

Mulroy

41b Leverton Street, London NW5 2PE **RIBA Stage 3 – Design and Access Statement**

04 September 2020	A	First issue
09 September 2020	B	Planning history updated
25 September 2020	P1	Issued for Planning

1 – Proposal

- 1.1 The application relates to a roof extension to a Victorian, mid terraced property within the Kentish Town Conservation Area, London Borough of Camden.
- 1.2 The applicants, who wish to start a family in the near future, are proposing an extension to the roof of their upper floor maisonette to create a third bedroom to support this growth. The building has a private first floor terrace leading to a private ground level garden. The applicants have researched other properties with the required three bedrooms but, due to affordability reasons, will require them to move out of the Borough.
- 1.3 Design options have been explored to create the additional bedroom wholly within the existing property, but this will result in the existing bedrooms becoming substandard.
- 1.4 The roof terrace was also explored as the location of a first-floor extension, but this will not provide the required area for a bedroom, possibly impact on the visual amenity and sense of enclosure on the neighbouring properties and prevent access to the rear garden.
- 1.5 After investigating the design and logistical options available it is felt that the roof extension will provide enhanced residential accommodation in line with the needs of the Borough, allow the

Mulroy

2 – Site & surroundings

applicants to remain within the property and improve the environmental and sustainability performance of the property.

- 2.1 The building is located on the western side of Leverton Street within a terrace of similar three storey properties and the application site is the upper two-bedroom maisonette arranged over the first and second floors.
- 2.2 The character of the front elevation of the immediate terrace is relatively cohesive, characterised by a stucco base and stock brick facades with red brick quoin and frieze detailing. The cornices and parapets are in various states of repair and the parapets are not continuous or consistent height. Windows are generally single glazed with original sashes though many front doors and garden walls have been replaced and are incongruous. There are long views of the front elevation from the north and south of Leverton Street. (see photograph below).
- 2.3 The various blocks on the street have varying details and character such that the architecture of the street is homogeneous but far from uniform.
- 2.4 The rear elevation of the block is also relatively consistent with flat rear elevations and valley pitched roofs. There have been a number of unsympathetic alterations to this terrace that have not occurred on neighbouring blocks and these include:
 1. Rendered and painted rear elevations
 2. Loss of original windows
 3. Replacement of original slate roof coverings with man-made concrete tiles
 4. Very deep single storey extensions
- 2.5 There have been various roof extensions on three storey properties on Leverton Street a number of which have been granted since the extension of the Conservation Area in 2011.

Mulroy

- 2.6 The terrace may be seen from the private realm in the rear gardens to the block and from Railey Mews to the north west.



View of 41 Leverton Street from north at junction with Railey Mews

Note the inconsistent parapet height and stepped building height down the street.

Mulroy



View of 41 Leverton Street from south at junction with Falkland Road

The buildings step down the street with a broken parapet line and inconsistent height. A modern replacement building forms the end of terrace.

Mulroy



View of 41 Leverton Street

Note the inconsistent parapet and loss of front garden details

Mulroy



View of 41 Leverton Street from the north

Note the broken parapet line

Mulroy



View of 41 Leverton Street from the north at junction with Railey Mews

Note the inconsistent parapet line

Mulroy



View of rear elevation of the block containing 41 Leverton Street taken from outside 5 Railey Mews

Note the rendered rear facades that are not original

Mulroy



View of rear elevation of 41 Leverton Street taken from the first-floor terrace

Note the rendered rear facade that is not original and is in poor quality

Mulroy

3 – Planning policy

- 3.1 The site is within the 2011 extension of the Kentish Town Conservation Area.
- 3.2 The applicable policy includes the following:
 1. The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 in which there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (2.10)
 2. Camden Local Plan (2017) Policy H6-h in which the Council seeks to secure high quality accessible homes suitable for families with children.
 3. Camden Local Plan (2017) Policy H7 in which the Council identifies the high priority to provide more ‘large houses’ (three bedrooms) within the borough to bridge the gap in housing provision for young families with children.
 4. Camden Local Plan (2017) Policy D1 in which *‘the Council will seek to secure high quality design in development [that] respects local context and character, preserves or enhances the historic environment[.] in accordance with Policy [D2][...] for housing provides a high of accommodation.’* In addition, *‘The Council will welcome high quality contemporary design which responds to its context, however there are some places of homogenous architectural style (for example Georgian Squares) where it is important to retain it.’* Conservation Area Appraisals and Policy D2 are invoked by Policy D1.
 5. Camden Local Plan (2017) Policy D2 covers heritage as follows: *‘The Council will preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden’s rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens and locally listed heritage assets.’*
 6. Camden Local Plan (2017) Policy CC1 (climate change mitigation)
 7. Camden Local Plan – CPG - Altering and extending your home (March 2019) – The Camden planning Guidance sets out

Mulroy

proposals that may or may not be acceptable with respect to roof extensions (pp 15-19).

