

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		21/12/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		22/11/2016	
Officer				Application Number			
Obote Hope				2016/5873/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Flat C 94 College Place London NW1 0DJ							
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal							
Variation of condition 3 (approved plans) of planning permission ref 2014/1387/P (dated 30/07/2014) for: erection of a rear dormer roof extension, formation of rear roof terrace and installation of 2 x rooflights, namely erection of an enlarged roof extension to the rear/side elevation.							
Recommendation:		Refuse variation of condition					
Application Type:		Variation of condition					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	00	No. of responses No. electronic	01 02	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultation responses:		Site Notice displayed 01-11-2016. Press Notice published N/A 2 objections received from 96 College Place. The objectors raised the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size, scale and bulk of the roof extension; • Not built in accordance with the approved plans; • Totally disregard at the planning process; • Most of the properties that applied for consent have built in line with planning guidance where applicable, and; • The retrospective consent would set a dangerous precedent 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		N/A - not located in a conservation area					

Site Description

The site comprises a three-storey mid-terraced property located on the east side of College Place in Camden Town. The premises are sub-divided into 3 self-contained flats and this application specifically relates to the top floor flat. The building is not listed. The site is not located in a conservation area.

Due to the location and layout of the terrace, its roofline is prominent in private views from the surrounding area.

Relevant History

Application site:

2014/1387/P – Planning permission granted on 24/07/2014 for erection of a rear dormer roof extension, formation of rear roof terrace and installation of 2 x rooflights on front roofslope.

EN16/0933 - Works not in accordance with planning permission 2014/1387/P

Other Relevant Sites

96B College Place

2003/2790/P – Planning permission granted on 05/02/2004 for construction of a roof extension above the existing 3-storey rear addition with rear roof terrace to provide additional living accommodation for the existing 2nd floor flat.

82C College Place

2006/5162/P – Planning permission granted on 08/01/2007 for erection of rear roof extension and rear dormer window plus roof terrace, installation of solar panels on the roof and rooflights plus photovoltaic tiles on the front (south west) elevation to extend existing flat at second floor level.

2011/2791/P – Planning permission granted on 10/08/2011 for erection of mansard extension and installation of terrace and dormer window to rear elevation and installation of 2x rooflights to front elevation to extend existing flat at third floor level.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2016

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance 2013-2015

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Chapter 2 – Design excellence

Chapter 3 – Heritage

Chapter 5-Roofs, terraces and balconies

CPG6 (Amenity)

Chapter 6-Daylight and Sunlight

Chapter 7-Overlooking, privacy and outlook

Assessment

The application proposes to amend the approved permission under reference (2014/1387/P) by varying condition 3 (built in accordance with approved plans). The approved scheme featured a dormer to the main rear roofslope and a mansard extension to the roof of the outrigger. The amendments include the extension of the mansard extension across the rear roofslope so that it forms an "L" shaped roof extension, with an increase in height of the extension to the ridge of the main roof and the associated increase in height of the side parapet walls. towards the roof's ridge with no setback contrary to planning guidance. The extension would measure between 3.6m - 6.2m depth, 3.0m – 6.0m in width and approximately 3.0m in height. As such, the height of the parapet wall would be increased. It should be noted, combining the two dormers where negotiated against as highlighted below and this application seeks permission for alterations to its form for a modified roof extension.

Planning Background

These works were started in August 2016 the Council received a complaint from a local resident in September once the scaffolding covers were removed, this revealed that an "L" shape mansard extension was being constructed in place of the approved rear dormer and mansard . It was duly noted by the complainant that the design of the roof extension was quite similar in appearance to plans/elevation that were submitted and rejected due to the scale and bulk of the extension proposed under Ref: EN16/0933.

Planning consent was granted in 2014 for a roof extension with terrace to the rear elevation (2014/1387/P), following correspondence with the planning officer, the application was revised and the following revisions secured:

Revisions

- The roof extension was reduced in depth by 2.74m so that it only extended as far out as the existing chimney.
- The side elevation of the roof extension was to be hipped rather than vertical
- The roof extension was revised so that it has a separate dormer window on the rear roofslope (rather than forming part of the roof extension).

The main issues for consideration are the visual appearance of the existing and proposed works and their impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Policy Background

Policy DP24 states that the Council will grant permission for development that is designed to a high standard. In terms of the works to this property, the following considerations contained within this policy are relevant:

- development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;
- Development should consider the character and proportions of the existing building, where extensions and alterations are proposed.

