

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	29/08/2018
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	16/08/2018
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Nora-Andreea Constantinescu			2018/3110/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
21 The Anna Freud Centre Maresfield Gardens London NW3 5SD			See draft 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>				
Roof extension to include creation of crown roof with two rooflights on top, replacement of rear dormer with two dormers, one new front rooflight, reinstatement of chimneybreast on southern side, increase in height of the chimneybreast on the northern side, all to non-residential institution (Class D1)				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Refuse planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Full Planning Permission			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	Site notices Press notice	<b>23/07/2018-16/08/2018</b> <b>19/07/2018-12/08/2018</b>	No. of responses	<b>3</b>	No. of objections	<b>0</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>Three neighbouring occupiers at no. 13 Fitzjohns Avenue, 11 and 52A Maresfield Gardens are in support of the current proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive change to the building and the streetscape</li> <li>- The proposal would help mask the stark change between the existing roof profile at no. 19 and the building, with subtle changes to no. 21</li> <li>- Not detrimental to the overall look of the road and surrounding area.</li> </ul>					
<b>Netherhall Neighbourhood Association</b>	<p>Have objected to the proposed scheme for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significant increase in roof volume, bulkier roof, awkward incongruous shape, pushing the ridge line forward to the front and rear by over 1m.</li> <li>- The front façade introduces a visually incongruous setting for the facade details, out of keeping with the general rooflines along the street</li> <li>- As a result the brick parapets would be raised on both side elevations which changes the appearance of the roof and streetscene</li> <li>- The proposed drawings fail to show the true effect of the proposed roof change</li> <li>- The front dormer would lose its significance and visual importance on the façade.</li> <li>- The proposed new dormer window at 3<sup>rd</sup> floor level would be contrary to CPG1 as it requires increase of the pitch height, and introduces a second level of dormers within an interrupted unbroken roofspace at this level.</li> <li>- The raising of the ridge height of the roof behind the decorative parapet should be resisted.</li> <li>- The projecting rooflights proposed on the flat roof will be visible from the properties facing no. 21</li> <li>- The raised parapets will affect the light into the windows at nos. 19 and 23 Maresfield Gardens.</li> <li>- The proposal will weaken the appearance of the building and will disrupt the harmony of the group of building of which this forms an important central element</li> <li>- The proposals neither preserves nor enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.</li> </ul>					

## Site Description

The application site is located on the western side of Maresfield Gardens and is occupied by a detached four storey building with rooms in the attic. The building has been occupied by The Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families (formerly known as the Ann Freud Centre) since 1955. The premises are used at present as a teaching/training/research centre for post-graduate students.

The site lies within Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area and the building is considered to make a positive contribution to it.

## Relevant History

**2018/0138/P** - Proposed use of the site as a dwelling house (Class C3) following the vacation of the current occupier and removal of existing outbuilding to rear. – **Granted 02/05/2018**

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework (2018)

### London Plan (2016)

Policy 7.4 – Local Character

Policy 7.6 – Architecture

### Camden Local Plan (2017)

Policy G1 Delivery and location of growth

Policy DM1 Delivery and monitoring

Policy D1 Design

Policy D2 Heritage

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG 1 – Design updated 2018 – chapters 2, 3, 5

CPG 6 – Amenity 2018 – chapters 2, 3

### Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area Statement (2001)

Paragraphs F/N15, F/N16, F/N17

### 1. Proposal:

1.1 Planning permission is sought for a roof extension to include:

- Creation of crown roof with two rooflights on top, to include increase in height of the pitched roof behind the decorative parapet of the front gable
- One new front rooflight at 5<sup>th</sup> level
- Replacement of rear dormer with two dormers
- Reinstatement of chimneybreast on southern side
- Increase in height of the chimneybreast on the northern side

1.2 The proposals have been revised by removing a front dormer at 5<sup>th</sup> level and replace it with a rooflight.

### 2. Considerations:

2.1 The main considerations in relation to the current proposed scheme are:

- Design and heritage
- Amenity
- Other matters

### 3. Design and heritage

3.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within 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 to be used. Policy D2 states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.

3.2 With reference to roof extensions CPG 1 Design indicates that it is likely to be considered unacceptable where the building is designed as a complete composition and its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level, where the scale and proportion of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.

3.3 Fitzhons Netherhall Conservation Area statement identifies that "roofs are an important and conspicuous element, a development of mid-late Victorian architecture that dominates the roof profile of skyline. The most common types of roofs are gables (various designs), pitched with dormers, shallow pitched with overhanging eaves". Maresfield Gardens is mainly residential in character with a couple of non-residential institutions such as the application building and Freud Museum. The buildings along the western part of the street, of which the application site is part are mostly detached but closely grouped; however, views of the building's side elevations are highly visible from public vantage points. The gaps between the buildings provide views to the rear gardens and create a rhythm to the frontage.