8. Camden Kentish Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Strategy (March 2011).

4 – Relevant Planning History

- 4.1 There have been various similar applications in Leverton Street, a number of which have been successful within Conservation area since its extension in 2011. A full record of the relevant planning history in the Conservation Area extension is illustrated on drawing
- 4.2 Below is a summary of these applications that have been decided since 2011 with notes from the officer's reports and appeals where available.

<i>Ref and address</i>	<i>Notes</i>
2019/2217/P 73 Leverton St	Refused on appeal, (reference APP/X5210/D/19/3232693) due to the unique location of the building. The Planning Inspectorate Appeal Decision found: <i>'Due to their positioning at the junction of Leverton Street with Countess Road, [73 Leverton St] and its immediate neighbours terminate the view along Countess Road'</i> (paragraph 5). The proposed mansard development was accordingly refused because it <i>'would be prominent in views along Countess Road.'</i> (paragraph 7).

Importantly, the rear elevation of the building, visible from Railey Mews, was found to *'make a neutral contribution to the Conservation Area.'* (Para 5). Even taking into account its position at the junction between Leverton Street and Countess Road, the appeal concluded the harm to the Conservation Area from the proposed mansard was *'less than substantial'* (paragraph 9). Accordingly, the Inspector deciding the appeal had to (under paragraph 196 of the National Planning

Mulroy

Policy Framework) weigh the 'less than substantial' harm against any public benefits of the proposal. However, the appellant failed to identify any public benefits (paragraph 10).

2018/3364/P
90 Leverton St

Granted – End of terrace of existing mansards

2015/5550/P
29 Leverton St

Granted – first floor extension

2015/0112/P
76 Leverton St

Granted – The case report is particularly relevant and so is quoted in full below:

4.2 - Mansard roof extensions are a common feature of the uniform terrace that 76 Leverton Street sits within, and are present at properties at numbers 78, 80, 82, 86 and 88. Number 84 also, has recent consent for a mansard roof extension which is yet to be implemented (see relevant history above). This forms an established pattern of additions and alterations at roof level, and given this precedent, the principle of a mansard roof extension at 76 Leverton Street is considered acceptable.

4.3 - CPG1 informs the basic principles of good design for mansard roof extensions, and proposals comply entirely with its guidelines. In keeping with CPG1, the lower slopes of the proposed mansard rise at an angle of 70 degrees and are set well back behind the parapet wall at the front in particular - sufficiently to minimise visibility from street level. In addition the roofing material would be of the highest quality, comprising solely natural slates.

4.4 - The most prevalent concerns within the objections raised relate to the height of the mansard. Initially the scheme proposed an internal

Mulroy

floor to ceiling height of 2700mm which on planning officer's advice was revised down to 2300mm. This fully addresses any reservations over height as the current proposed floor to ceiling height of 2300mm is well in keeping with guidance set out in CPG1, and would allow the mansard to form a subordinate addition to the host building, causing minimal visual disruption to the existing stepped gradient of the rooflines within the terrace.

4.5 - Revisions also replaced proposed dormer windows to the front and rear with flush conservation style rooflights. These would form a far less prominent addition to the roofslope than dormers, and particularly at the front of the property, would prevent any additional bulk to the mansard which could be visible from the street. Positioned in line with existing windows the proposed rooflights would also serve to complement the symmetry of the host building. The addition of solar panels to the upper roofslope poses no harm in terms of design either, and in line with CPG3 make a welcome contribution to the sustainability of the proposed scheme.

4.6 - The rear elevation benefits too from revisions to the scheme which retain the valley profile to the parapet line. This considered design choice respects 'the general and important characteristic of unaltered roof parapet lines' that 'still persists on Leverton Street', highlighted within the Kentish Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement (page 37). It also means that proposals fully comply with CPG1 guidance which states that 'on buildings with a 'valley' or 'valley' roof if a mansard extension is considered acceptable...then the parapet should be retained.'

