

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	16/06/2016
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	26/05/2016
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Raymond Yeung			1. 2016/2262/P 2. 2016/2332/L		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
50- 52 Stanhope Street London NW1 3EX			Refer to draft decision notice.		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of mansard roof extension to create an additional storey to Nos. 50 & 52 Stanhope Street.					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission and listed building consent			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission Listed Building Consent			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	13	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 29/04/16 to 20/05/16. Press advertisement published from 05/05/16 to 26/05/16.</p> <p>Adjoining owners/occupiers</p> <p>Officer’s response below in <i>italic</i></p> <p>Freehold owners of proposal site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Do not want any change to the building or the original Butterfly roof to be touched <p><i>Please see design paragraph below</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Overdevelopment of the site <p><i>Additional residential space may be acceptable in principle, regarding the building itself Please see design paragraph below</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Overlook our private garden <p><i>Please see design paragraph below</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Do not want any disturbance to their tenants <p><i>The proposals are an extension to residential properties below, the proposal is not considered to have an impact on neighbouring properties</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Do not give permission for scaffolding to be put on our land or our roof to be touched <p><i>Considered not a material planning matter</i></p>					
Local groups comments:	<p>Local Groups No reply to date.</p>					

Site Description

The Grade II listed buildings form a pair of properties dating from c.1804. No. 52 is constructed of yellow stock brick, whilst no. 50 has been rendered with a rusticated stucco ground floor. Both are 3 storeys with basement. They are situated on the east side of Stanhope Street between Drummond Street and William Road.

A later 20th century infill block is located at 54-56, and a further pair of early 19th century non listed properties stand at 58 and 60. None of these buildings have mansard roofs and all are characterised by their lack of visible roof forms and strong parapet lines. To the rear, nos. 50 and 52 have matching traditional valley roofs. The neighbouring restaurant at no. 48 is also listed. The site is not located within a conservation area. The building is in residential use.

Relevant History

2015/0529/P & 2015/0889/L 'Erection of mansard roof extension to create an additional storey to No.50 & 52 Stanhope Street'. (withdrawn)

2013/5061/PRE - 'Mansard roof extension' ('any addition or alteration to the roofline would be unacceptable in principle')

52 Stanhope Street

2007/3995/P and 2007/3996/L - Erection of mansard roof extension to provide additional floorspace to existing first/second floor maisonette (Class C3). – Refused 28/02/2008

Refusal reason:

The proposed mansard roof, by virtue of its projection above the prevailing parapet line, would detract from the unaltered roofscape of the terrace to the detriment of the character and appearance of the building, the terrace and the area generally contrary to policies S1/S2 (strategic policies), B1 (general design principles) and B3 (alterations and extensions) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and supporting Camden Planning Guidance December 2006.

The 2007 Appeal dismissal decision states:

- 4. The special interest of the building stems from its largely unaltered form as an example of an early 19th century London house, having a simple but elegant design and proportions*
- 7. I consider that an important feature is the original roof form, with no visible addition at the front and the original 'butterfly' form at the rear, matching its listed neighbour. Whilst I accept the appellant's point that the proposal would not be visible from the pavement on the same side of the street, it would be visible on the opposite side of the road and for some distance in a northerly direction. In my judgement, it would appear as an obvious and intrusive addition to the listed building*
- 8. The stark appearance of the proposed side walls would have a particularly unacceptable effect. Although views of the rear of the building are limited, the principle of the loss of the original roof form adds to my concerns on the effects of the proposals on the special interest of the building. Therefore, the proposed works would harm the special architectural and historic interest of the building*
- 9. I have taken account of the appellants expressed intentions to use carefully selected materials in the construction of the extension. I would expect this to be the case in any event and does not overcome my concerns in relation to the principle of the proposal*

No.48 Stanhope Street

2015/7135/P & 2015/7247/L -Erection of mansard roof extension, installation of 2 rooflights to the

front elevation and associated internal alterations. – Refused 18/05/2016

Refusal Reason:

The proposed roof extension, by reason of its bulk, mass, size and form, and loss of historic fabric, would be harmful to the appearance of the host property and detrimental to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, 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 DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy:

CS1 – Distribution of growth

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies:

DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

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

Camden Planning Guidance 2015 –

CPG1 – Design Chapter 3, Chapter 4 (para 4.12 -4.13) and chapter 5 (paragraphs 5.6-5.8).

