

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		08/03/2018	
(Member's Briefing)		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		20/12/2017	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Obote Hope				2017/4740/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Flat 3, 2nd floor 12 Leighton Grove London NW5 2QT				See draft decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a mansard roof extension with terraces to the front and rear elevations. (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission					
Application Type:		Full planning permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified		00		No. of responses	
						01	
						01	
Summary of consultation responses:		2 site notices were displayed between 19/01/2018 – 09/02/2018.					
		Owner/occupier of no.12 objected to the proposal on the following grounds:					
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing roofscape uniformity should be preserved. 					
Site Description							
The application site comprises a 3 storey property located towards the northern end of Leighton Grove, south of the junction with Brecknock Road. The host building is in residential use (C3 use class) and has been converted into three self-contained flats.							
The application site is not listed, nor is it located in a conservation area. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character.							

The host building sits within a row of 6 properties with an unbroken roofline. All 6 properties feature a uniform front parapet wall to the front with a butterfly valley roof behind.

Relevant History

The application site

PEX0000814 - Erection of a mansard roof extension to top floor flat. **Refused** on 19/12/2000 for the following reason:

The proposed roof extension would have a detrimental visual impact on the existing unspoilt roofline of the terrace, contrary to Unitary Development Plan policies EN1 and EN57. The proposed design of the extension involving the loss of the rear butterfly parapet wall, would also be detrimental to the appearance of the building and the terrace, contrary to policy EN57 and supplementary Planning Guidance.

36559/R1 - Change of use and works of conversion to provide three self-contained flats, including the erection of a three-storey rear addition. **Granted** 31/08/1983.

Planning history of surrounding terrace

No.22

2010/5534/P - Renewal of extant planning permission granted on 26/10/2007 (app ref: 2007/4075/P) for the erection of a roof extension with rear terrace to maisonette. **Granted** 19/11/2010. N.B. This permission has now expired without being implemented.

2007/4075/P - Erection of a roof extension with rear terrace to maisonette (Class C3). **Granted** 26/10/2007.

2004/0329/P - Erection of a roof extension behind existing front and rear parapets. **Granted** 05/03/2004.

PEX0000842 - Erection of a roof extension at third floor level and alteration of first floor rear window & formation of French doors plus the erection of a metal stair linking the kitchen to the roof terrace at rear first floor level. **Refused** 07/12/2000.

No.23

2009/2325/P - Erection of a new roof extension following the demolition of existing roof extension, to upper floor maisonette (Class C3). **Granted** 08/07/2009.

8501043 - The erection of a new 3rd floor roof extension to the existing house. **Granted** 02/10/1985.

No.12

PEX0000814 - Erection of a mansard roof extension to top floor flat. Refused 19/12/2000 (mentions unspoilt roofline and Loss of butterfly roofline harms the building and terrace – mansard roof with 2 x dormers front and rear).

No.29

24551 - Change of use and works of conversion, including the erection of a roof extension and a three storey rear addition, to provide four self-contained dwelling units. **Granted** 18/08/1977.

No.30

15311 - Conversion, and erection of roof extension and rear addition, to provide four self-contained dwelling units at 30 Leighton Grove, N.W.5. **Granted** 01/03/1973.

No.38

2016/1523/P - Erection of a mansard roof extension and conversion of 1st/2nd floor maisonette to 1 x 1 bedroom flat and 1 x 2 bedroom maisonette. **Refused** on 12/05/2016 for the following reason:

“The proposed roof extension by reason of its height, bulk, detailed design and location on a terrace of properties with a largely unimpaired roofline would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and the terrace, contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies”.

Appeal ref: APP/X5210/W/16/3152200 dismissed 07/09/2016.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan 2016

The Camden Local Plan 2017

G1 Delivery and location of growth

A1 Managing the impact of development

D1 Design

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 - Design

CPG6 - Amenity

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of mansard roof extension with terrace to the front and rear elevation.

1.2 The key considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Design (the impact of the proposal on the character of the host property as well as that of the wider streetscene);
- Amenity (the impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers).

