

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		28/08/2017	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		18/08/2017	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Charlotte Meynell				2017/3782/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
14 Reed's Place London NW1 9NA				Refer to draft decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of mansard roof extension and 4 x front dormer windows.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Householder Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	0	No. of responses	0	No. of objections	0
Summary of consultation responses:		<u>A site notice was displayed on 28/07/2017 and expired on 18/08/2017.</u> <u>A press notice was advertised on 27/07/2017 and expired on 17/08/2017.</u> No responses were received from neighbours.					
South Kentish Town CAAC comments:		The South Kentish Town CAAC has objected on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While approval has been given previously to raising the height of Reed's Place houses since the conservation area was created, it has changed the character negatively. • The original valley roof is clearly visible. Those of contemporaneous 119-131 St Pancras Way (built as Sussex Terrace) have not been allowed to be changed. There have also been objections to the creation of 3-storey buildings in the mews of Rochester Place. On conservation grounds, this application should be refused. 					

Site Description

The subject site is a two-storey end of terrace building located on the north-western side of Reed's Place, within the Jeffrey's Street Conservation Area. Reed's Place is a paved pedestrian street accessed from a narrow passage from Royal College Street to the south-west.

The site is not listed but has been identified as a building that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Jeffrey's Street Conservation Area.

Relevant History

14 Reed's Place

2017/2311/P – Erection of mansard roof extension. **Planning permission granted 16/06/2017**

2003/1045/P – Erection of a roof extension. **Planning permission granted 04/09/2003**

13 Reed's Place (Neighbouring property)

2015/2543/P – Erection of mansard roof extension and alterations to roof of ground floor rear extension. **Planning permission granted 11/06/2015**

12 Reed's Place (Neighbouring property)

2006/1998/P – Erection of a roof extension to the residential dwelling (Class C3). **Planning permission granted 21/06/2006**

PE9800722 – The erection of a roof extension and a single storey rear extension. As shown on drawing numbers 980935, CM101, CM102, CM103. **Planning permission refused 25/02/1999; Appeal dismissed 21/12/1999**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan 2016

Camden Local Plan 2017

G1 Delivery and location of growth
A1 Managing the impact of development
D1 Design
D2 Heritage

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (2015)
CPG6 Amenity (2011)

Jeffrey's Street Conservation Area Statement (2002)

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

- 1.1 The application seeks planning permission to convert the original valley roof and erect an atypical mansard roof extension to create a third storey of living accommodation.
- 1.2 The proposed roof extension would raise the rear parapet wall, flank wall and chimney by 2.7m to bring the ridgeline of the roof in line with that of the neighbouring properties Nos. 13 and 12 Reed's Place. These elements would be raised using London stock brick to match the existing and the side boundary wall would slope at an angle of 46 degrees toward the front elevation.
- 1.3 Behind the flank wall, the roof extension would feature a front roof slope with an angle of 40 degrees, which would not be set back from the principle parapet wall. Four dormer windows measuring 1.3m in width, 1.0m in height and 1.5m in depth would be inserted into the front roof slope. The dormer windows would be in line with the windows below and would be set down 0.3m

from the proposed ridgeline. The proposed front roof slope would be built with slate tiles to match the neighbouring roof extensions and the front dormer windows would be clad in zinc with white painted timber doubled glazed sash windows.

1.4 To the rear, the extension would continue vertically rather than sloping as per a typical mansard. Three new white painted timber framed sash windows measuring 0.9m in width and 1.3m in height and set down 0.3m from the proposed ridgeline would be inserted into the rear elevation at second floor level.

1.5 A mansard roof extension was approved at the site in 2017 under application ref. 2017/2311/P (see history section above). The approved mansard roof extension was set back from both the front and rear parapets, with a 70 degree angle to the rear roof slope and a 40 degree angle to the front roof slope; however, the angle of the front roof slope would have been concealed behind the flank wall which would be raised at a 70 degree angle to both the front and rear. The proposal also included the insertion of three dormer windows into the rear roof slope, and six rooflights into the front roof slope.