Camden's Supplementary Planning Guidance with regard to roofs states that roof extensions and alterations should be of an appropriate scale and should not be excessively prominent. It states that the Council will consider whether works are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form of the application building and the established townscape. Detailed design including materials and windows should be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the original building and the surrounding area. (p 36)

Furthermore, in relation to dormers, these should also meet the following criteria Dormers should not be introduced where they cut through the roof ridge or the sloped edge of a hipped roof. They should also be sufficiently below the ridge of the roof in order to avoid projecting into the roofline when viewed from a distance. Usually a 500mm gap is required between the dormer and the ridge or hip to maintain this separation (p 37).

Finally, in number, form, scale and pane size, the dormer and window should relate to the façade below and the surface area of the roof. They should appear as separate small projections on the roof surface (p 37).

Camden SPG Chapter 5 “Roofs, terraces and balconies” states in para. 5.8 that a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable where:

- Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions;
- Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.

With regard to dormer extensions paragraph 5.11 states:

- (Dormers) should be sufficiently below the ridge line of the roof in order to avoid projecting into the roofline when viewed from a distance. Usually a 500mm gap is required between the dormer and the ridge or hip to maintain this separation. Full-length dormers on both the front and rear of the property will be discouraged to minimise the prominence of these structures;
- Dormers should not be introduced where they interrupt an unbroken roofscape;
- (Dormer windows) should be aligned with the windows on the lower floors and be of a size that is clearly subordinate to the windows below.

unauthorised roof extension

The works that have been carried out without permission are detrimental to the appearance of the subject building and fail to preserve the character and appearance of the area:

- The roof extension stretches across the full extent of the rear roof with no clearance to either side and no clearance to the ridge. The depth of the extension on top of the outrigger has been slightly reduced. The additional roof extension was designed to provide additional headroom, depth and for increased internal floor space rather than to provide additional daylight;
- The minimum clearances of 0.3m to the ridge, which was negotiated on two separate occasions has been ignored, and the separate dormer window on a retained rear roofslope has been omitted. As a result, the extension is bulky and top-heavy, changing its character from a mansard extension and dormer extension into an large and unsightly “L” shape mansard style roof extension. The proposal is incongruous in design and does not relate subordinately to the existing building, the extension is unsympathetic to the character and proportions of the host building. Instead it forms a top-heavy, dominant extension which is visually prominent and obtrusive. Because of the size of the roof extension and its width and height in relation to the original roof, the extension undermines and erodes the primacy of the original roof and detracts from its visual integrity;
- The roof extension is disproportionate in height, bulk and scale to all the roof extensions in this location, and the roof extension is highly visible in private views from neighbouring properties and gardens. This harms the character and appearance of the immediate area and the unauthorised works that have been carried out have a detrimental impact on the rear roofline and jar with the rear elevation of the property as a whole. The works introduce visual clutter to what is an otherwise uncluttered elevation and a clean roofline in breach of policy DP24 and fail to preserve and enhance the host building’s appearance;
- The original elevation of each house in the terrace is simple in design and the clean roofline forms part of the visual character and appearance of the terrace. The amended roof extension would have a footprint of 26.8sqm and combined with the terrace only a fraction over 9sqm of the original rear roof form would be retained (however the as built scheme loses virtually all of the original rear roof). As such, the extension would be prominent from numerous neighbouring properties and gardens. The modified extension, as proposed, would have a detrimental, intrusive impact on the clean roofline and would jar with the simple design of the rear elevation. The proposed works would fail to preserve and enhance the appearance host building appearance in breach of policy DP24.
- It is also noted that there are certain discrepancies on the submitted plans labelled “As Built” compared

to what has actually been built on site: the lower slopes of the mansard are much steeper than the approximately 69° shown on the plans, effectively creating a larger extension (in terms of volume) than applied for as the amendment, and the flattened roof extends the full width of the outrigger, rather than retaining a small apron to the side.

Impact on neighbour amenity

The flank of the dormer has not introduced additional bulk that would materially affect daylight and sunlight to the windows of neighbouring habitable rooms. The proposed amendment would not result in a material impact on sunlight and daylight to neighbouring properties.

The rear facing window within the unauthorised extension replicates views from windows at lower levels and does not result in direct overlooking to any neighbouring habitable room. The existing and proposed extension would not cause any material overlooking.

Conclusion

Neither the as built or proposed scheme is acceptable due to their failure to comply with adopted policies and guidance and the visual harm they cause to the host building and the terrace as a whole. As such it is recommended that the amendment be refused and that as the as built scheme is different to the submitted amendment an enforcement notice be served requiring the removal of the constructed roof extension.

Recommendations:

1. Refuse planning permission