

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		10/02/2017	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		04/08/2016	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Charlotte Meynell				2016/2793/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
21 & 21A College Lane London NW5 1BJ				Refer to draft decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>		<b>Area Team Signature</b>		<b>C&amp;UD</b>		<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Erection of mansard roof extension to include 4 x front dormer windows and 4 x rear dormer windows to create an additional storey for existing 2 dwelling houses (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	19	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		A site notice was displayed on 08/07/2016 and expired on 29/07/2016. A press notice was advertised on 14/07/2016 and expired on 04/08/2016.  No responses were received from neighbours.					
<b>Dartmouth Park CAAC comments:</b>		No response was received.					

## **Site Description**

The subject site relates to two adjacent two-storey properties Nos. 21 and 21A located on the western side of College Lane, within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The lane is a narrow footpath with mostly 19th Century two and three storey flat-fronted cottages on the western side, and hedges and high walls on the eastern side which fall outside of the conservation area. New development is under construction behind the hedges on the eastern side of College Lane.

The site is not listed but has been identified as a building that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area along with Nos. 1-15 and 18-23. The subject site is part of a group of four houses in the terrace that share an architectural style, eaves line, roof form and painted brick to the front elevation.

## **Relevant History**

### **21 College Lane**

**2015/4700/P** – Erection of mansard roof extension. **Refused 13/10/2015**

**2006/5447/P** – Erection of a roof extension including raising the ridge height and rear mansard extension with dormer windows to single family dwelling house. **Refused 26/03/2007**

### **21A College Lane**

**2015/4688/P** – Erection of mansard roof extension. **Refused 13/10/2015**

**2006/5341/P** – Erection of a roof extension including raising the ridge height and rear mansard extension with dormer windows to single family dwelling house. **Refused 26/03/2007**

### **Reasons for refusal**

1. The proposed mansard roof, by virtue of its height, bulk, mass and design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the group of properties in the terrace of which it forms a part fundamentally changing the historic form of the terrace to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. **(2015/4700/P and 2015/4688/P)**
2. The proposed rear dormers by reason of their proximity to neighbouring residential properties would cause unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy. **(2015/4700/P)**

### **Neighbouring sites**

**2014/4012/P** – Erection of mansard roof extension at **18 College Lane**. **Granted 21/08/2014**

**2013/7376/P** – Erection of mansard roof extension with associated dormers to front and rear of **18 College Lane**. **Refused 04/02/2014**

### **Reasons for refusal**

1. The proposed mansard roof, by virtue of its height, bulk, mass and design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the cottage and fundamentally change the historic form of the terrace to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.
2. The proposed rear dormers by reason of their proximity to neighbouring residential properties would cause unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy.

**2013/1645/P** – Erection of a mansard roof to form a new bedroom and bathroom, with dormer windows to the front and rooflights to the rear to **17 College Lane**. **Granted 17/05/2013**

**2012/3386/P** – Erection of 2x dormer windows in the rear roofslope and installation of two rooflights to

front roofslope to provide additional habitable floorspace for the existing dwelling house to **19 College Lane. Granted 29/08/2012**

**2011/3211/P** – Erection of new second floor with mansard roof with front dormer window and one velux window to the rear elevation and erection of single storey extension at rear first floor above existing addition to **16 College Lane. Granted 30/08/2011**

**8903558** – Renovation of existing single family dwelling including installation of dormer to the rear of **22 College Lane. Granted 17/01/1990**

**8802363** – Conversion of a loft for residential purposes including the insertion of a dormer window at the rear of **20 College Lane. Granted 19/10/1988**

**18839** – Erection of a roof extension at **22 College Lane. Refused 05/07/1974**

### **Relevant policies**

#### **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**

#### **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

#### **Development Policies**

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

#### **Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG1 Design (2015)

CPG6 Amenity (2011)

#### **Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2009)**

### **Assessment**

#### **1.0 Proposal**

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a mansard roof extension to the adjoining properties Nos. 21 and 21A College Lane. The main features of the proposal comprise:

- The raising of the parapet line by 0.5m to the front elevation and 1.0m to the rear elevation, and the installation of 2 x front dormer windows and 2 x rear dormer windows and 1 x rooflight to the flat roof to each property.
- The proposed dormer windows would measure 1.1m in width, 1.2m in height and 0.6m in depth. The dormer windows would be in line with the windows below and would be set down 0.5m from the proposed ridgeline.
- The pitch of the proposed mansard would involve raising the ridge height of the house by approximately 0.65m and changing the pitch of the front and rear roof slopes from the existing 26° angle to approximately 70°. The extension would provide an additional bedroom and bathroom to each property.
- The proposed mansard roof extension would be built with natural slate tiles and traditional timber sash windows to match the existing. The boundary walls and front and rear chimney stacks to the adjoining property No. 22 College Lane would be raised using London stock

bricks to match the existing.

- The proposal is a resubmission of similar schemes refused in 2006 and 2015 (see history section above). The proposed increase in the height of the ridgeline for the refused schemes was 0.6m in 2006 and 1.3m in 2015.

1.2 Following negotiation with the applicants, the proposed scheme was revised to address the objections of the Council's Conservation Officer. The following amendments have been made:

- The proposed new flat-roof ridgeline would stand 100mm lower than originally proposed, at a height of 650mm above the existing ridgeline;
- The dogtooth brick course that currently decorates the front eaves line would be retained halfway up the newly erected parapet.

