

| | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Delegated Report | | Analysis sheet | Expiry Date: | 23/03/2018 |
| | | N/A / attached | Consultation Expiry Date: | 14/03/2018 |
| Officer | | | Application Number(s) | |
| Kristina Smith | | | 2018/0445/P | |
| Application Address | | | Drawing Numbers | |
| 27 Healey Street London NW1 8SR | | | Refer to Decision Notice | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signature | C&UD | Authorised Officer Signature | |
| | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | |
| Erection of mansard roof extension to dwellinghouse (C3) | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | Refuse planning permission | | |
| Application Type: | | Householder Application | | |
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | | Refer to Draft Decision Notice | | |
| Informatives: | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | | No. of responses | 00 | No. of objections |
| | | | | 00 |
| Summary of consultation responses: | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2no. site notices were displayed from 21/02/18 to 14/03/2018 – 1 outside the application site and 1 on Grafton Crescent No responses received | | |
| Local groups comments: | | 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

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

25 Healey Street (adjoining neighbour)

2017/7058/P - Proposed erection of additional floor with mansard roof extension to dwellinghouse – **Pending decision** (intention to refuse)

23 Healey Street

2018/3464/P - Erection of mansard roof extension with front and rear rooflights to provide additional residential floorspace (Class C3) **Refused 13/09/2018** on the grounds that

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

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**

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"

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

Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (adopted September 2016)

- Policy D2 Design Principles

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

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 2m from the principal elevation to provide a terrace. The mansard would have a flat roof with vertical front and rear elevations that are largely glazed. The mansard would be finished in metal cladding.

1.2. 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. Policy D3 of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (2016) states that ‘Proposals must be well integrated into their surroundings and reinforce and enhance local character’ with the supporting text reading ‘Development must respect the historic appearance of Kentish Town in order to reinforce rather than detract from its local distinctiveness.’

2.4. 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.

2.5. The properties on this side of Healey Street have an abundant planning history when it comes to applications for mansard applications. Two appeals relating to mansard roof extensions have

been dismissed on 19/09/2016 and 02/02/2017 at no.23 Healey Street, which form a material consideration in the assessment of this application given the site conditions are largely similar. The Inspector's report refers 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'*.

- 2.6. At no.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. It should be noted this decision is inconsistent with the more recent appeal decision at no.23 Healey Street. From reading the decision it is clear that the Inspector was aware of the allowed appeal at no.21 Healey Street and still chose to dismiss the 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. Given no.27 is equal to no.23 in terms of its prominence and contribution to the streetscape, it is considered the Inspector's judgement should be extended to the application site.
- 2.7. At the time of writing the mansard roof extension at no.21 Healey Street remains unimplemented and no's 19-31 remain a prominent run of unaltered valley roofs. The permission expires on 19/07/2019.
- 2.8. 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'*.

Detailed design

- 2.9. The roof extension would have a vertical front elevation which would be completely glazed and a largely vertical rear elevation with a sloping section of 70 degrees at the bottom. It would comprise full height glazed doors to the front and rear elevation. This is a wholly non-traditional interpretation of a mansard roof extension that would not comply with the design guidance of CPG1 (design) which states that mansards should have a 70 degrees slope and in terms of windows, comprise dormers or rooflights to the lower slope. The detailed design of the mansard is considered to represent additional harm above and beyond the harm caused by the introduction of a mansard on this very prominent section of 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. Given the existing large window openings below, the front terrace is not considered to lead to a material loss of privacy to the properties on the opposite side of Healey Street.

4. Recommendation

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

