings. Overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions. Extensions should therefore be subordinate to the original building*

The proposal complies with all of the requirements set out in DP24. The mansard is subordinate to the original building in terms of scale, and respects the context of both the principal and neighbouring buildings.

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

“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. The factors we will consider include: a) visual privacy and overlooking; b) overshadowing and outlook; c) sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels...”

Due to the scale, height, position, and distance from neighbouring houses it is not believed that the mansard will create any material risk of overlooking, loss of privacy, or loss of light or have any other impact on the amenity of neighbours whatsoever.

5. Camden Planning Guidance SPD, 2015

CPG 1 - Design

Paragraph 4.7 *“Alterations should always take into account the character and design of the property and its surroundings. A harmonious contrast with the existing property and surroundings may be appropriate for some new work to distinguish it from the existing building; in other cases closely matching materials and design details are more appropriate so as to ensure the new work blends with the old.”*

“Paragraph 5.7 Additional storeys and roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where:

- 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;*
- Alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form;*
- 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.”*

All three of the above criteria are satisfied. The property is not part of any terrace or group of buildings. The proposed mansard is sympathetic to the building, and there is an established pattern and precedent for mansard additions across much of Queens Crescent and the surrounding area, and the proposed mansard will cause no harm.

“Paragraph 5.8 A roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances where there is likely to be an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene:

- There is an unbroken run of valley roofs;*
- 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;*
- Buildings or terraces which already have an additional storey or mansard;*
- Buildings already higher than neighbouring properties where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural composition;*

- *Buildings or terraces which have a roof line that is exposed to important London-wide and local views from public spaces;*
- *Buildings whose roof construction or form are unsuitable for roof additions such as shallow pitched roofs with eaves;*
- *The building is designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level;*
- *Buildings are part of a group where differing heights add visual interest and where a roof extension would detract from this variety of form;*
- *Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.”*

The proposed mansard will not have any adverse effect of the street scene or skyline. None of the above scenarios apply to this site and there is no reason why the mansard should not be allowed on any of these grounds.

“5.15 Mansard roofs are often the most appropriate form of extension for a Georgian or Victorian dwelling with a raised parapet wall and low roof structure behind. Mansard roofs should not exceed the height stated in Figure 5 so as to avoid excessive additional height to the host building. They are often a historically appropriate solution for traditional townscapes.”

“5.16 The lower slope (usually 60-70°) should rise from behind and not on top of the parapet wall, separated from the wall by a substantial gutter.

5.18 Roofing materials should be of the highest quality because of their significant visual impact on the appearance of a building and townscape and the need to be weather-tight. Natural slate is the most common covering and this should be laid with a traditional overlap pattern.

5.19 On buildings with a ‘valley’ or ‘butterfly’ roof if a mansard extension is considered acceptable in terms of the guidance in paragraphs 5.7 and 5.8 of this chapter, then the parapet should be retained. The new roof should start from behind the parapet at existing hopper-head level, forming a continuous slope of up to a maximum of 70° (see Figure 6). In this context, it is usually more appropriate to introduce conservation-style roof lights, which are flush with the roof slope, rather than dormers. Terraces and additional railings will not usually be acceptable.”

The proposed mansard complies with all of the detailed design guidance for mansard roofs listed in CPG above.

Pre-Application Advice

The advice of 18 April 2016 concluded that *“the proposed works would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area and it is considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the visual and residential amenities of the residential properties to the west on Grafton Road”*.

However, it was accepted that *“the principle of providing additional HMO accommodation at the application site is considered to be acceptable...”* and that *“the Council will support the provision of housing with shared facilities and student housing provided that the development is accessible to public transport, workplaces, shops, services, and community facilities. The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4, which is relatively high, and therefore the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this respect.”*

It is submitted that the pre-application advice, while non-binding, needs to be addressed in the following respects:

“In this case, the application building sits alone in the street scene and is not viewed as part of a wider group of buildings, and the building features a valley roof which appears to have been unimpaired by alterations.”

While this statement is correct, it is not a reason for the mansard being unacceptable. Paragraph 5.8 of CPG1 refers to an *“unbroken run of valley roofs”*. While the property has a valley roof, it is not part of a terrace with an *unbroken run* of such roofs. On the contrary it stands detached at the end of a road with numerous mansard additions. The CPG1 gives express guidance at Paragraph 5.19 which indicates that merely having a valley/butterfly roof is not grounds to refuse a mansard. In any case the rear butterfly detail is to be maintained.

The proposal to add a mansard roof to the building is contrary to the guidance in CPG1 and is unlikely to be considered acceptable if a formal planning application is submitted.

This does not appear to be correct. All of the criteria in paragraph 5.7 of the CPG are satisfied, and none of the grounds in paragraph 5.8 of the CPG apply. The proposed mansard is a textbook “True Mansard” as described in the CPG. There does not appear to be any guidance in the CPG which this proposal contravenes.

“the building is relatively close to the buildings to the west on Grafton Road (less than 6 metres apart at first floor level). Due to the close proximity, there is likely to be some loss of sunlight to the properties on Grafton Road in the early morning. If the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable, a formal planning application would need to be accompanied by a daylight/sunlight study which fully assesses the impact on these properties.”

The applicant duly commissioned a Daylight, Sunlight & Overshadowing Report from Syntegra Consulting which analysed the impact of the proposed mansard on the surrounding properties. That report concluded that **“the surroundings buildings at 106 Queen’s Crescent, 184 – 196 Grafton Road and Carlton Primary School will not be adversely affected by the proposed development. The proposed scheme is acceptable.”**

“The addition of the mansard roof may also cause a loss of outlook and a sense of enclosure to the buildings on Grafton Road, particularly when viewed from the lower, rear-facing windows, which already have a relatively poor and limited outlook due to the flank wall of the application building.”

