

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	21/06/2017
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	24/05/2017
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Hugh Miller			2017/1948/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
22 Fortess Grove LONDON NW5 2HD			See draft decision	
<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 plus glazed dormer to dwellinghouse.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission.		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p><i>Press Notice advertised 03/05/2017, expires 24/05/2017. Site Notice displayed on 03/05/2017, expires 24/05/2017.</i></p> <p><u>19 Fortress Road:</u> The proposed roof extension, by reason of its location, bulk, form and height in a terrace unaltered by roof extensions, would harm the appearance of the building and the character of the roofscape in this mews and the character and appearance of the Kentish Town Conservation Area. The small house has already received planning for a side extension and a basement - the addition of a roof extension seems unnecessary for the purposes of providing a family home. There is a symmetry between the terrace of no. 21 and 22 that would be entirely altered by this extension. As neighbours, we object to the planning proposal.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<b>Kentish Town CAAC:</b> no response received.					

## Site Description

A 2- storey semi-detached property located on the west side of Fortess Grove to the rear of 28 to 34 Fortess Road a 5-storey mixed residential and commercial building. The host building is one of a pair that abuts 28 to 34 Fortess Road building at the rear.

The site is located within the Kentish Town Conservation Area. The property is not listed.

## Relevant History

November 2016 – PP Granted - Erection of single storey first floor side and side infill extension, replacement of existing timber sash windows with matching windows and replacement of front and side door to dwelling house; ref. 2016/5944/P

November 2016 – PP Granted - Excavation of single storey basement extension below the footprint of the existing building, erection of first floor side and rear extensions, installation of replacement windows and new door to courtyard of dwellinghouse; subject to legal agreement; ref. 2016/5858/P.

### ***Other associated sites:***

#### 28 to 34 Fortess Road

Full planning permission (**2012/1683/P**) granted for: Change of use and works of conversion from offices (Class B1) to 9 x residential units (5 x 1-bedroom; 3 x 2-bedroom and 1 x 3-bedroom) at 1st to 4th floors (Class C3) including mansard roof extension, glazed screens to balconies and terraces to rear elevation, infill extension at rear ground and first floor levels, alterations to fenestration and new residential entrance on Fortess Grove granted on 15/02/2013.

GDPO Prior approval for change of use from offices to residential under Class J (**2013/5346/P**) for: Change of use of the ground and mezzanine floors from office (Class B1) to 6 x self-contained flats (C3) at 28 – 34 Fortess Road, granted on 21/10/2013

## Relevant policies

### **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)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

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

#### **Supplementary Planning Guidance:**

Camden Planning Guidance 2011 - 2015

CPG1 (Design)- chapters 1, 2, 3 & 5

CPG6 (Amenity) – Chapters 6 & 7

#### **Kentish Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011**

#### **London Plan 2016**

#### **National Planning Policy Framework 2012**

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

## D1 Design

### A1 Managing the impact of development

*The emerging 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 ended 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 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.*

## Assessment

### Background

In April 2015 the Council provided written pre-application advice (ref.2015/1867/PRE) for the erection of a first floor and a mansard roof extensions and excavation at basement throughout the footprint of the property. The applicant was advised that whilst the side extension and new basement floor was acceptable and subject to compliance with the council's policies and guidance, the mansard roof extension was unacceptable in principle.

The current proposal is for a mansard roof extension.

### Proposal

- *Erection of mansard roof extension plus dormer door to dwellinghouse.*

The main concerns are:

- a] principle of a mansard roof extensions,
- b] design and impact on the appearance of the building and on the character and appearance of the conservation area; and
- c] neighbour amenity.

### Design

#### Principle of the mansard roof extension

All the houses except for nos. 9 -10 and 1-3 (Fortess House) have been identified as making a positive contribution to character and appearance of the Kentish Town conservation area.

The host building has an "L" shaped footplate and is one of a pair of semi-detached 2-storey dwelling houses comprise flat roof set behind part gable, part flat, raised and rendered painted parapet at the front and sides. It abuts the larger neighbouring building nos.28-34 Fortess Road at the rear. The semi-detached pair shares some similarities in terms of design, scale and proportions, to other houses in Fortess Grove but are atypical of these terraced houses due to their setting and roof form which is considered unsuitable for mansard roof extension. It is acknowledged that the host building does not form part of the overall terrace group; however, in this singular setting, a mansard roof extension here would unbalance this pair of buildings, be visually prominent, and harm the appearance of the building, the surrounding street scene and the conservation area. In particular the size, location and design of the mansard proposed on only half of the roof here would result in a lopsided and incongruous addition to the property unbalancing the semi-detached pair of houses. It is considered therefore that the proposed roof extension is unacceptable in principle and the detailed design.