2. Design and appearance

2.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions to existing buildings are proposed. Policy D1 aims to ensure that all developments, including alterations and extensions, respect the character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties as well as the character and proportions of the existing building where alterations are made. The proposal would be a departure from these design principles due to the scale of the development and setting within an unaltered roofscape.

2.2 The Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1: Design) states that a roof alteration is likely to be considered unacceptable in circumstances such as the presence of unbroken runs of valley roofs or where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations and extensions. It adds 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.

2.3 The application site sits within a terrace of 6 similar 3 storey Victorian terraced properties all of which retain their original butterfly roof profile.

2.4 The property is not listed or located within a conservation area; however, the rest of the terrace, and the majority of this side of Leighton Grove is characterised by an unbroken roofline, which is considered to make a positive contribution towards the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

2.5 Although the proposed extension is set back from the front elevation, the development would still be visible from longer views along Leighton Grove and from the upper windows of surrounding properties. The mansard roof extension would fundamentally alter the traditional roof form, disrupting the uniform appearance of the terrace, and detracting from its overall character. Thus, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the host building, the wider terrace and streetscene. Approval of the development would set an unwelcome precedent, which would erode the current consistency of appearance within the terrace. The proposed mansard roof is therefore considered unacceptable in principle.

2.6 In terms of the detailed design of the proposals, the mansard roof would not be a true mansard roof extension as the front elevation would feature almost full-width sliding doors opening onto a front terrace and the rear would consist of aluminium double door and window. The roof would be new single ply membrane flat roof (1:80 fall) - zinc standing seam. The design and materials would be unsympathetic to the host building. Moreover, the fenestration treatment bears no relationship with the fenestration pattern of the floors below.

2.7 Although Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1 – Design) advises that a mansard roof is often the most appropriate form of extension for a Georgian or Victorian dwelling with a raised parapet wall, the detailed design of the proposal is not in accordance with the design principles as set out in CPG1. The guidance recommends a true mansard roof or a flat-topped mansard with the lower slope rising from behind the parapet wall at an angle of 60-70 degrees. Although the proposed mansard is set behind the front parapet, it rises at a much steeper angle than recommended.

2.8 Overall, the proposed mansard roof is not considered acceptable both in principle and by reason of its detailed design.

3.0 Roof terraces

3.1 The proposed terrace to the front elevation would measure approximately 1.9m in depth and 5.8m in width. The introduction of a terrace to the front of the host building would further disrupt the harmonious composition and balance of the greater part of this terrace of which the application site forms an attractive and cohesive part. The rear roof terrace would measure 0.6m in depth and 4.9m in width and it is proposed to install metal balustrade within the brickwork of the butterfly roof design. The cumulative impact of the rear terrace proposed would further erode the historic character of the host building, diminishing the roof profile, which is worth preserving. The overall design of the roof terraces proposed would be inappropriate in both design and appearance, the scheme would allow irreversible loss to the architectural integrity of this terrace, which has a largely unspoilt and cohesive roofline.

4.0 Amenity

4.1 The Local Plan Policy A1 seeks to ensure that the amenities of existing and future occupiers are not unduly impacted by development in terms of privacy, outlook, sense of enclosure, loss of daylight/sunlight, noise and vibration. It is considered that the proposals would not have a detrimental impact in this regard.

4.2 The roof of the neighbouring property remains undeveloped at roof level. Therefore, the roof extension is not considered to cause harm to the amenity of adjoining occupiers in terms of loss of light, nor would the extension contribute to a sense of enclosure. It is not anticipated that the proposed terraces to the front and rear elevations would increase levels of overlooking nor increase the loss of

privacy, given the location of the existing windows on the floors below. As such, the proposal is not considered to harm the amenity of adjoining occupiers and would comply with policy A1 of the Local Plan 2017.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed roof extension by reason of its detailed design and location on a terrace of properties with a largely unimpaired roofline would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding terrace, contrary to policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 Refuse planning permission