

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		21/09/2018	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		31/08/2018	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Kristina Smith				2018/3464/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
23 Healey Street London NW1 8SR				Refer to Decision Notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>		<b>Area Team Signature</b>		<b>C&amp;UD</b>		<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Erection of mansard roof extension with front and rear rooflights to provide additional residential floorspace (Class C3)							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>02</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
				No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2no. site notices were displayed – 1 outside the application site and 1 on Grafton Crescent</li> </ul> No responses received					
<b>Local groups comments:</b>		Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum had no comment to make on the application					

## Site Description

The application site is located on the east side of Healey Street and has a rear garden which can be accessed from Grafton Crescent. The property is a mid-terrace three storey building with an original valley roof. The building is not listed, nor is it located within a conservation area.

The terrace on the east side of Healey Street, which the property forms a part of, has a largely unimpaired profile of valley/butterfly roofs. The site is visible from public views on Healey Street but even more so from Grafton Crescent which bounds the terrace immediately to the rear. Properties between No 31-19 Healey Street are clearly visible and prominent from Grafton Crescent.

## Relevant History

### 23 Healey Street (Application site)

**2016/4729/P** - Erection of mansard third floor roof extension to create additional accommodation. **Refused 28/10/2016** on the grounds that:

- The proposed roof extension, by reason of its design, bulk, height and location within a terrace of largely unimpaired rooflines, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building, streetscene and surrounding area

### **Appeal Dismissed 02/02/2017**

*The Inspector commented that the development and the combined effect of the two adjacent roof extensions (no.21 and no.23) would be particularly prominent and would dominate the local roof scape to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.*

**2016/1596/P** - Erection of a third floor roof extension to create additional accommodation. **Refused 22/07/2016** on the grounds that:

- The proposed roof extension, due to its bulk, height, detailed design and location within a terrace of unbroken rooflines, would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building and streetscene

### **Appeal Dismissed on 09/09/2016**

*The Inspector commented that the proposed mansard roof extension is not an appropriate form of development for this location and the need to provide a larger family home is not sufficient to outweigh the harm identified. The Inspector drew attention to the pattern of valley roofs which are visually exposed within Grafton Crescent.*

**2016/1593/P** - Demolition of existing single storey extension, creation of two storey rear extension, and addition of timber sash window in the closet wing. **Granted 23/05/2016**

**2015/6912/P** - Erection of a two storey rear extension, first floor rear terrace, insertion of roof lights, replace the second floor rear UPVC window with a timber frame and converting the first floor rear window to a door. **Granted 03/03/2016**

### **EAST SIDE OF HEALEY STREET** (Same side as application site)

#### 21 Healey Street (neighbouring property)

**2015/6097/P** - Erection of a mansard roof extension. Demolition of existing part single, part two storey rear extension and erection of ground floor rear extension with roof terrace above (at first floor) and erection of first floor part width rear extension. **Refused 04/02/2016** on the grounds that:

- The design, bulk, scale, visibility and location, detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, contrary to policy 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 Allowed 19/07/2016**

*The Inspector considered that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area and was of the opinion that the rear of Healey Street is not prominent in wider views and therefore the proposed development would appear “neither dominant nor incongruous”, but would form “one of a number of subordinate changes to the rear of the terrace”*

25 Healey Street (neighbouring property)

**2017/7058/P** - Proposed erection of additional floor with mansard roof extension to dwellinghouse. **To be recommended for refusal. Pending final decision**

27 Healey Street

**2018/0445/P** - Proposed erection of additional floor with mansard roof extension to dwellinghouse. **To be recommended for refusal. Pending final decision**

11 Healey Street

**2017/4303/P** - Erection of mansard roof extension with front rooflights and rear dormers. **Granted 22/09/2017**

13 Healey Street

**2016/6350/P** - Erection of mansard roof extension with dormer windows to front and rear elevations and creation of roof terrace (Class C3). **Refused 17/01/2017**

### **Appeal Allowed 14/08/2017**

3 Healey Street

**2011/3177/P** - Erection of a mansard roof style extension to rear of top floor flat. **Refused 31/08/2011** on the grounds that:

- The proposed roof extension, by reason of its design, bulk, scale and location, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, contrary to policy 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.