1.6 Several amendments were negotiated to the mansard roof extension approved under application ref. 2017/2311/P, including the introduction of a rear roof slope at a 70 degree angle and a reduction in size of the rear dormer windows. No amendments were received to the current scheme.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 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 D1 aims to ensure the highest design standards for developments. Policy D1 paragraph 7.2 states that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and to respect the character, setting, form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the character and proportions of the existing building. Policy D2 states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves or, where possible, enhances' its established character and appearance.

3.2 Paragraph 5.7 of CPG1 (Design) states that additional storeys and roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where there are a variety of additions or alterations to roofs which create an established pattern and where further development of a similar form would not cause additional harm. Paragraph 5.8 of CPG1 highlights 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 Paragraphs 5.14-5.16 of CPG1 (Design) states that mansard roof extensions are likely to be an acceptable form of roof extension where it is the established roof form in a group of buildings or townscape. It adds that there are three main aspects to consider when designing a mansard roof extension: pitches and profile; external covering; and windows. With specific regards to existing valley and butterfly roof forms, paragraph 5.19 of CPG1 states that the parapet should be retained and the new roof should start from behind the parapet at existing hopper-head level, forming a continuous slope of up to a maximum of 70 degree.

3.4 The Jeffrey's Street Conservation Area Statement identifies alterations and additions to roofs and parapet walls as development which can lead to the degradation of the Conservation Area if carried out unsympathetically. Paragraph JS23 of the statement advises that "because of the

varied design of roofs in the Conservation Area it will be necessary to assess proposals on an individual basis with regard to the design of the building, the adjoining properties and the streetscape". It goes on to state that "where the principle of an extension is acceptable they should respect the integrity of the existing roof form and existing original details should be precisely matched".

- 3.5 The principle of the erection of a mansard roof extension at the subject site has already been accepted as part of the assessment for application ref. 2017/2311/P, which was granted planning permission on 16/06/2017. The host property is the only remaining building on the north-western side of Reed's Place that has not been altered at roof level, therefore the erection of a roof extension at the site would not be considered to result in additional harm to the terrace.
- 3.6 Whilst the principle of a roof extension at the site is accepted, the design of the proposed mansard roof extension is not considered to be architecturally sympathetic to the host building, as it would build up the rear elevation at second floor level and feature a front roof slope with a 40 degree angle and a flank wall slope with a 46 degree angle, contrary to CPG1 (Design) guidance. The roof extension would appear unduly bulky with an irregularly shaped flank elevation and is not considered to be subordinate to the host building.
- 3.7 Mansard roof extensions featuring raised rear parapet walls at second floor level have been approved at all the neighbouring properties along the terrace on this side of Reed's Place. However, No. 14 Reed's Place is unique in the terrace, as it is of a greater width than the other buildings and has a distinctive valley roof form. The property's end of terrace location also means that the rear and flank elevations of No. 14 are highly visible from Royal College Street to the west.
- 3.8 As such, it is considered that a continuation of this pattern of development at the subject site is not appropriate, as the removal of the rear valley parapet line would not respect the integrity of the existing roof form, and the resulting bulk and scale of the roof extension would be highly prominent. This would detrimentally impact upon the character and appearance of the host building, the surrounding streetscape, and the Jeffrey's Street Conservation Area, to which the subject property has been identified as making a positive contribution.
- 3.9 The mansard roof extension previously approved at the subject site under application ref. 2017/2311/P was of a typical design which retained the rear valley parapet line and raised the flank wall at a 70 degree angle to the front and rear. The traditional design of the approved roof extension was considered to be architecturally sympathetic to the host building and would not appear as an incongruous addition when viewed from Royal College Street. This was considered appropriate to safeguard the character and appearance of the host building and the Jeffrey's Street Conservation Area.
- 3.10 In terms of detailed design, the proposed front dormer windows would be significantly larger in size and scale than the existing front roof lights at Nos. 13 and 12 Reed's Place. As such, the proposed dormer windows would not be considered to be subordinate to the windows below and would result in the proposed roof extension appearing more visually intrusive when viewed from Reed's Place and Rochester Place to the north-east, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building.

4.0 Neighbouring Amenity

- 4.1 Policy A1 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Policy A1 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 By reason of the location and nature of the works, it is not considered that there would be any

adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook or privacy.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed roof extension by reason of its design, bulk, scale and visibility, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building, surrounding streetscape, and the Jeffrey's Street Conservation Area, contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 Refuse Planning Permission