Mulroy

2012/4430/P 85 Leverton St	Granted based on a traditional mansard design following the refusal on appeal of 2012/1170/P
2012/1170/P 84 Leverton St	Granted – infill mansard
2011/2093/P 6/7 Railey Mews	Granted mansard extensions to neighbouring houses adjacent to a Grade 2 listed building. The officer’s report states: <i>‘The CPG states that roof alterations are likely to be unacceptable where there is likely to be an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene. However, the CPG states that they are acceptable where 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. Railey Mews benefits from a consistent and largely unaltered roof pattern stepping down gradually from north to south. However, the principle of the mansard has been established by granting permissions in the terrace at No’s 9-14 Railey Mews (see photos). Although the proposed mansard would alter the existing even rhythm and stepped roof form of the terrace to some degree, due to the narrow street the roofscape is not particularly prominent from the streetscene (sic) nor is it visible from longer views outside of Railey Mews.’</i>

- 4.3 There have been numerous other mansard projects granted planning approval before the extension of the Conservation Area. The most relevant is 2007/5472/P, 87 Leverton Street. In the case report for this approval the following assessment was given for the mansard

Mulroy

'There are already roof extensions on properties along this side of the terrace at No. 59, 65, 77 and 79. A roof extension has also been approved next door to the site at No. 89 in 2005 but has not yet been built. On this basis, the principle of a roof extension cannot be objected to. The design of the extension is considered appropriate; it is a traditional mansard style extension which is set back from the front and rear roof slopes in a similar fashion to that which was approved at No. 89 in order to reduce its impact and visibility from ground floor levels. The rear valley roof form has been retained in accordance with CPG advice with the extension set behind it. Materials are natural slate and timber windows. A rooflight is also proposed to the roof of the extension but this will not be visible from street level and given its limited size, will not produce any noticeable light pollution. The extent of overlooking from the front and rear windows will not worsen the existing situation. No other amenity impacts from the extension will arise.'

5 – Leverton Street Character Appraisal

- 5.1 The Appraisal states that in Leverton Street there is a homogeneity of design and detailed joinery (Appraisal, p17). However, Leverton Street comprises buildings of two distinct typologies as follows:
1. South of Falkland Road, east and west side - two-storey painted stucco with valley roofs with isolated mansard roof extensions.
 2. Falkland Road to Ospringe Road – The buildings are generally three storeys with flat fronted elevations. The general roof form is valley roofs though the block to the east side between Falkland Road and Ascham Road have pitched roofs. Over 30% of similar properties in this group have mansard extensions as shown in the extract from 20049-2-002 below. The application site is shown in pink.

Mulroy



6 - Design

6.1 Based on the current policies, previous approved applications and a response to the local context, the design proposal has been developed as follows:

NPPF - Sustainable development

The addition of a third bedroom and improvement of the thermal efficiency of the existing building fabric will be an enhancement of the building in terms of its lifelong function and energy efficiency.

LDF – H6 and H7

The addition of the third bedroom will address Camden’s basic need for more large houses for families within the borough. The provision will result in the applicant not moving out of Borough, following the trend noted in the LDF, and being able to start a family in the most affordable manner.

This is a basic public benefit of the scheme in that Camden’s housing demand is met in

Mulroy

a sustainable way by improving upon existing housing stock.

LDF – D1

The proposal will be subordinate to the host building, set back so as not to be visible from Leverton Street and have a traditional mansard on the front elevation that will be set back behind the unaltered parapet.

LDF – D2

The front and rear elevations, parapet and rear valley roof form will be preserved within the context of the Conservation Area.

Conservation Area
Appraisal

The architectural character of the immediate area is not as consistent as it would first appear. The parapet of the application site is broken in various places giving a slightly stepped appearance that breaks down the uniformity of the terrace. The proposed mansard is set behind this parapet so as not to be visible from the north of south along Leverton Street. In addition, through the justification for the approval of the more prominent mansards on Railey Mews, the mansard extension at 41 Leverton Street continues the typology that is established and common on the remainder of the Street. Refer to drawing 20049-2-002 that highlights the history and presence of mansard extension in the extended conservation area relative to the application site.

