

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		23/07/18	
		N/A / attached		Cons. Expire:		05/08/18	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Jaspreet Chana				2019/2751/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
90 Torriano Avenue Kentish Town London NW5 2SE				See draft decision			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Retention of existing side and rear railings around roof access hatch on top of mansard roof, plus alterations to replace existing front timber rails by new relocated metal railings set back from front.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse permission					
Application Type:		Full planning application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	00	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultations:		<p>A site notice was displayed on 12/07/19 (consultation end date 05/08/19).</p> <p>Two objections were raised by neighbours from 88 Torriano Avenue and 142 Leighton Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would like to make sure that if permission is granted the roof will only be used for maintenance issues. I have a balcony on the third floor and I wish to have no one overlooking into my property for privacy reasons. A year ago I objected to the planning for a terrace at the back 2nd floor level because of the overlooking of my garden and direct views into my bed, bath and living rooms. The planning was refused on the grounds of mutual overlooking. I am still overlooked by the top floor windows and have to draw all blinds for privacy in my top bedrooms, This application is to enable a terrace on the roof, which will also directly overlook my property and family rooms. In addition the wooden balustrade has already been sited on the roof even through the consultation is still in process. <p><i>Officer's response: Please see sections 3 and 4 below.</i></p>					

Site Description

No.90 is a five storey terraced villa located to the north-east side of Torriano Avenue. The surrounding area is predominantly residential consisting of four to five storey terraced villas of similar size and design. The property is not within a conservation area or a positive contributor.

Relevant History

90 Torriano Avenue:

EN19/0271 – enforcement case opened to investigate Addition of balustrade on the roof.

2016/5809/P - Two storey front extension at first and second floor levels, mansard roof extension, replacement windows, in association with conversion of existing 1st and 2nd floor flat (3-bed) into 2x self-contained flats (1x 1-bed flat and 1x 2-bed flat) (Class C3) – Refused on 07/12/2016 and then appealed this was dismissed on 24/04/2017.

2016/3920/P - Creation of 3rd floor level roof terrace including alteration of existing window to form doorway and provision of terrace balustrading – Withdrawn – 14/09/2016.

2016/0361/P –Mansard roof extension to create additional living accommodation and alterations to rear windows – Granted – 05/04/16.

2015/5256/P - Erection of 2 no. conservatories at rear of building; lowering of ground level in rear garden; reduction in height of privacy screen at end of rear garden; erection of glass canopy in rear garden; creation of porch underneath main staircase at front; replacement staircase to front to access lower ground floor; creation of lower ground floor storage area; erection of street-level glass balustrade at front; new bin storage with screen at upper ground floor level at front; alterations to openings – Granted – 30/12/2018.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

The London Plan (2016) with new London Plan intend to publish 2019

Camden Local Plan (2017)

- D1 Design
- A1 Amenity

Camden Planning Guidance:

- CPG – Design
- CPG – Extending and improving your home
- CPG – Amenity

Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (2016)

- D1 Design

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1. The rooftop currently has an enclosure of timber railings around a roof access hatch and rooflight on the roof of the mansard roof extension in order to provide a safe accessible area for maintenance purposes. These railings are all unauthorised. Planning permission is sought to retain these. Revised plans have been subsequently submitted to carry out alterations to reduce their visual impact from the front by replacing the front timber rails and installing vertical metal railings further set back from the front. The railings all measure: 0.90-1m in height, will surround 10sqm of flat roof and would be set back 2m from the front edge of the mansard extension.

2. Assessment

2.1. The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are as follows:

- Design and visual impact on the character and appearance of the host building and street scene;
- Impact upon neighbouring amenities

3. Design

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 respect local context and character; comprise details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character; is sustainable in design and construction; integrates well into surrounding townscape and open spaces; and respond to natural features.

- 3.2. The revisions to this application are aimed at reducing the impact of the unauthorised existing timber slatted guarding rails which were added to the mansard roof on the property without permission. The timber guarding is to be removed from the front and reduced in height and set back further on the roof. The alterations now involve lightweight vertical metal railings in black (at 0.9m in height) along the front part, set back 2m from the front edge of the mansard roof; all the railings would occupy an area of 10sqm around the glazed rooflight and access hatch. The railings are proposed to guard the roof whilst any maintenance work would be carried out on the roof.
- 3.3. It is understood from the planning history that permission was granted in 2016 for a mansard extension of the existing roof of the property and so the existing railings are an additional element added to an extension. Given this, it is considered that the balustrading as existing appears incongruous above the mansard roof and adds harmful clutter to the roofscape. The front and side timber rails are clearly visible from the street at ground level and create an ungainly and prominent feature which is incongruous at this rooftop location and at odds with the traditional clean mansard roof profile. The rear rails are also visible in long views from private gardens at the rear.
- 3.4. The proposed alterations in the revised scheme would push the front rail further back by about a metre, so that it is set back from the front edge of the mansard by 2m and set down to 0.90m in height. However it is considered that, in the absence of photomontages or onsite mockups at roof level to prove otherwise, it is likely that the relocated front rails would still be partially visible from the front and side in angled views from the street. Thus although this solution would improve the current situation, it still does not fully resolve the issue of the railings being prominent and visible within the streetscene. The rear railings would continue to be visible and dominant from rear private viewpoints and again forming incongruous clutter at this rooftop location.
- 3.5. It is considered that partial views, both short and long, of the railings as altered would still be had from public and private viewpoints, including from front street level. As such the railing enclosure would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the host property and the surrounding roofscape and streetscene. It is also noted that no other property along this terrace or opposite the road has had any roof extension, structure or railings above a mansard roof. Thus it is considered the proposed alterations would create unnecessary and incongruous visual clutter and would harm the appearance of this property and the character of the general roofscape of the area and streetscene, contrary to policy D1.

4. Impact upon neighbouring amenities

- 4.1. The railings are not intended to create a new roof terrace at this level but rather safety railings for future maintenance activity. It is understood that some levels of overlooking may be had from the roof whilst conducting any maintenance work. It is considered that this would only be for a temporary period of time therefore it is not considered to cause an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity. Furthermore it is considered similar views are already had from the existing mansard roof extension and the second floor rear windows, therefore it is not considered that further harm would be had to neighbouring amenities in regards to overlooking.
- 4.2. If permission was to be granted then a condition should be imposed to ensure the roof is not used as a roof amenity terrace in order to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring premises.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1. Overall, the railings would appear incongruous above the mansard roof and would add harmful clutter to the roofscape. They would be partially visible both in short and long views and as such would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host property, the local roofscape and streetscene and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy D1 (Design) of Camden's Local Plan 2017 and policy D1 (Design) of Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission