

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>01/12/2017</b>
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>05/12/2017</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Elaine Quigley			2017/4810/P 2017/540/L		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
8 Little Green Street London NW5 1BL			See draft decision notices		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
<p>(i) Removal of double pitched roof and installation of a mansard roof with dormers to create additional habitable accommodation to the existing single family dwelling (C3 use class).</p> <p>(ii) Removal of double pitched roof and installation of a mansard roof to provide an additional habitable accommodation and associated internal works to second floor bathroom to the existing single family dwelling (C3 use class).</p>					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<p>(i) Refuse planning permission</p> <p>(ii) Refuse listed building consent</p>			
<b>Application Type:</b>		<p>Householder Application</p> <p>Listed Building Application</p>			

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>05</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed on 03/11/2017 and expired on 24/11/2017 and a press notice was published on 09/11/2017 that expired on 30/11/2017. Following a site visit on 14/11/2017 it had become apparent that the site notices had been removed before the consultation period had expired. It was considered reasonable to display the site notices again from 15/11/2017 to 06/12/2017 thereby extending the consultation period for a further 10 days.</p> <p>1 letter was received from Councillor Jenny Headlam-Wells (Labour Councillor for Kentish Town Ward). She requested that the application be referred to Member's Briefing and to the Planning Committee for determination. She was of the opinion that the proposal has taken into account the historic nature and quality of Little Green Street.</p> <p>1 letter of objection received from local resident (no postal address provided) raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal would involve entirely inappropriate creation of a whole extra mansard floor on this hitherto unaltered 18<sup>th</sup> century house, together with the loss of its butterfly roof and with 'associated internal works' including, no doubt, a new internal stair. This is wholly unacceptable.</li> <li>• This building, being an end-of-terrace house to a run of modest shop-houses (bow windows intact) is already, since its construction, slightly higher than its neighbours. The only visible alteration it appears to have undergone at some point is the modification of its front doorway, but it is a measure of how slight the alteration has been that the wood surrounds to the door are original and match those of the adjoining houses.</li> <li>• I feel strongly that people who buy expensive listed houses should not then expect to be able to alter the whole nature of the property by trying to transform it into a larger one. If they wanted a larger house than those in Little Green Street they should have looked elsewhere in the first place.</li> <li>• Camden has, recently, had a good track record for rejecting unsuitable and greedy applications relating to significant buildings. I trust and believe that this current application will be treated with the rejection it deserves</li> </ul> <p>3 letters received from neighbouring occupiers at 10 Ingestre Road, 5 Little Green Street and 7 Little Green Street raising no objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewed the plans and very happy from them to go ahead. They will not change the character of the area and will fit in nicely with the existing houses</li> <li>• The mansard fits the profile of the other houses and Georgian buildings in general</li> <li>• I have seen the area and street change, sometimes for the better,</li> </ul>					

	<p>sometimes for the worse. I feel that the plans for number 8, which I have studied in detail, are sympathetic to the street and would in no way detract from its unique character</p>
<p><b>Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC)</b></p>	<p>Dartmouth Park CAAC – object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Loss of twin (integral to parapet) pitched roofs harms both original character and setting of the listed building.</li><li>• The proposal represents over-development of the listed building.</li><li>• Impact on the special character of the listed building and its setting from the total loss of the double inset pitched roofs (shown on drawing 2102/C, but not included in all applications) will be clearly seen from Highgate Road.</li> <li>• Light spillage may also impact on top levels of no. 9 Little Green Street opposite</li></ul>

## Site Description

The site is a corner property located on the north side of Little Green Street in close proximity to the pedestrian accessway known as College Lane that connects Chetwynd Road to the north and Lady Somerset Road to the south. It comprises a single family dwelling.

The site is surrounded by mainly residential development. It is located within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and is a Grade II Listed Building. All of the properties on the north side of Little Green Street are Grade II listed.

In terms of accessibility Little Green Street is a very narrow street that does not offer any on-street parking provision in close proximity. In paragraph 7.20 of the Dartmouth Park CAAMS it states that Little Green Street is “*a narrow street on the east side of Highgate Road. The buildings on both sides of the street sit hard onto the pavement and combined with its constricted width it remains a charming 18<sup>th</sup> century quality. On the north side a small terrace of late 18<sup>th</sup> century cottages in yellow stock brick forms a compact group, some with unusual bow fronted windows at ground floor.*”

The site is also located within the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan area.