#### Design and appearance

Policies CS5 of the Core Strategy and DP24 of the Development Policies states that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standards in terms of design, respecting the character, siting, context, form and scale of existing buildings and the surrounding area. Supplementary design guidance contained within CPG 1(Design) provides details on how the above policies will be applied for extensions and roof developments. This states that roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable if they would have an adverse impact on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene. This includes:

1. Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roofline that are largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a co-ordinated design;
2. Buildings or terraces which have a roof line that is exposed to important London-wide and local views from public spaces;
3. Buildings designed as a complete architectural composition and the proposed development would undermine the style or roof level;

4. Buildings are part of a group where differing heights add visual interest and where a roof extension would detract from this variety of form;
5. Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by an additional roof extension.

The proposed mansard roof would measure 16.77sqm (3.9m x 4.3m x2.60m [h]) and set back 1.2m from the front parapet and would occupy part of the roof abutting no.21 on the north side. The building's height would increase by 2.59m, from 5.17m to 7.76m. More particular, the extension height as shown may be incorrect owing to the absence of accurate section drawings to demonstrate an acceptable standard of habitable accommodation.

The proposed roof extension is neither a 'True Mansard' nor 'Flat Top Mansard' with the requisite lower slope and steep angle, nor does it include suitable sized dormer windows. The CPG guidelines states that mansard extensions are the most appropriate form of roof extension for the host building (Victorian, raised parapets para.5.15). In this instance however, a contemporary designed extension has been submitted following the Council's written pre-application advice indicating that a roof extension is considered unacceptable in principle owing to the particular circumstances associated with this pair of dwellinghouses. The resultant roof form is a bespoke contemporary-designed roof extension, which is considered an incongruous form of development more suited to a contemporary design building rather than a Victorian semi-detached building. The roof extension would have a rectangular footplate, be part vertical and part pitched, and have a front dormer with large full-height glazed sliding doors with balustrade. Notwithstanding the setback, it is considered that sections of the partywall upstands and the bespoke roof extension would be visible from the north and south-east sections of Fortess Grove and also from private views within the residential units at 28-34 Fortess Grove immediately at the rear.

In terms of character, the houses have a shallow pitched roof. The original lines and form of the roof remains a distinctive feature together with its angled parapet. The proposed development would completely erode the roof form of both properties, introducing a completely new roof form which would be visually prominent and dominate the roof and would fail to respect the integrity of the host building. It would cause harm to the appearance of both the host building and the semi-detached property that would unbalance the composition of both properties, and as such, would result in visual harm to the conservation area within which it is located.

Policy DP24 requires extensions to consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings and the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed. In this instance, it is considered that the proposed bespoke design and roof form not only fails to comply with the Council's CPG roof guidelines referred to above, but also it fails the tests set out in policy DP24. The semi-detached pair of houses nos. 21 & 22 shares similar age, height, architectural features and external appearance. Although the precise detailing of the dwellings varies, there is a consistency to their general composition and height and to the character of the terrace. Each dwelling frontage incorporates a parapet concealing the roofs behind, presenting a consistent and continuous roofscape which is undisturbed by any existing roof or dormer extension. Within this semi-detached pair, the proposed bespoke extension would be visually prominent in long and short views and would be an incongruous form of development that interrupts an otherwise visually distinct, uniform and intact section of semi-detached houses where no such features exist. The proposed roof extension is therefore considered unacceptable in principle and also in detailed design and is considered to result in demonstrable harm. It would also set an undesirable precedent for future roof extensions and alterations to this semi-detached pair of houses.

The extension will harm the character and appearance of the Kentish Town conservation area. Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013.

**Amenity**

The proposed roof extension would be visible to neighbouring residential occupiers at no.20 opposite, but it is separated by the highway and, as with all roof extensions, is not considered unreasonable in its location to cause any serious harm to neighbour amenity in terms of impact on outlook, sunlight/ daylight and privacy.

At the rear at nos.28-34 Fortess Road, the roof extension would be set against a blank rear wall. Although it is approx. 0.7m away to one side of a window to a habitable room of the neighbouring flat at 1st floor level, it is significantly angled away from this window and will not affect its receipt of light and outlook. Thus the scheme complies with policy DP26.

**Recommendation:** Refuse planning permission.

**Photos**



No.22 Fortess Grove; Nos. 28-34 Fortess Road in background.

View due north-west



View due south – nos.21 & 22 Fortess Grove & nos.28-34 fortess Road