Mulroy

6.2 Below we have set out how the proposal has been designed to integrate the design principles of the **CPG – Altering and Extending your home 2019** (CPG)

4.1 – established pattern of roof extensions to a terrace or group similar buildings

Drawing 20049-2-002 illustrates that there is an established pattern of mansard development on the northern part of Leverton Street. The Appraisal notes that the street is homogeneous, and we have described how the application site is part of the northern group of buildings on Leverton Street where mansard extensions are dominant. Approved application 2015/0112/P refers to this established typology on similar buildings.

The approved applications for mansards in Railey Mews (2011/2093/P and others) that are more conspicuous from the public realm, establishes that mansards are acceptable within the Conservation Area Extension.

4.1 – alterations are architecturally sympathetic

The front elevation will be a 70° traditional mansard set behind the parapet as described in CPG 4.6 – drawing 20049-2-007. The rear elevation will retain the valley roof form as CPG 4.9 but see below for further design information.

4.1 - There are a variety of additions [...] to roofs which create an established pattern and where further

The application site is within an architecturally similar group that is part of the northern Leverton Street in which over 30% of the properties have mansard roof

Mulroy

development of a similar form would not cause additional harm

extensions. A number of these have been approved after the formation of the Conservation Area Extension and 2015/0112/P confirms that a mansard is an established type of extension on the properties in this group.

There has been only one refusal for a mansard development on Leverton Street, at No73. The appeal decision (APP/X5210/D/19/-3232693) confirms:

1. this was due to the building's unique position at the end of Countess Rd, because the mansard would be prominent in views along Countess Road (paragraph 7);
2. the rear elevation of the building, visible from Railey Mews, was irrelevant because it would *'make a neutral contribution to the Conservation Area'*. Even given its position terminating the views along Countess Road, the harm to the Conservation Area by the proposed development was identified as *'less than substantial'*.

The result of the appeal decision for 73 Leverton Street and approval of the mansards on Railey Mews have established that when viewed from the rear, a similar mansard on 41 Leverton Street, the only location that it can be seen albeit obliquely, would have an equally *'less than*

Mulroy

	substantial' impact on the Conservation Area as all other approved mansards on the street and those approve on Railey Mews.
4.4 – the extension should allow sufficient habitable space	With a ceiling height of 2.3m a bedroom and small bathroom to current habitable standards may be provided without the introduction of large dormers to the front elevation. (20049-2-005).
4.4 – dormers should relate to the façade below	The front elevation includes two small traditional dormers that relate to the window pattern below (20049-2-007).
4.4 – the lower edge of the dormer should be below the parapet line	The mansard has been designed to accord with clause 4.6 (20049-2-009).
4.6 – traditional mansard design	The building has been designed in accordance with figure 4b as a flat-topped mansard of 70° set below the existing parapet with an internal ceiling height of 2.3m. Windows will timber sashes and the roof covering will be natural slate.
4.9 – valley or butterfly roofs	The rear dormer is set back from the rear façade to: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Minimise its impact on the view from Railey Mews2. Maintain the valley roof form
4.10 – other types of roof extension	The proposed extension will make clear the division between the new dormer and the original building in the following ways:

Mulroy

1. The dormer will be glazed with a high-quality glazing that will contrast with the traditional elevation below
2. The dormer will be set back from the façade.
3. The extension will be finished in a dark colour to be visually recessive.

6 – Our track record

- 6.1 Mulroy Architects is an RIBA Chartered Practice established in 2008 and located in Kentish Town.



Our work has been featured on the Grand Designs programme in which we created a contemporary home within a Conservation Area.

www.channel4.com/programmes/grand-designs/on-demand/57385-007

7 - Conclusion

- 7.1 In conclusion we believe that the proposed extension is an appropriate development in the conservation area as:

Mulroy

1. The proposal provides long-lasting public benefit in that it meets Camden's need for 'large' houses in the area suitable for children (Policies H6-h and H7) with the least possible impact (Policy CC1). The public benefit of improved housing stock within the Borough will outweigh the negligible impact on the Conservation Area as noted in the NPPF, paragraph 196.
2. The optimising and upgrade of existing housing stock is in accordance with Camden's sustainability goals (Policy CC1).
3. It is an established extension typology in the group of similar buildings on Leverton Street that has been proven through similar developments to have a minimal impact on the Conservation Area
4. The extension will be a traditional mansard to the front and subordinate and recessive to the rear in accordance with the current CPG.
5. The existing valley roof profile will be maintained in accordance with the current CPG
6. The use of modern but high-quality materials to the rear will not have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area.

End