## Relevant History

### Application site

Planning permission and listed building consent (ref 2016/6070/P and 2017/0076/L) were **granted** on 24/07/2017 for the erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension with rooflights and replacement of the eastern side wall, boundary fence, trellis and gate fronting College Lane, following demolition of the existing single storey rear extension to the existing dwelling.

Planning permission (8400856) was **granted** on 20/06/1984 for the erection of a side boundary wall to an overall height from College Lane of 7 feet.

### Other relevant planning applications (cited by the applicant as pertinent to this case)

Flat 6, Grove End House, 150 Highgate Road

Planning permission and listed building consent (2017/2383/P and 2017/2381/L) were granted on 20/12/2017 at Planning Committee for erection of a roof extension at second floor level and valley style roof addition at third floor including front and rear dormers and associated roof terraces following demolition of existing mansard addition and installation of new entrance gates and railings to the front of the property. Please refer to paragraph 3.19 for further discussion of this.

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2012

#### The London Plan (2016)

#### Camden Local Plan 2017

G1 Delivery and location of growth

H1 Maximising housing supply

H3 Protecting existing homes

A1 Managing the impact of development

A4 Noise and vibration

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport

T2 Parking and car-free development  
T3 Transport infrastructure  
T4 Sustainable movement of goods and materials  
DM1 Delivery and monitoring

### **Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG1 Design (2015) Chapters 2; 3, 5 and 6  
CPG2 Housing (2015) Chapters 4 and 5  
CPG6 Amenity (2011) Chapters 4, 6, 7, 8  
CPG7 Transport (2011) Chapters 5, 6, 9  
CPG8 Planning Obligations (2015) Chapters 3, 5, 7, 10

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement (CAAMS) (adopted 2009)

Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (2016)  
Policy D3

## **Assessment**

### **1.0 Background**

1.1 Planning permission and listed building consent 2016/6070/P and 2017/0076/L was recently granted subject to the signing of a s106 legal agreement for the erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension with rooflights and replacement of the eastern side wall, boundary fence, trellis and gate fronting College Lane, following demolition of the existing single storey rear extension to the existing dwelling.

1.2 The proposal originally included a roof extension which involved infilling between the two existing pitched roofs. This was considered to fundamentally alter the roof form which, although much of its fabric has been altered, still relates closely to the original and has the character of a Georgian roof. The applicant removed this element of the scheme following advice from officers that it was considered unacceptable.

### **2.0 Proposal**

2.1 Planning permission and listed building consent are sought for the removal of the double pitched roof and installation of a mansard roof with dormers to create additional habitable accommodation to the existing single family dwelling (C3 use class).

2.2 The proposal would include the removal of the existing twin pitches and erection of a traditional mansard roof extension. The mansard would measure 3.2m from the internal floor level to the ridge, 2.3m from the top of the parapet wall to the ridge and 1.7m from the top of the parapet wall to the front part of the upper roof slope. It would include a 70 degree angle roof on the lower slope and would be set back by 0.7m from the front and rear elevations. Two dormer windows would be installed in each of the western and eastern side elevations. The dormers on the eastern side elevation would measure 0.97m (width) and 1.1m (height) and on the western side elevation would measure 0.87m (width) by 1.1m (height).

2.3 The roof extension would provide an additional bedroom and bathroom at third floor level.

2.3 The proposal would include internal alterations to the second floor of the property. These would include squaring off the family bathroom and creation of a circulation space to allow access to the new staircase to access the mansard roof. The internal works to the bedroom to the rear would include the removal of an angled wall and replacement with a wall of that would create a more standard layout.

### **3.0 Assessment**

3.1 The proposal would be assessed against the following material considerations

- Loss of the existing historic roof

- Internal alterations
- Design of the new mansard roof
- Amenity
- Transport
- Planning obligations
- Other matters

#### Policy context

##### Camden Local Plan

3.2 Local Plan Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy D1 requires development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, which improves the function, appearance and character of the area; and Policy D2 states that the Council will preserve, and where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas and listed buildings.

