

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>30/08/2018</b>	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>16/09/2018</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Numbers</b>			
Samir Benmbarek				2018/3177/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
Top Floor Flat 23 Grafton Road London NW5 3DX				See 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 2x front and 2x rear dormers at third floor level							
<b>Recommendation:</b>		Refuse Planning Permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	--	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>Site notices were displayed in close proximity to the site on 17/08/2018 (expiring on 10/09/2018) and a press notice was displayed on 23/08/2018 (expiring on 16/09/2018).</p> <p>To date, no responses have been received on the application.</p>					
<b>CAAC/ National Amenity Society comments:</b>		The Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum were formally consulted. No response has been received to date on the application.					

## Site Description

The application is related to a three-storey mid-terrace dwelling located on the western side of Grafton Road. The property is located within the Inkerman Conservation Area. It is not a listed building, but is described within the Inkerman Conservation Area Statement as a building that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area.

The building is in use as residential (Use C3) with the building separated into 3x self-contained flats.

The building falls within the scope of the **Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan**.

## Relevant History

No relevant planning application history.

## Relevant policies

**National Planning Policy Framework, 2012**

**The London Plan 2016**

**Camden Local Plan 2017**

A1 (Managing the impact of development)

D1 (Design)

D2 (Heritage)

**Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance**

CPG1 Design (Updated March 2018)

**Inkerman Conservation Area Statement 2001**

**Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan 2016**

Design Policy D3: Design principles

## Assessment

### Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of mansard roof to provide further residential accommodation to the existing top floor flat at No. 23 Grafton Road.

The proposed mansard extension would be constructed of slate tiles and would be a 70 degree pitch rising from behind the parapet at the front elevation. The proposed mansard extension would feature 2x dormer windows at both the front and rear elevation. The windows within the dormers are timber framed sash windows painted white.

As a result, the proposal would create an uplift of 40sqm of additional residential accommodation for the top floor flat. No additional residential units would be formed as part of the proposal.

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 Inkerman Conservation Area;
- The impact the proposal may have upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

### Assessment of Impact on Host Building and Surrounding Area

Along the western side of Grafton Road (Nos. 1-31A inclusive), only one mansard extension is present which is at the neighbouring building, No. 21 Grafton Street. This was not constructed with the benefit of planning permission. Apart from this, there are no roof extensions, although there is minimal development along the terrace such as rooflights. Along the terrace of buildings, there are valleys roofs, which remain intact (apart from No. 21, which has the mansard roof extension).

Within this context, the pattern of the existing roofscape within the host group of buildings along the western side of Grafton Road and the established and dominant roof form of the host terrace is the original valley roof form. Therefore, the row of buildings in which the application building forms part of is considered to be largely unimpaired.

The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained in policy D1 are relevant to the application; development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the quality of materials used. Policy D2 will preserve, and where appropriate, enhance Camden's diverse assets and their settings including conservation areas.

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.

Within the Inkerman Conservation Area Statement, guideline Ink25 (p.29) states 'Mansard additions and other forms of roof extension, which fundamentally change the roof form, are uncharacteristic of the Conservation Area. The introduction of roof addition of this nature is unlikely to be acceptable due to the adverse affect on the skyline and surrounding streetscene'.

The Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan policy D3 (a/b/c) notes that developments could be supported where they meet the following criteria:

- Proposals must be based on a comprehensive understanding of the site and its context
- Proposals must be well integrated into their surroundings and reinforce and enhance local character, in line with paragraph 64 of the NPPF (2012 – since superseded)

- Proposals must identify and draw upon key aspects of character, or design cues from the surrounding area. Appropriate design cues include grain, building form (shape), scale, height and massing, alignment, modulation, architectural detailing, materials, public realm and boundary treatments

Within this preceding context, the proposal would erode the largely unimpaired character amongst the terrace of buildings by introducing an additional storey above the consistent terminating height along the terrace. Although there is a neighbouring mansard extension next door, this was not constructed with the benefit of planning permission and demonstrates the erosion of the character of the previously uniform terrace of buildings. Therefore, the principle of a mansard extension, by virtue of its location within a group of largely unimpaired building at roof level would be contrary to policy D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan, CPG 1 and D3 of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan.

The detailed design of the proposed mansard extension is considered acceptable in regards to general mansard design. However, due to the concerns as detailed in the previous paragraphs, this would not overcome the unacceptability of the mansard roof extension in principle.

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 that it forms a part of and the Inkerman Conservation Area. Although it would provide extended residential accommodation, this does not outweigh the concerns of design and its impact upon the conservation area as explained previously.

### **Amenity**

Policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan seeks to ensure that the amenity of neighbouring properties is protected. It states that planning permission will not be granted for development that causes harm to the amenity of occupiers and neighbours in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy.

It is considered no harm would be caused in regard to the amenity of the neighbouring properties or surrounding gardens by virtue of the position of the development upon the roof of the building. In respect to daylight and sunlight, the proposal would not impede upon the existing levels of daylight and sunlight experienced by the neighbouring properties. Furthermore, in respect to overlooking, this would not be increased as opportunities of overlooking would remain the same into the rear gardens which is typical of residential settings.

### **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

As the proposal results in an uplift of under 100sqm of floorspace, the development would not be liable for either the Mayoral or Camden CIL.

### **Recommendation**

**Refuse Planning Permission.**