CPG6 - Amenities

NPPF 2012

London Plan 2016

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 Proposed is a mansard roof at 3rd floor level to both buildings.

2. Land Use

2.1 The extension would provide space (3rd floor) for an additional two bedrooms to No.50 and three additional bedrooms to No.52 with a bathroom for both. Provision of additional residential floorspace is considered to be acceptable.

3. Design

3.1 Within the delegated report from previous refusal in 2008, it stated the following;

It is considered that the proposal is unacceptable 'in principle'. Annex C27 of PPG 15 is clear that "The roof is nearly always a dominant feature of a building and the retention of its original structure, shape, pitch, cladding and ornament is important." Whilst traditionally designed and proportioned mansard roofs may be acceptable in some locations, this is rarely the case where an original roof form would be lost as a result.

The proposed mansard would appear as an incongruous feature within this small group of buildings, projecting above the prevailing parapet line and introducing prominent and visually intrusive brick party walls. Camden Planning Guidance 2006 outlines several situations in which roof alterations might unacceptably impact upon the skyline and a building's immediate context. This includes where there is an unbroken run of valley roofs, where the building is listed for its historic or architectural interest and where terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions.

Given that the listed building retains its traditional valley roof, and that the wider group of buildings are characterised by a lack of visible roof forms, this proposal is considered unacceptable. The proposed mansard roof, by virtue of the loss of the existing traditional valley roof form, would undermine the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

3.2 Under the previous pre-app advice and subsequent withdrawn application the following comments were given by the Conservation & Design team stated the following:

However as these are Grade II statutory listed buildings such a proposal would involve the loss of the original historic fabric and of the historic butterfly roof form which is an integral part of their structure and significance. The effect would be harmful to the special historic and architectural interest of the listed buildings. The proposal conflicts with Core Strategy CS14 & Policy DP25, and I therefore raise a conservation objection.

3.3 There seems to be little amendment of the proposals since the application which was dismissed at appeal, the pre-app and 2015 withdrawn application. There is also very little additional historical assessment brought forward, and without a site visit and no supporting evidence, it is assumed that historic fabric remains within the existing roof form.

Current application

3.4 With the above taken into consideration, it has been established that such roof extension is not

acceptable to the listed building.

3.5 A number of policy and design changes have been introduced since the 2008 refusal; Special regard must now be attached to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, under s.66 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013. Special regard must be attached to the desirability of preserving a listed building and its features of special architectural or historic interest, under s.16 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013.

3.6 National policy guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') confirms the great weight in favour of the conservation of 'heritage assets' such as conservation areas and listed properties. The particular significance of any element of the historic environment likely to be affected by a proposal should be identified and assessed. Any harm should require clear and convincing justification. In accordance with Paragraph 128, a description of the heritage asset's significance should be provided that in this instance its listed status. It is also a requirement to describe how proposed works would affect this significance.

Assessment

3.7 Following an assessment of the documents submitted with the application it is clear that very little historic assessment has been carried out, which is contrary to the NPPF para 128 which states: 'In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. For instance, no historic floor plans have been submitted or been referenced and the following information within the submitted D&A/Planning Statement is seen to be incorrect, as commented in bold and italic below:

- 'the butterfly form, neither unique nor referred to in the list description' ***The butterfly roof form is typical of a building of this age, as referenced in Historic England's 'London Terrace Houses 1660-1860 A guide to alterations and extensions'***

- 'No.52 and the more ornate former shopfront at No.50 and the magnificent later Victorian public house at No.48 were all listed together on 14th May 1974. No.48 is the likely principal reason for these listing, No.s 50 and 52 being included for frontages in the setting of the flamboyant Public House.' ***Each are individually listed and not grouped with No.48, there is nothing within the descriptions of 50 and 52 which suggests this is the case.***

- 3.19 'Listing descriptions of 48, 50 and 52 Stanhope Street are attached containing details of the buildings' history, appearance and significance helping to identify what gives each its special historic or architectural interest.' ***Historic England's website states the following 'Early listings were written primarily for identification, whereas we now take care to explain significance and define the extent of listing'.***

- 3.23: Proposals respond to the historic and architectural constraints of the listed building, mansard roofing being typical and sympathetic to the original style. ***No historic analysis or plans/photographs have been submitted to justify this statement***

3.8 The proposal may also result in the loss of surviving original fabric, the heritage statement does not justify this element. The addition at roof level proposed would detract from the overall integrity of

the building's special architectural and historic interest.