### **WEST SIDE OF HEALEY STREET (Opposite side to application site)**

14 Healey Street

**2011/1557/P** – Erection of a mansard extension and installation of solar panels to roof of dwelling, **Refused 20/06/2011** on the grounds that:

- The proposed roof extension, by reason of the detrimental visual effect that this would have on

the unaltered roof line of the host terrace and the wider street scene, and the proposed materials which are considered to be at odds with the appearance and character of the host building and the wider terrace and street scene, contrary to policy 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.

**2011/5193/P** - Erection of a mansard extension to dwelling house. **Refused 02/12/2011** on the grounds that:

- The proposed roof extension, by reason of its scale, location and design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider terrace contrary to policy 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.

**Granted on Appeal on 13/03/2011**

16 Healey Street

**2014/4400/P** - Erection of a mansard roof and rear extension at ground floor level, installation of glazed balustrade and glazed screening, and replacement of existing window with door for the provision of a roof terrace at first floor level. **Granted 16/09/2014**

**2016/4604/P** - Erection of a mansard roof and extension at ground floor and first floor level to the rear of the existing dwelling house. Installation of a glazed balustrade and glazed screening to create a terrace at first floor level to the rear of the existing dwelling house (Class C3). **Granted 07/10/2016**

## **Relevant policies**

**NPPF 2018 (National Planning Policy Framework)**

**The London Plan 2016**

**Draft London Plan 2018**

**Camden Local Plan 2017**

The Local Plan policies relevant to the proposals are:

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

## **Camden Planning Guidance**

- CPG 1 – Design (2015)
  - o Design excellence: sections 2.6 – 2.8, page 10
  - o Context & Design: section 2.9 – 2.12, pages 11 – 12
  - o Heritage : section 3, pages 15 - 27
  - o Materials: section 4.7, page 31

- CPG – Amenity (2018)
  - o Daylight and Sunlight: section 3, pages 7-16
  - o Overlooking, privacy and outlook: section 2, pages 4-7

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal / Background

- 1.1. Planning permission is sought to convert the valley roof and erect a mansard roof extension to create a fourth floor. The proposed roof extension would be set back approximately 1.6m from the principal parapet wall and 0.6m from the rear. The front and rear roof slopes would both be 70 degrees. The mansard would comprise 3 roof lights to the front roof slope and 2 rooflights to the rear roof slope. It is indicated that the mansard would be natural slate construction.
- 1.2. Planning permission has been refused twice for a mansard roof extension at the application site under references 2016/4729/P and 2016/1596/P. Both refusals were subsequently appealed and both appeals were dismissed.
- 1.3. The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:
- Design
  - Amenity

### 2. Design and Appearance

- 2.1. Policy D1 of the Local Plan requires all developments to be of the highest standard of design and will expect development to consider:
- Character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings and constraints of its site;
  - The prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development;
  - The impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape
- 2.2. Paragraph 5.7 of CPG1 Design provides specific design guidance on roof extensions, advising that
- “Additional storeys and roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where:*
- a) There is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would help to re-unite a group of buildings and townscape;*
  - b) Alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form;*
  - c) 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.”*
- 2.3. Mansards are not an established roof form on Healey Street and particularly not on the east side of Healey Street where the application site is located. Neither would the application be architecturally sympathetic or retain the integrity of the roof form. The rear elevation of no's 19 – 31 are highly visible from Grafton Crescent where they read as a striking example of an unbroken run of valley roofs. The Council consider it particularly important to preserve the integrity of the roofline of this section of the terrace given its visibility from and subsequent contribution to the

Grafton Crescent streetscene. Roof additions on the west side of Healey Street and further down the east side of the street have significantly less visibility and therefore cannot be understood as precedent. There are currently no other visible additions or alterations on no's 19-31 Healey Street and so further development would certainly cause additional harm.