Again, this is not accepted. The new mansard will not have any material effect on the outlook of the rear windows on Grafton Road. The pre-application advice accepted that in respect of overlooking, the **“level of overlooking is not likely to be significantly worse than the existing situation and the views would be at an angle rather than direct, which is likely to be considered acceptable.”** It is submitted that the same principle applies for outlook. Any loss of outlook to the lower floor windows would be negligible and materially no worse than the existing situation.

“The Further Alterations to the London Plan 2015 (FALP) requires 1 cycle parking space per 2 beds for student housing. These would need to be illustrated on the plans and they would need to be covered and secure (and preferably internal). It is noted that the existing cycle parking provision would not be considered acceptable.”

The proposal will provide secure and covered cycle spaces inside the front lightwells for up to 12 bikes. More than the 8 spaces required for a 15 bedroom student house.

“The proposal would not re-unite a group of buildings or townscape; instead the resultant building would appear even more at odds with Nos. 106 and 108 Queen’s Crescent on the opposite side of the road, which are also lower in height and which also appear subservient to the buildings on Grafton Road.”

The building is a standalone building and is not part of any group of buildings therefore this point is not relevant. The CPG does not require mansards to reunite groups of buildings to be permissible.

No.s 106-108 Queen’s Crescent are a pair of modern two-storey houses built c. 1990. They are of no architectural merit and are not characteristic of Queen’s Crescent or the surrounding area. 106-108 Queen’s Crescent was never intended to mirror the application site, which is a three storey, split level, double fronted, Victorian villa with large front lightwells. Being at odds with no 106-108 Queen’s Crescent is no reason to resist development at the application site. 106-108 Queen’s Crescent are already lower in height than the application site. 205-207 Queen’s Crescent will still be subservient to the dominant properties on Grafton Road after the addition of the proposed mansard, as the property is set back from the street, and the proposed “true” mansard will be behind the parapet wall and at a 70 degree angle.



A comparison of the front elevations of Elly House and 106-108 Queen's Crescent opposite shows that 106-108 Queen's Crescent is not characteristic of the area and has always been at odds with the older Elly House.

Design & Access

Context – the aim of the proposal is to increase the number of bedrooms in the property by three, as well as provide an additional kitchen and bathroom. It is established policy that the Council will support the provision of housing with shared facilities and student housing provided that the development is accessible.

Design – the proposed mansard follows the CPG1 guidance in every respect. It will be at a 70° maximum pitch, and be set behind the parapet wall. The front parapet wall will conceal a significant portion of the mansard extension from the street view. The step back from the parapet wall and the pitch of the lower mansard slope will help to conceal the mansard from the street scene, and ensure that the mansard is subservient to the host property. The room sizes and layout of the new rooms in the mansard comply with the Council's Private Sector Housing Team standards.

Use – the use as an HMO providing student accommodation with shared facilities, which is protected expressly in the LDF will remain unchanged.

Access – no changes are proposed to the existing access. The existing communal staircase will continue up to connect the proposed mansard floor.

Privacy/Amenity – the pre-application accepts that the level of overlooking from the proposed mansard to the rear of Grafton Road or the school grounds would not be any worse than existing levels of overlooking. The same principle applies to the existing outlook from Grafton Road. Any loss of light would be negligible and the proposal would be acceptable as confirmed in the Daylight, Sunlight, and Overshadowing Report.

Materials - the mansard slopes will be in slate to match the existing butterfly roof. The flat mansard roof is proposed in a single ply fibre-glass membrane. The front windows would be timber sash to match the existing windows below. The rear windows would be conservation-style roof lights.

Scale – the mansard would increase the ridge height of the building from 8.8m to 10.4m. This will be approximately 300mm higher than the terrace at 186 Grafton Road, which whilst not directly adjoining the property is the closest terraced building. This height difference is minimal and is not readily perceptible due to the visual break afforded by the single storey building at 186A Grafton Road.

Parking/ Cycle Storage –the site has a PTAL of 4. No car parking is provided or necessary given the excellent transport links. The property has secure covered storage for 12 bicycles in the front lightwells. In excess of the 1 cycle parking space per 2 beds for student housing minimum set in the FALP. Additional cycle storage is available in the rear garden if required.

Refuse/Recycling – The front lightwells provide ample space for refuse storage. Currently there are 4x 120 litre wheelie bins. More can be provided, if required.

Summary

- It is established that the principle of providing additional HMO accommodation at the application site is acceptable.
- The scheme has been amended and refined following the pre-application advice to remove the rear upper floor extension and address the other issues raised.
- The Daylight, Sunlight, and Overshadowing report concluded that the surroundings buildings at 106 Queen's Crescent, 184 – 196 Grafton Road and Carlton Primary School will not be adversely affected by the proposed development. And that the proposed scheme is acceptable.
- The design of the proposed mansard follows the CPG1 guidance in every respect. It will be at a 70° maximum pitch, and be set behind the parapet wall. The front parapet wall will conceal a significant portion of the mansard extension from the street view. The room sizes and layout of the new rooms in the mansard comply with the Council's Private Sector Housing Team standards.
- The proposed mansard is sympathetic to the building, and there is an established pattern and precedent for mansard additions across much of Queen's Crescent and the surrounding area, and the proposed mansard will cause no harm.
- The step back from the parapet wall and the pitch of the lower mansard slope will help to conceal the mansard from the street scene, and ensure that the mansard is subservient to the host property.

It is hoped that officers will support this proposal and if for any reason there are any concerns, it is requested that the Agent be contacted to allow the applicant the opportunity to address such concerns.