

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		24/08/2017			
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		14/07/2017			
Officer				Application Number(s)					
Kristina Smith				2016/6586/P					
Application Address				Drawing Numbers					
12 Carol Street London NW1 0HU				Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature			
Proposal(s)									
Erection of mansard roof extension									
Recommendation(s):		Refused							
Application Type:		Householder Application							
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice							
Informatives:									
Consultations									
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. responses		00		No. of objections		00	
Summary of consultation responses:		<u>A site notice was displayed between 23/06/2017 and 14/07/2016</u> No responses received							
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		N/A							

Site Description

The application site refers to a three storey Victorian mid-terrace property situated on the north side of Carol Street which runs parallel to Greenland Road to the north, and adjoins Camden Street to the east. The property forms part of the wider building group which comprises no's 6-24. No.4 Carol Street, a double-fronted larger building, is situated at the east end of the terrace and marks the end of the building group by virtue of its change in style.

Though the property is not listed, the whole of Carol Street is locally listed in recognition of its architectural and townscape significance. In reference to Carol Street, the Local List reads, '*almost intact mid 19th century terraced street with former pub at eastern end...High quality residential architecture and a very pleasing townscape created by the intactness of the group and its unaltered roofline*'

The site is not located within a conservation area.

Relevant History

Flat C, 45 Carol Street

2011/4404/P - Erection of mansard roof extension to flat (Class C3). **Refused 28/10/2011 on the grounds that:** *The proposed roof extension, by reason of its design, bulk, scale and location, would be cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the host building, the group of which it forms part*

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan March 2016

The Camden Local Plan was adopted on 3rd July 2017. The relevant policies to the application are:

A1 Managing the impact of development
D1 Design – Paragraph 7.2

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 - Design - Paragraph 5.7
CPG6 - Amenity

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought to convert the valley roof and erect an atypical mansard roof extension to create a fourth floor of living accommodation. The proposed roof extension would be set back approximately 0.85m from the principal parapet wall with a front slope of 70 degrees. To the rear the extension would continue vertically rather than sloping as per a typical mansard.

1.2 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:

- Design
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

2.0 Design and Appearance

2.1 Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 (paragraph 7.2) requires all developments to respect the local character, setting, context and form of neighbouring buildings as well as the character and proportions of the existing buildings when considering extensions. It continues to state that development should respect the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape as well as the wider historic environment and features of local historic value.

2.2 Paragraph 5.7 of CPG1 (Design) guidance advises mansard roof extensions are likely to be acceptable where it is the established roof form in a group of buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would help to re-unite a group of buildings and townscape. Mansards are not an established roof form on Carol Street and there are no other examples of a mansard roof on the street. The erection of a mansard roof would therefore further serve to disrupt rather than re-unite the building group. The applicant has identified two roof extensions in the wider area as justification for the proposal. Firstly, no.4 Carol Street, which has notable differences in form and character to the application site and is not an appropriate reference. Secondly a property "*at the end of Carol Street junction with Camden Street*". This property, whilst more similar to the proportions and style of the application site, forms part of a different building group on Camden Street and is not part of the built environment context. Therefore, neither properties can be understood as precedent.

2.3 CPG1 Design also states that alterations may be acceptable when they are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form. It is considered that the mansard roof would be harmful to the integrity of the roof form as the distinctive valley roof, which is integral to the character and appearance of the host property, would be lost. Furthermore, the form of the mansard roof, by reason of its vertical rear elevation, is an irregular and unsympathetic design of extension that would be even more harmful to the building and the wider terrace than a traditional mansard would be.

2.4 In terms of detailed design the front slope of the mansard roof would comply with CPG1 (Design) insofar that it would be set behind the parapet and the slope would be angled at 70 degrees. It would have a centralised single dormer window, which, if the principle of a mansard roof was acceptable, would be appropriate detailing. The rear elevation; however, would not have the slope typical of a traditional mansard roof an instead would be of a sheer vertical gradient. This would have the effect of making the mansard roof appear exceptionally bulky and out of proportion with the both the host property and surrounding buildings to the detriment of the entire building group. It would be clad in lead sheeting which, whilst a traditional material for a mansard roof, would in this context appear as an incongruous contrast to the brickwork of the storeys below. A full height Crittal glazed window positioned at the very edge of the extension would not respect the positioning of the windows below and its scale would serve to disrupt the window hierarchy of the rear elevation.

2.5 Two rooflights would be installed on the flat top of the rooflight which appear to project beyond the flat plane of the roof. Given their position at height however, it is unlikely they would be prominent

features.

3.0 Neighbouring Amenity

3.1 By reason of the location and nature of the works, it is not considered there would be any adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of daylight/sunlight, outlook or privacy.

4.0 Recommendation

4.1 Refuse planning permission on inappropriate location, bulk and design