##### The Planning (listed building and conservation area) Act 1990

3.3 Statutory provision under section 16 and 66 of the Planning Act requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

3.4 In considering developments affecting a conservation area, Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) requires that local authorities shall pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

3.5 In this case the site forms part of sub area 1 of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

3.6 In line with the above statutory duties and recent case law, considerable importance and weight has to be attached to the impact of the heritage assets and their setting. It should also be noted that the duties imposed by section 66 and 72 of the Act are in addition to the duty imposed by section 3(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, to determine the application in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

##### The NPPF

3.7 Paragraph 129 requires Local planning authorities to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise.

3.8 Any assessment should be taken into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

3.9 Paragraph 137 states that "*Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.*"

3.10 Section 7 of the NPPF is concerned with good design. Paragraph 60 states that, "*Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.*"

##### Loss of the existing roof

3.11 Due to its deep plan form, the house has a distinctive M shaped double pyramidal roof. The

Heritage, Design and Access Statement advises that the existing roof has been almost entirely rebuilt in the 1960's with alterations undertaken including the removal of the central chimney stack, replacement of original materials including the lead box gutter with modern flat roof membrane, as well as replacement of most of the original roof timbers. From visiting the site it is clear that the roof underwent changes in the postwar period so not all the historic fabric survives, including original timbers and the slate finish. That said, the original roof form still exists (although altered) and is a characteristic form of the listed building, and has the character of a Georgian roof. The pitches are an historic roof form (even if there may have been alterations in the past), and is considered to be a rare surviving roof form in the local area. The roof form is somewhat visible from higher-ground views within the surrounding area and within the setting of surrounding listed buildings. The loss of the historic roof structure would be considered harmful to the special architectural character of the listed property and would be considered unacceptable.

#### Internal alterations

3.12 The proposal would include reconfiguration of internal walls to square off the existing family bathroom area which is located at second floor level. It would also include removal of the existing angled wall to the bedroom at the rear at second floor level and replacement with a new wall to create a more traditional room layout. As these walls are non-original fabric their removal and replacement would be considered acceptable.

3.13 The proposal would also include the installation of a new staircase from second to third floor levels to create access to the new habitable accommodation within the roof. Harm would be caused to the special interest of the listed building by obscuring the historic layout on the existing second floor by inserting a continuation of the historic staircase to create a further floor and would not be considered acceptable.

3.14 It is considered that the modest benefits in the form of the improvements to the layout of the second floor rooms would not outweigh the harm caused by the loss of the historic roof form and circulation sequence.

#### Design of the mansard roof extension

3.15 The existing roof measures 2m from the internal floor level to the ridge of the roof. It is set back 1.3m from the front and rear parapet walls. In comparison the proposed mansard roof would measure 3.2m from the internal floor level to the ridge of the roof and 2.3m to the front of the upper slope. It would be set back 0.7m from the front and rear parapet walls. Its overall height would be increased by 1.2m and it would be set closer to the parapet walls by 0.6m at the front and rear. Its height together with its reduced set back from the main elevations of the house would result in the mansard being a more prominent roof structure in relation to the historic building and from surrounding public views from the conservation area.

3.16 It is considered that the mansard roof would fundamentally alter the roof form which, although altered, still has the character of a Georgian roof. The mansard roof would be considered to be too tall and lofty and would be considered an inappropriate form of roof replacement for the host building. Its size and height would result in the mansard adding significantly to the bulk of the building that would be considered harmful to the special historic and architectural character of the listed building, strongly evident in the clean parapet line it presents to the surrounding streets.

3.17 The property is a three storey book-end building at the end of the row of 7 two storey cottages that have habitable accommodation within the roofs. It is one of the tallest buildings in the street and is similar in height to the book-end three storey building on the south side of the street at no. 9 Little Green Street. The existing M shaped roof extension is not visible from shorter views along Little Green Street. The proposed mansard would be more visible from Little Green Street as it is coming closer to the front façade of the building and is higher than the existing roof form. Its size and height would result in additional bulk and prominence that would be considered harmful to the setting of the listed terrace, and which would compromise its strong formal relationship with the other taller Georgian houses with parapets which form part of one another's settings and those of the smaller

cottages.