## **2.0 Assessment**

- The main planning considerations in the assessment of this application are:
- Design (the impact that the proposal has on the character and appearance of the host property, as well as the conservation area and wider street scene);
- Amenity (the impact of the proposal on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers).

## **3.0 Design**

3.1 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.

3.2 CPG1 (Design) states that a roof alteration is likely to be considered unacceptable in circumstances such as the presence of unbroken runs of valley roofs or where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations and extensions. It adds that a roof addition is likely to be unacceptable where the proposal would have an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene.

3.3 The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy identifies roof extensions and additions as an area of concern that may erode the attributes of the character and appearance of the conservation area. The appraisal advises that "development proposals will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area" and that "additional storeys, fundamental changes to the roofline and insensitive alterations can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will be resisted. Alterations and extensions to the front roof pitch can be particularly damaging to the appearance of the Conservation Area".

3.4 The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area has a variety and complexity that charts the history of domestic architecture from the late 18th century to the present day. Large mansion blocks and Victorian villas contrast with cottages that contribute a semi-rural character to the area. The conservation area benefits from a number of interesting views. The conservation area retains its clear historic rooflines, which are important to preserve, and to which the original roofing materials make a significant contribution.

3.5 The subject properties have been identified as making a positive contribution to the character of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The site forms part of a sub-group of four houses in the terrace that share architectural style, eaves lines and roof forms. The wider terrace is contemporary with Little Green Street but the properties are humbler in architectural style with simpler elevations. The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy

notes that the properties on College Lane have a variety of plot widths and surface finishes, and that “the variations of façade treatment and articulation, and mix of eaves lines provide valuable interest”.

- 3.6 The terrace has a largely unimpaired roofline, which contributes to the character of the area. The introduction of a mansard roof with front and rear dormer windows to the application site would fundamentally change the roof form, as the mansard roof would be clearly visible above the parapet level. This would erode the current consistency of appearance within the terrace. The application site is also prominent in long views. The proposal is therefore considered to be unacceptable as the roof extension would be inconsistent with the appearance of the existing terrace and would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 3.7 Although the revised scheme would retain the delicate architectural dentil course halfway up the newly erected parapet, raising the parapet as proposed would destroy the expressed low, flat eaves line, and so unacceptably remove elements of interest in views along the lane, and a distinguishing quality of the host building. Whilst views of important features may be limited in views from the wider public realm, this does not override the harm that would be caused to the host building.
- 3.8 There are some examples of roof extensions in the terrace which are varied in sizes, plot widths and styles, and have concealed roofs behind parapets on the front and rear elevations. This is the significant difference between the successfully extended properties and the proposed roof extension at Nos. 21 and 21A.
- 3.9 Mansard roof extensions with front dormers have been approved at Nos. 16 and 17 College Lane, but these are not comparable to the subject site as these properties are set back from the principle elevation of the terrace and featured concealed roof behind front and rear parapets as noted above. A further mansard roof extension approved at No. 18 College Lane in 2014 is also not comparable due to the architectural differences of the properties. No. 18 is unique within the terrace, as it does not form a part of any subgroup of properties, and the height of its proposed mansard matched the height of the adjoining properties at either side, thus appearing as a discreet addition within the terrace. By contrast, the proposed mansard roof extension at Nos. 21 and 21A would protrude above the predominant roofline of this part of the terrace and would break the existing cohesion between the subgroup of properties of which they form part.
- 3.10 The proposed mansard roof extension would increase the height of the ridgeline by 0.65m. The proposed height of the refused schemes in 2015 (2015/4688/P and 2015/4700/P) was 1.3m; a reduction in height by 0.6m does not overcome the reasons for the previous refusal. As mentioned in site history list above, a similar proposal to both properties was also refused in 2006 (2006/5341/P and 2006/5447/P).
- 3.11 The alteration to the façade and the raising of the height of the ridgeline of the proposed mansard roof extension are unacceptable as they would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwellings, the terrace and subgroup of properties of which they form a part and the conservation area generally. Furthermore, the detailed design of the mansard extension, by virtue of its height, bulk and mass, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwellings.

#### **4.0 Residential Amenity**

- 4.1 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden’s residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by stating that the Council will only grant permission for development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight.

4.2 The proposed increase in bulk is not considered to be such as to result in a significant loss of light and increased sense of enclosure in neighbouring properties. In terms of overlooking, the proposed rear dormer windows at No. 21 would face the rear windows and gardens of the properties along Highgate Road, specifically No. 118. The distance between the rear building lines of College Lane and Highgate Road is approximately 16m, which is 2m below the minimum 18m general requirement. If the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable, a planning condition could require that the windows be fitted with obscure-glazing up to a height of 1.7 metres above the adjacent floor level, which would mitigate satisfactorily against any overlooking to the properties at the rear.

4.3 The proposed rear dormer windows at No. 21A would face the existing gap between Nos. 118B and 120 Highgate Road and would not directly face any habitable window. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed dormer windows at No. 21A would not result in any significant loss of privacy and is in line with Policy DP26.

## **5.0 Conclusion**

5.1 The proposed roof extension by reason of its height, bulk, mass, design and location on a terrace of properties with an unimpaired roofline, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the group of properties in the terrace of which it forms a part, fundamentally changing the historic form of the terrace to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation 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 to Policies DP24 and DP25 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

## **6.0 Recommendation**

6.1 Refuse Planning Permission