- 2.4. The properties on this side of Healey Street have an abundant planning history when it comes to applications for mansard applications. Starting with the application site, two previous appeals relating to mansard roof extensions were dismissed on 19/09/2016 and 02/02/2017, and these decisions remain a valid and material consideration in the assessment of this application. The appeal decisions refer to the visibility of the terrace from Grafton Crescent and the disruption the proposal would have on the consistent pattern of valley roofs. The most recent appeal decision refers to *'the architectural rhythm and quality of the roof scape viewed from the upper floors of properties in the immediate vicinity of the site along Healey Street and Grafton Crescent'*, which the mansard would *'compromise to a harmful degree'*. Therefore, it is only rational that the proposed mansard remains unacceptable in principle and should be refused again on the same grounds.
- 2.5. At neighbouring property 21 Healey Street, an appeal against the Council's decision to refuse a mansard roof extension was allowed on 10/07/2016 despite it being contrary to Camden's planning policy as outlined above. This decision is inconsistent with the more recent appeal decision at the application site. At the time of writing the mansard roof extension at no.21 Healey Street remains unimplemented.
- 2.6. In the most recent appeal decision at the application site, it was evident that the Inspector was aware of the allowed appeal at no.21 Healey Street and still chose to dismiss the second appeal, stating that *'in my opinion the development and the combined effect of the two adjacent roof extensions would be particularly prominent and would dominate the local roof scape to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area'*. It is therefore clear that the Inspector does not consider the allowed extension at no.21 as precedent and considers the proposal for an additional mansard would result in additional harm. The Inspector's report refers to other roof alterations along Healey Street, including at no.25 but dismisses them as not appearing intrusive or dominant and therefore not harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
- 2.7. More recently, an application was granted by the Council at no.11 Healey Street further down the same side of the street. The 'reason for granting' made it clear that the Council's support was due to the fact the rear elevation was not visible from Grafton Crescent and therefore the loss of the highly visible valley roof was not as crucial. Furthermore, an appeal for a mansard roof extension was allowed at no.13 Healey Street on appeal and the Inspector justified the decision partly in terms of it having only partial visibility from Grafton Crescent. Importantly, the Inspector also notes in relation to the planning history at the application site, *'the rear of No 23 sits close to the end of the terrace in Grafton Crescent so would be more visible, and perhaps have a greater impact'*.
- 2.8. It is worth noting there are two live planning applications for mansard roof extensions at no's 25 and 27 Healey Street, which the Council are intending to refuse on the grounds that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and area.

#### Detailed design

- 2.9. The current application has reconsidered the previous design which incorporated large glazed doors leading on to a terrace to the front. Whilst this application demonstrates an improvement, the design is still considered to be inappropriate.
- 2.10. The mansard would be located 1.6m behind the front parapet with a 70 degree roof slope to

the front and rear. Its form is considered to be a contrived and non-traditional, an outcome of an attempt to reduce its visibility from Healey Street. It is contrary to CPG1 design guidance which advises that mansards should start from behind the parapet.

- 2.11. The position of the rooflights has been determined by the internal layout, rather than through consideration of the fenestration of the rest of the building. The rooflights fail to respect the position of windows below and represent unsympathetic detailed design. Whilst the front rooflights would not be visible from street level, they would be from 'above ground' windows of the properties opposite. The rear rooflights would be visible in public views from Grafton Crescent where it is considered they would result in additional harm to the host building and streetscape.

### **3. Amenity**

- 3.1. By virtue of the location and size of the additional bulk and massing, and the distance from neighbouring windows, the proposed mansard roof would not cause any reduced daylight and sunlight or outlook to the surrounding dwellings.

### **4. Recommendation**

- 4.1. Refuse planning permission on inappropriate location, bulk and design.

