

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|----|--|
| Delegated Report | | Analysis sheet | | Expiry Date: | | 31/07/2019 | | | |
| | | N/A | | Consultation Expiry Date: | | 05/08/2019 | | | |
| Officer | | | | Application Number(s) | | | | | |
| Ben Farrant | | | | 2019/2925/P | | | | | |
| Application Address | | | | Drawing Numbers | | | | | |
| 8 Clarkson Row London NW1 7RA | | | | See draft decision notice | | | | | |
| PO 3/4 | | Area Team Signature | | C&UD | | Authorised Officer Signature | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | | | |
| Erection of dormer extension to rear roof slope. | | | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | Refused | | | | | | | |
| Application Type: | | Householder | | | | | | | |
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | | Refuse Permission | | | | | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | | No. of responses | | 00 | | No. of objections | | 00 | |
| Summary of consultation responses: | | A site notice was displayed between 12/07/2019 and 05/08/2019 It was advertised in the Ham and High between 11/07/2019 and 05/08/2019 No responses were received. | | | | | | | |
| Camden Town Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) | | No comment. | | | | | | | |

Site Description

The application site is a three storey mid-terraced property of a modern design, sited within a row of ten properties (of a similar design) on the north-eastern side of Clarkson Row. The property is sited within the Camden Town Conservation Area, though the terrace is not noted within the conservation area appraisal and management plan. The closest listed buildings are nos. 13-24 Mornington Crescent (Grade II listed), some 35m to the east.

Whilst of a modern construction, the entire terrace at present has a roof profile as originally constructed with 1 no. rear facing roof light to each property only. It is a sensitively designed catslope roof, which helps to reduce the overall bulk of the development to the rear on this triangular patch of residential development bounded by terraces along Clarkson Row, Mornington Place and Mornington Crescent (listed buildings).

Relevant History

None.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Chapter 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

The London Plan March 2016

Camden Local Plan 2017

A1 - Managing the impact of development

D1 - Design

D2 - Heritage

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG Altering and Extending your Home (2019)

CPG Design (2018)

CPG Amenity (2018)

Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2007)

Assessment

1.0. Policy Context

1.1 Local Plan Policy D1 states that The Council will seek to secure high quality design in development. The Council will require that development: a. respects local context and character; b. preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with policy D2 (Heritage).

1.2 Local Plan Policy D2 states that The Council will The Council will preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings.

1.3 The Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan outlines that the special interest of sub area two (residential), is formed from the uniform appearance of properties, use of materials (yellow London stock brick, natural slates, rusticated ground floors and stucco detailing), tree lined streets, and open spaces. In reference to roof forms, it states:

'Fundamental changes to the roofline, insensitive alterations, poor materials, intrusive dormers, or inappropriate windows can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will not be acceptable.'

1.4 CPG Altering and Extending your Home states that (para.4.2) roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances:

'Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions', and

'Buildings designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level;'

1.5 Para. 4.4 of CPG Altering and Extending your Home further states:

'Dormers should not be introduced where they interrupt an unbroken roofscape.'

2.0. Design and Impact on the Conservation Area

2.1 Proposed is the erection of a dormer window to the rear roof slope, stepped 500mm up from the eaves, 2.6m down from the ridge, and 190mm from the edges of the roof. It would be finished in materials to match the host property. There is no planning history for roof alterations to this terrace, with each property remaining as originally constructed with a single rear roof light.

2.2 Whilst it is acknowledged that the host property is of a modern design, the entire terrace benefits from an unbroken roof slope. The unbroken roof form reflects the unbroken terrace of roofs on Mornington Crescent (listed buildings with valley roofs) and the more modern pitched roofs on Mornington Place. The unbroken roof slopes on this triangle of land is a key characteristic of the immediate area. Introducing a dormer as proposed would result in an incongruous addition to the roof which would impact on this local characteristic. The addition would be incongruous in this context and is considered to be unacceptable in principle in accordance with the above referenced policies and guidance.

2.3 It is noted that the application site has an interesting catslide roof, unseen on many properties within the Borough. This architectural detail helps to reduce the overall bulk of the terrace along Clarkson Row, making them appear more subservient within the context, particularly with regards to the listed buildings to the rear. The proposed development would serve to detract from this roof slope detail, and would substantially increase the overall bulk of the dwellinghouse. The proposed development would serve to compromise the overall composition and architectural style of these sensitively designed properties. This would be particularly harmful if replicated through the adjoining terrace.

2.4 Aside from the principle of the development, CPG Altering and Extending your Home states:

'Usually a 500mm gap is required between the dormer and the ridge or hip as well as from the party wall and eaves to maintain an adequate separation'

2.5 It is noted that the proposed development would only allow for 190mm of separation distance, resulting in a dominant appearance to the dormer. This would be particularly harmful if replicated throughout the roof slope, particularly given the narrow width (3.88m) of these houses.

2.6 The proposed dormer would be publically visible in glimpses from above the garage block adjacent to 13a Mornington Place as well as on the approach on Clarkson Row. It would also be visible in a number of private views from the properties along the north and east sides of this triangle of development (formed by Clarkson Row, Mornington Place and Mornington Crescent). The proposed development is considered to be inappropriate within these views, introducing an alteration to an otherwise important unbroken terrace of roofs, and diminishing the architectural integrity of the sensitively designed original form of the terrace.

2.7 As such, the proposal is considered contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017), and the NPPF (2019), and is therefore recommended for refusal.

2.8 Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area and nearby listed buildings, under s.66 & s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013.

3.0. Impact on neighbours

3.1 Given the siting, scale and design of the proposed addition, on balance, it is considered not to result in undue harm to neighbouring amenities. Whilst an additional level of overlooking may be achievable to the rear of the site, given the existing arrangement this would not constitute undue harm.

Recommendation

Refuse planning permission