

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	29/03/2017
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	23/03/2017
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Kristina Smith			2017/0652/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
18 Harmood Street London NW1 8DJ			(Prefix: TRS068) EX_000; EX_001; EX_021; P2_101; P2_200; P2_201; P2_301; Design & Access Statement (dated 09/01/2017); Planning Statement	
<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 with two doors and terrace to front and dormer window to rear				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refused		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application		
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice		
<b>Informatives:</b>				
<b>Consultations</b>				
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<u>A site notice was displayed between 24/02/2017 and 17/03/2017</u> <u>A press advert was displayed between 02/03/2017 and 23/03/2017</u> No responses received		
<b>No CAAC associated with Conservation Area</b>				

## Site Description

The application site is a mid-terrace two storey dwelling house situated on the east of Harmood Street, close to the junction with Chalk Farm Road. The property has been extended to the rear at ground and first floor levels. There is also an existing addition at roof level to enable roof access; however, there does not appear to be planning consent for this structure.

To the south of the site there is a demolition and rebuild development underway for a part 2, part 4-storey building to provide student accommodation (planning ref. 2008/2981/P (as amended by planning permission ref: 2012/4135/P). This development clearly forms a distinct building group to the two-storey terrace properties to which the application site belongs.

The property is not listed; however, it is located within the Harmood Street Conservation Area and is identified as a positive contributor. The Harmood Street Conservation Area statement refers to the distinct quality of the conservation area resulting from the terraces of small, well detailed houses, which remain largely unaltered and have a distinct 'cottage' character.

## Relevant History

### APPLICATION SITE

**2013/2127/P** - Erection of a mansard roof extension with front and rear dormer windows to dwelling house (Class C3) **Refused 31/05/2013** on the grounds that: *'the proposed roof extension, by reason of its design, height, bulk and location in a group of buildings with a largely unaltered roofline, would result in harm to the character and appearance of the building, the group of buildings of which it forms a part, and the Harmood Street Conservation Area'*

**2009/1532/P** - Erection of a rear extension at second floor level on top of the existing back addition with access to a terrace and the erection of a first floor rear infill extension; alterations to the window. **Granted 22/05/2009**

**9200399** – Erection of a mansard roof extension with dormer windows at front and rear together with the provision of rear roof terrace at second floor level - **Refused September 1992** on the grounds that: *"The proposed roof extension would have an adverse effect on the appearance of the building and terrace by reason of its bulk and detailed design and would therefore be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area"*

The decision was appealed and dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 1st July 1993 (reference T/APP/X5210/A/93/220659/P2). The Planning Inspector concluded that the mansard would *"significantly increase the height and mass of the house, which would harmfully detract from the predominant continuity of line and uniformity of design in this attractive terrace."*

### 22 HARMOOD STREET

**34752** - The construction of a roof extension. **Granted 04/10/1982**

### 34 HARMOOD STREET

**2016/4754/P** - Erection of a mansard roof extension to existing dwelling (Class C3) - **Refused 06/10/2016**

## **Relevant policies**

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

### **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

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 (2015) sections 5.1 – 5.25

CPG6 – Amenity (2011) sections 6.1 – 6.18 & 7.1 – 7.11

### **Harmood Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2005)**

### **Camden Local Plan Submission Draft 2016**

The emerging Camden Local Plan is reaching the final stages of its public examination. Consultation on proposed modifications to the Submission Draft Local Plan began on 30 January and ends on 13 March 2017. The modifications have been proposed in response to Inspector's comments during the examination and seek to ensure that the Inspector can find the plan 'sound' subject to the modifications being made to the Plan. The Emerging Local Plan at this stage is a material consideration in decision making, but pending publication of the Inspector's report into the examination only has limited weight.

A1 - Managing the impact of development

D1 - Design

D2 - Heritage

## Assessment

### 1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought to convert the valley roof and erect a mansard roof extension. To the front the mansard would be set back approx. 2.8m behind the parapet and would have full length glazed doors that lead on to a terrace. To the rear, the mansard would be set back approx. 2.8m from the existing second floor level extension with a 74 slope to the rear elevation and include a dormer window. The extension would provide a bedroom of approx. 18sqm at third floor level.

1.2 A previous application (ref no. 2013/2127/P) at the site was refused on the grounds that the design, height, bulk and location of the mansard extension in a group of buildings with a largely unaltered roofline, would result in harm to the character and appearance of the building, the group of buildings of which it forms a part, and the Harmood Street Conservation Area. It is not considered that this application has overcome the previous reason for refusal.

1.3 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:

- Design and Appearance
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

### 2.0 Design and Appearance

2.1 The Council's Development Plan Policy DP24 requires all developments to respect the character, setting, context and proportions of the existing buildings when considering extensions. Section 24.7 continues this theme stating that development should respect:

- The character and constraints of its site;
- The prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development;
- The impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape

2.2 CPG1 Design guidance advises mansard roof extensions are acceptable where it is the established roof form in a group of buildings. The application site belongs to a building group of 11 terrace houses nos. 14 – 34 on the east side of Harmood Street. The roofscape remains largely unimpaired by roof extensions, with the only roof additions being a mansard at no. 22, a roof level addition at no.34, and a small roof access structure at the application site. These examples cannot be understood as precedent as the mansard roof was consented in 1982 under a now-obsolete planning policy and neither of the other two roof extensions appear to have been granted consent. More recently, two applications for a mansard roof have been refused including one at no.34 (2016/4754/P) and another at the application site (2013/2127/P).

2.3 Although the proposed mansard roof extension is well set back from the front elevation, it is likely that it would be visible in longer views from the public realm, particularly given that Harmood Street is a relatively wide street and therefore oblique views of the mansard from further down the street in both directions are probable. While it is appreciated the mansard roof would not be as prominent as the existing mansard at no.22, it would still appear as an incongruous addition to an otherwise largely unimpaired roofscape to the detriment of both the host property and the building group. Rear views of the mansard would be limited as the Harmood Grove properties are orientated away from the rear elevation.

2.4 The Harmood Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy also strongly discourages roof additions, in particular mansards, due to the impact on the character of the conservation area (pg. 10). The statement asserts that the conservation area acquires its character from the 'cottage-like' appearance of the predominantly two storey Victorian terraces. The addition of a roof extension is a non-traditional alteration that would be harmful to the small proportions and architectural integrity of these properties which were designed to terminate with a valley roof rather than a mansard. The existing mansard at no.22 has already caused harm to the character and otherwise strong parapet line of the terrace and should not be used as a justification for further harm.

2.5 Section 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013 requires for buildings in conservation areas that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. It is considered that this proposal would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and this heritage asset.

2.6 The terrace to the front of the mansard is not a proposal that would be supported. On the subject of terraces at roof level, CPG1 states that a terrace will only normally be acceptable on the rear of properties and also discourages the set back of mansards to provide a terrace. The proposal therefore contravenes both requirements. The full length doors on the front of the mansard, which would be seen in private views, would be harmful to the hierarchy of the fenestration which should become smaller moving up the building.

### **3.0 Amenity**

3.1 The proposed mansard roof, on account of its size and location, would not cause any reduced daylight and sunlight or outlook to the surrounding dwellings. The terrace to the front of the mansard would be set behind the existing principal parapet wall meeting building regulations and is not considered to represent a decrease in the privacy conditions of occupiers of the dwellings opposite.

### **4.0 Recommendation**

4.1 Refuse planning permission on inappropriate location, bulk and design.