Form

3.9 As stated within the appeal decision the form of the roofs are an integral part of the significance of the listed buildings and fundamental to understanding their architectural and historic significance and the total loss of the form would therefore detract from the building's special interest. The interest also lies in the detailing and composition of the street elevations and the cellular plan forms and hierarchy of spaces within which are capable of making a material contribution to the understanding the design and intended functioning of the dwellings, and thus also contribute to its significance. In this instance the retention of the existing roof form is key to preserving the building's significance.

3.10 In addition, the proposal will significantly alter the appearance of the buildings, by changing a low, butterfly structure that is largely hidden from view at street level into a more steeply pitched mansard, with dormers, that will be far more prominent.

Fabric

3.11 The alteration to the listed buildings and addition of the mansards will involve the loss of historic fabric and would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of two listed buildings. The public benefits (housing, green roofing and energy efficiency) brought forward have not been properly demonstrated and are not seen to outweigh this harm.

3.12 The submitted D&A/Planning statement has undertaken no survey outlining the condition and quality of the original composition/fabric. No evidence was submitted to demonstrate the internal fabric is modern - and any loss of historic fabric requires justification. Expanding the owners' living space is not sufficient justification in of itself.

3.13 Camden Planning Guidance (CPG 1 – Design) emphasises that in assessing applications for listed building consent the Council has a statutory requirement to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The Council must also consider the impact of proposals on the historic significance of the building, including its features, such as:

- Original and historic materials and architectural features;
- Original layout of rooms;
- Structural integrity; and
- Character and appearance

3.14 English Heritage's document "Mansard Roofs" states that in many circumstances English Heritage (now known as Historic England) advise against adding any visible extra storey to the roof of a terraced house, particularly when (inter alia): The existing roof structure is of historic or architectural interest.

3.15 The proposed roof design is inappropriate and at odds with the traditional character and appearance of the simple roof on the listed building. . The Inspector noted "the special interest of the building stems from its largely unaltered form as an example of an early 19th century London house, having a simple, but elegant design and proportions."

3.16 The proposed extension would increase the scale and bulk of the host properties when viewed on their own and alongside the neighbouring buildings. This terrace is currently characterised by an undeveloped roofline. Furthermore, The stark appearance of the proposed side walls would also have a particularly unacceptable effect on the streetscene. This visible aspect of the roof in situ is an

integral part of the significance of this listed building and fundamental to understanding its architectural and historic significance.

3.17 With regard to the wider context of the host building, the proposal would significantly alter the appearance of the building, by changing a low, butterfly structure that is largely hidden from view at street level into a more bulky mansard extension, which will be more prominent and clearly visible. The alteration proposed would have no public benefit and there is no justification that the harm would be less than substantial to the character and appearance of the neighbouring listed building that forms part of the terrace. The previous reason for refusal referred to the projection above the prevailing parapet line which would detract from the unaltered roofscape of the building and terrace to the detriment of the special historic interest of the building, which is still considered to be the case.

3.18 As such, the proposal is not acceptable due to loss of historic fabric, harm to significance and the proposed detailed design, bulk and height which would also harm the character and appearance, and special interest of the properties. As such it would conflict with Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010-2015, Policy DP24 and DP25 of the Camden Development Policies 2010-2025 and Paragraphs 56 and 58 of the Framework, all of which seek high quality design that respects local context and character. It would also be contrary to the advice in CPG1 of the SPG that advises roof additions are likely to be unacceptable where they cause harm to listed buildings.

Amenity

The extension is unlikely to harm amenity of adjoining occupiers by reason of loss of daylight/sunlight or loss of privacy.

Recommendation: Refuse permission and listed building consent.