

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		19/05/2016	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		06/06/2016	
Officer				Application Numbers			
Samir Benmbarek				2016/1258/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
21 Pratt Street London NW1 0BG				484_01; 484_02			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of mansard roof extension to dwelling							
Recommendation:		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	35	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		To date no representations have been received.					
CAAC/ National Amenity Society comments:		N/A					

Site Description

The application is related to a three storey end of terrace corner building located on the northern side of Pratt Street on the junction with Bayham Street. The property is not within a conservation area, nor is it a Listed Building. At ground floor level, there is retail (A1) use while on the upper floors is a two storey maisonette (Use C3).

Nos. 6-14 Pratt Street (inclusive) is Grade II Listed Buildings within the immediate vicinity of the application site. There are no Locally Listed Buildings nearby.

Nos 15, 16 and 17-19 Pratt Street have mansard roof extensions present at roof level although No. 15 and No. 16 has been without the benefit of planning permission. The group of buildings where the applicant building is located within have no alterations to the roofs in the form of an extension.

Relevant History

No. 21 Pratt Street (Application Site):

No relevant planning history

It is noted there are a number of mansard roof extensions within the group of buildings further along Pratt Street which have been granted planning permission by the Council.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework, 2012

The London Plan 2016

LDF Core Strategy, 2010

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Camden Development Policies, 2010

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

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

Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance

CGP1 Design, 2015 – paragraphs 5.7- 5.10, 5.14-5.20

1. Proposal

1.1 Permission is sought for the erection of mansard roof following demolition of existing roof to dwellinghouse..

1.2 The main issues for consideration are:

- The impact of the proposal upon the character or appearance of the host building, the terrace of which it forms part and the streetscene;
- The impact the proposal may have upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

2. Assessment of Impact on Host Building and Surrounding Area

2.1 Along the terrace of buildings on the northern side of Pratt Street (Nos. 21- 33 inclusive), there are no roof extensions present and it is acknowledged that minimal developments such as roof lights are present within this row of buildings. No 21. Pratt Street (the application building) is a corner building featuring a flat roof while the other buildings in the terrace feature original valley roofs.

2.2 Opposite the application building at the southwestern corner of Pratt Street and Bayham Street, No.16 Pratt Street has a mansard roof extension present which was not achieved via planning permission. No. 15 also to the west of Bayham Street has mansard roof extension without the benefit of planning permission. No. 17-19 Pratt Street is a purpose built block featuring a mansard which was approved in the 1990s prior to the adoption of the Council's Local Development Framework Policies (2010) and Camden Planning Guidance (2013).

2.3 Within this context, the pattern of the existing roofscape within the host group of buildings along the northern side of Pratt Street has not been influenced by the roof developments (authorised or not) on the blocks on the other side of Bayham Street. Therefore, the established and dominant roof form of the host terrace is the original roof form.

2.4 In regards to LDF policies, respecting the local character is an intrinsic aim. In particular, DP24 require careful consideration of the characteristics of the site, features of local distinctiveness, and the wider context to be demonstrated in order to achieve high quality development which integrates into its surroundings. Within areas of distinctive character, it is considered development should reinforce those elements which create the character.

2.5 In considering the proposal against CPG1 (Design), roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances:

- Complete terraces of groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding the whole terrace or group as a co-ordinated design;

2.6 Within the preceding context, the proposal would remove this consistency amongst the terrace by introducing an extra storey at fourth floor level which would go against the character of the group of building by featuring a mansard roof extension above the consistent height established along the terrace. Furthermore this would be made prominent by virtue of the corner location of the host building. Therefore, the mansard extension by virtue of its location within a group of buildings which do not feature roof extensions would be contrary to policy DP24.

2.7 In regards to its detailed design, CPG1 states that the preferred for a mansard roof extension addition is 60-70 degrees. The pitch of the proposed mansard extension is 70 degrees which is considered to be acceptable for its visual prominence as well its position behind an existing parapet wall. The materials for the proposed mansard are considered inappropriate with a timber frame and hanging tiles, although the design of the windows match that of the existing windows of the building and are considered sufficient.

2.8 It is considered that the mansard extension would represent an incongruous and unsympathetic feature which would harm the character and appearance of the host building, the terrace which it forms a part of and the streetscene.

3. Amenity

3.1 It is considered no harm would be caused in regard to the amenity of the neighbouring properties or surrounding gardens in terms of access to sunlight, daylight, privacy, outlook, noise or sense of enclosure by virtue of the

position of the development upon the roof of the building.

4. Recommendation

Refuse Planning Permission.