3.18 The increased size and height of the mansard would also be considered to result in it being more prominent from views from the west from Highgate Road, from the east from Ingestre Estate, from the south up College Lane, and to the north from beyond the Overground viaduct. In these views, the existing parapet and historic roof form relates strongly to near neighbours of comparable age and scale and with comparable features. They provide a counterpoint in the townscape to the characterful and less consistent variety of roof and eaves conditions on the smaller historic cottages. Such changes would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would be considered unacceptable.

#### Other examples of applications that include loss of an existing roof form to a historic building

3.19 The applicant has referenced another application that they consider to be pertinent to the assessment of this application. The site is Flat 6, Grove End House, 150 Highgate Road. Planning permission and listed building consent (2017/2383/P and 2017/2381/L) were granted on 20/12/2017 at Planning Committee for erection of a roof extension at second floor level and valley style roof addition at third floor including front and rear dormers and associated roof terraces following demolition of existing mansard addition and installation of new entrance gates and railings to the front of the property.

3.20 It is considered that this case is a very different situation and as with all listed buildings each case is considered on its own merits. At no. 8 Little Green Street the existing roof, although altered during the post war period, is still the original roof form. The principle of the replacement of the existing historic roof form which is a major factor in the building's special interest was considered unacceptable as part of the previous 2017 application (the roof extension was omitted from the previous scheme) and this remains the view of the Council. In the case of Grove End House, the roof was already modern following the erection of a third storey extension during the later c19th and early c20th. In the 1960's -70s the attic accommodation was adapted and the M roof was largely removed and /or infilled and the flat roof with a mansard style rear roof slope added. The house had already been substantially extended upwards, such that its massing, roofline and roof form no longer reflected their historic character, such that it was considered that the loss of the non-original existing roof and its replacement was acceptable. It is considered that no comparisons can be made between the properties as 8 Little Green Street has remained relatively unaltered over time.

3.21 The two listed buildings are in reasonably close proximity to each other and are in the same sub area of the conservation area (sub area 1); however, within this sub area they are in areas of very different character. In the case of Grove End House the positioning of the edges of the proposed roof would be set well back from the east and west elevation. The hipped nature of the roof means that the roof dips towards each end and as such the new roof would be largely concealed from public views from the front in long and short views. The proposed mansard roof at 8 Little Green Street would be 2.5m to the ridge of the lower slope of the mansard and would be set in 0.7m from the front façade of the building. Its increased height and reduced set back from the front façade would result in the extension being more prominent from public views from the west, east and north. Consequently the impact of this proposal on the conservation area would be different from that of Grove End House.

#### Amenity

3.22 The proposed roof extension would not result in any loss of daylight or sunlight to habitable windows of neighbouring occupiers. It is not considered to harm the privacy or outlook of the adjoining neighbours and would be considered to have a satisfactory relationship with the neighbouring properties. Concern has been raised by the CAAC that the proposal may result in light spill to the neighbouring property at no. 9. The neighbouring property is also three storeys in height. Any light spill from the west facing side dormer windows in the new mansard roof would not be seen from windows that serve habitable rooms in no. 9 and would therefore no result in any harmful impact on the amenity of this property.

#### Transport



3.23 Due to the narrow width of Little Green Street, the location of the site near the end of the street, and the absence of parking in the vicinity; servicing during construction is likely to be difficult. A Construction Management Plan (CMP) would be required, to be secured by Section 106 legal agreement. This would also require a CMP implementation support contribution fee of £3,136. A financial contribution would also be required to ensure any damage to the footpath during the works is repaired, also to be secured by a S106 agreement.

3.24 If the scheme was considered acceptable in all other regards, these would have been secured via Section 106 Legal Agreement. Given the context of the recommendation this consequently forms a reason for refusal of the application, although an informative would also specify that without prejudice to any future application or appeal, this reason for refusal could be overcome by entering into a legal agreement in the context of a scheme acceptable in all other respects.

#### **Other matters**

3.25 The local ward Councillor requested that the application be referred to Member's Briefing and to the Planning Committee for determination. Under the Council's Constitution the Council can determine applications that recommend refusal under delegated powers and there is no requirement for them to be referred to Member's Briefing or the Planning Committee.

### **4.0 Recommendation**

4.1 Refuse Planning permission and listed building consent.