3.4 The applicant considers the existing development at no. 19 Maresfield Gardens as being a relevant precedent and justifying the proposed scheme by suggesting that it enables a more balanced relationship with both neighbouring buildings at no. 19 and no. 23 and "therefore

helps to architecturally reunite the properties in this part of Mareasfield Gardens” as detailed in the Design and Access Statement. There are no planning records of any permission being granted for these works therefore it is not possible to determine the acceptability of the development at no. 19, however this does appear in later planning applications at this site, after 1996. This historic development at no. 19 is the only one along this street which changes the building’s roof volume by increasing the ridge width in an incongruous manner, resulting in significant loss of the host building’s original architectural style and character, out of scale with its surroundings. It is therefore considered that the development at no. 19 does not form an acceptable precedent in this instance, as the character of the buildings on Maresfield Gardens is strongly represented by dual pitch roofslopes, with front gables and secondary front dormer at eaves level.

3.5 Fitzhons Netherhall Conservation Area statement stresses that insensitive alterations can harm the character of the roofscape with poor materials, intrusive dormers, and inappropriate windows and in many instances there is no further possibility of alterations. The proposal would change the profile of the existing roof by increasing its ridge width to 4.42m along the whole roof. The roof volume would be significantly larger than existing, adding incongruous bulk which would change completely the appearance of the host building as a whole, and its views from the street.

3.6 The host building’s banding and richness of architectural features which surrounds the building on all sides, holds significant importance to the buildings appearance and character. The drawings submitted do not show how the proposed roof extension would deal with the existing historic features. It is considered that this development would not support such neat continuation of the brickwork within the new roof shape, which would result in significant harm to the architectural qualities of the building and its contribution to the Conservation Area.

3.7 Furthermore, the proposed alterations to the roof would change the existing roof profile by increasing the pitch of the roof, changing the composition of the front dormer by recessing it within the roofslope. The existing front dormer would be recessed and would no longer project forward which changes its composition and the overall appearance of the roof along the street.

3.8 The proposal includes a rooflight at fifth floor level. CPG 1 states that in conservation areas where roof slopes are very prominent they would be “sensitive to changes that even the installation of roof lights may not be acceptable”. As in the current situation, the rooflight would be located at a high level, which is out of character with the host building. It is noted that the property at no. 23 Maresfield Gardens has a rooflight in a similar location, however there are no planning records of such alteration being approved and this is the only example along the northern part of the street with a rooflight within the front roofslope. It is therefore considered that the established character along this part of the street does not include rooflights at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor level, and therefore this would be unacceptable in this instance.

3.9 In relation to the rear elevation, the building has two existing dormer windows above the eaves and one above at fifth floor level sitting asymmetrically to the ones below. The proposal would replace the existing dormer at fifth floor level with two smaller ones aligned with the dormer windows below. When assessing this element of the proposal in isolation for the installation of the two dormers at this level it would be considered acceptable due to their modest scale and appropriate positioning in relation to the existing rear elevation. Notwithstanding this, the resulting change in roof profile would significantly change the appearance of the existing dormers at eaves level. The cumulative impact of the increase in volume of the roof, with resulting changes to the roof slopes would be detrimental to the character of the host building and neighbouring ones.

3.10 The reinstatement of the chimney on the southern side and increase in height of the one on the northern side of the building, would be acceptable if assessed in isolation; however, in the context of the proposed scheme and substantial increase in the roof volume this would not

be supported.

3.11 Overall, the proposed scheme is not considered to preserve or enhance the appearance of the host building and the character of the street or conservation area which is contrary to policies D1, D2 and to s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The dual pitch roofs with steep slopes and eaves dormers are characteristic for this part of Maresfield Gardens. The proposed scheme would detract from this character, resulting in an incongruous addition, which does not pay significant consideration to the importance of its detailing and architectural features which make the character of the this building.

#### **4. Amenity**

4.1 Policy A1 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that would not harm their amenity. The main factors which are considered to impact the amenity of the neighbouring residents are overlooking, loss of outlook and sense of enclosure, implications on daylight, sunlight and noise.

4.2 The proposed increase in roof volume with associated alterations, due to its nature and location, would not directly affect the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers, in terms of loss of light, outlook and overbearing appearance.

#### **5. Other matters**

5.1 The applicant states in the application form and Design and Access statement that the premises are still in D1 use. The planning history shows that a certificate of lawful development has been granted to convert the property back to residential. It is understood that at the time of this application the premises are still in D1 use. The acceptability of the proposed scheme and the additional accommodation created for the continued use of the property as a teaching / research centre does not outweigh the harm caused to the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding streetscene. .

#### **6. Recommendation**

6.1 Refuse planning permission.