

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	02/02/2017
			Consultation Expiry Date:	03/01/2016
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Helaina Farthing			2016/6350/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
Flat C 13 Healey Street London NW1 8SR			See decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of mansard roof extension with dormer windows to front and rear elevations and creation of roof terrace (Class C3).				
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning permission		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 13/12/2016; expiring on the 03/01/2017.</p> <p>One objection was received by the Owner/Occupier of 9 Healey Street</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The proposed scheme is similar to recent refusals on the east side of Healey Street and noted that the east side of Healey Street remains unimpaired;</i> 2. <i>The rear of the property is close to Grafton Crescent an extension will result in overlooking and loss of light;</i> 3. <i>The application by a top floor flat, will have effects on other tenants;</i> <p><i>Officer Response</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>See section 3.3;</i> 2. <i>See section 5.2 and 5.3;</i> 3. <i>The objection relating to the effects on the downstairs tenants is a civil matter and therefore has not taken into account in the assessment.</i> 					
CAAC/Local groups comments: No CAAC	No CAAC					

Site Description

The subject site is located on the east side of Healey Street and relates to the top floor flat. The property is a three storey Victorian building which is stucco-faced at ground level, with stock brick above and stucco dressings. At roof level, valley roofs are concealed behind stucco parapets. The building is not listed and 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. Whilst Grafton Crescent adjoins the rear, in this instance it is considered that only the properties 19 – 31 Healey Street are visible and prominent and therefore the application site is not in view from Grafton Crescent.

Relevant History

There are no records for other planning applications at the subject site, however a summary of all Applications for mansard roofs within Healey Street is given here:

2011/1557/P - 14 Healey Street, west side of street – refused on 20/06/2011 for the following reason: *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. This is contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) and DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework 2010, and to Camden Planning Guidance (2011).*

2011/3177/P - Flat B, 3 Healey Street, east side of street, in group of four buildings of different style to subject property – refused on 31/08/2011 for the following reason: *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.*

2011/5193/P - 14 Healey Street, west side of street- Granted on 02/12/2011 at appeal. The Inspector considered “*there is not an unbroken run of valley roofs. Nor is there an established form of roof addition or alteration*”, however, this is not the case in relation to the subject site where no roof alterations exist on the east side of Healey Street, with the exception of no. 21 Healey St. The mansard proposed at 14 Healey Street which was granted at appeal, was much lower in height and more lightweight as noted by the inspectorate.

2014/4400/P - 16 Healey Street, west side of street- Granted on 16/09/2014.

2015/6097/P – 21 Healey Street, east side of street – Granted on 19/07/2016 at appeal.

2016/1596/P – 23 Healey Street, east side of street – Refused on 09/09/2016 at appeal.

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)

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a roof extension and second floor roof terrace;

- The proposed mansard roof with brick parapets to match existing; natural slate roof and lead line hardwood dormer windows;
- Removal of existing roof to rear extension, replaced with new flat roof/terrace. A 50mm stainless steel handrail and glazed balustrade to be erected.

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.

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.

3.3 The terrace along the eastern side of Healey Street remains largely unimpaired at roof level. Whilst the design and access statement considers the modest roof box extensions on no. 15 and no. 25 Healey Street as justification for the proposed mansard roof extension on the grounds that the roofscape along the east side of Healey Street is not unbroken. The two roof extensions are modest box extensions covering no more than 25 per-cent of the roof form and through a review of planning history it is noted that these do not have planning permission. The modest extensions are likely to be unauthorised development and not considered a material consideration. With the exception of the recently approved mansard at no. 21 at appeal, it is noted that there are no mansard roof extensions on this side of Healey Street, at the scale proposed, and the terrace retains the traditional butterfly/valley roof profile from the rear

3.4 With regards to the decision at no. 21 that was approved at appeal, which is the only approved mansard along the eastern side of Healey Street, the Council consider that the decision in relation to no. 23 where the application was more recently refused at appeal is of greater relevance. Whilst this

application differs from these two, not visible from Grafton Crescent, the proposal is considered to cause harm to both the host dwelling but also the wider terrace along the eastern side of Healey Street and as such contrary to policy.

3.5 The positioning of the proposed roof terrace at second floor level is considered acceptable in principle, however with the traditional appearance of the rear elevations of terrace the glass balustrade would not be sympathetic to the host building. Therefore, a more traditionally designed balustrade is considered appropriate.

4.0 Detailed Design

4.1 Policy CS14 aims to ensure the highest design standards for developments. Policy DP24 states that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and respect the character, setting, form and scale of neighbouring properties and the character and proportions of the existing building.

4.2 The proposed design has attempted to be sensitive to the location and reduce its prominence; however the overall mass, and unsympathetic impact to the otherwise unbroken valley roofs along the terrace are considered to be harmful to the Victorian terrace and not appropriate development for the location. Therefore, whilst the proposal has been sensitively designed, it is not the appropriate development for the location.

5.0 Amenity

5.1 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."

5.2 Given the location of the roof extension and its distance from the surrounding properties, the proposal is not considered to harm the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of access to sunlight, daylight, visual bulk, sense of enclosure or privacy.

5.3 With regards to the proposed terrace, given the positioning and existing terraces along Healey Street it is considered there is mutual overlooking and therefore there is no harm to the amenity of the adjoining occupiers.

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 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 area and is subsequently harmful to the area.

7.0 Recommendation

7.1 Refuse planning permission