

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	31/12/2020
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	03/01/2021
Officer				Application Number(s)	
Obote Hope				2020/5119/P	
Application Address				Drawing Numbers	
63 Camden Mews London NW1 9BY				See draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of a mansard roof extension to provide additional accommodation for 1st floor flat, including attached roof enclosure on rear wing for a 2nd floor roof terrace; and installation of timber fence on the rear ground floor flat roof to create a 1st floor roof terrace.					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission			
Application Type:		Full Planning Application			
Informatives:					
Consultations					
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02	
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed 10/12/2020 which expired 03/01/2021. Press notice was published 09/12/2020 which expired 02/01/2021.</p> <p>The Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee raised the following objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bulk is excessive; • The height and volume of the proposal are inappropriate in relation to neighbouring buildings; • The proposal fails to maintain the rhythm of neighbouring buildings; • The choice of materials fails to make a positive visual contribution to the conservation area or support historical precedent. 				

Site Description

The application site is located on the west of Camden Mews in close proximity to the junction with Cantelowes Road. To the north of the site lies properties fronting Camden Road, to the south are properties fronting Abingdon Close. The site comprises a traditional two storey mews building that is occupied by a garage/workshop on the ground floor with a residential flat above. The character of the street in this part of Camden Mews is principally two storey properties that step forward in groups of three in terms of the building line.

The site lies within the Camden Square Conservation Area. The building is not a listed building and is not identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area.

Relevant History

2014/5026/P - Erection of a single storey rear extension at first floor level and timber fencing around adjoining roof terrace. **Granted** permission on 23/12/2014.

2007/4037/P - Planning permission for the change of use from ground floor car workshop (B1c) and first floor flat into 2 no. dwelling houses with integral garages including a two storey front extension, mansard roof extension and a remodelled rear ground floor extension with terraces above.– **Refused 16/11/2007.**

Reasons for refusal:

Reason 1:

The proposed development, by virtue of the loss of the existing business floorspace without adequate justification, would result in the net loss of accommodation suitable for small firms, contrary to policies E2 'Retention of existing business uses' and E3 'Specific businesses uses and areas' of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.

Reason 2:

The proposed development, by reason of the loss of the stepped front building line, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building, the wider terrace, and the Camden Square Conservation Area, contrary to policies B1 'General design principles', B3 'Alterations and extensions' and B7 'Conservation areas' of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.

Reason 3:

The proposed development, by reason of its design, would fail to provide accessible homes to meet the needs/future needs of those with mobility difficulties, contrary to policy H7 'Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing' of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.

Reason 4:

The proposed roof extension would, by reason of its prominent location, scale, height, and detailed design would be detrimental to the setting of the terrace of adjoining buildings and have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the Camden Square Conservation Area, contrary to Policies B1 'General design principles', B3 'Alterations and extensions', B7 'Conservation areas' of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2006 and 'Roofs and terraces' contained in the Camden Planning Guidance 2006.

Reason 5:

The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing a car capped scheme, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area, contrary to policies T8 'Car free housing and car capped housing' and T9 'Impact of parking' of the London Borough Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.

2007/6024/P - Erection of a single storey front extension, alterations to the rear elevation including replacement of existing close boarded fence on first floor rear terraces with 1.1m high glass screen and mansard roof extension to provide two self-contained residential flats at first and second floor levels. – **Refused 05/03/2008. Decision appealed (ref: APP/X5210/A/08/2076528/WF) and dismissed 27/10/2008.**

Reason for refusal:

Reason 1

The proposed development, by reason of the loss of the stepped front building line, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building, the wider terrace, and the Camden Square Conservation Area,

contrary to policies B1 [General design principles], B3 [Alterations and extensions] and B7 [Conservation areas] of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.

Reason 2

The proposed roof extension would, by reason of its prominent location, scale, height, and detailed design would be detrimental to the setting of the terrace of adjoining buildings and have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the Camden Square Conservation Area, contrary to Policies B1 [General design principles], B3 [Alterations and extensions], B7 [Conservation areas] of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2006 and 'Roofs and terraces' contained in the Camden Planning Guidance 2006.

Reason 3

The proposal, by reason of the inadequate overall floor area of the each of the new flats and inadequate size of the main bedroom area, would result in substandard habitable accommodation and would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the future occupiers, contrary to policy SD6 [Amenity for occupiers and neighbours] of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and guidance contained within the Camden Planning Guidance 2006.

No planning permission has been given for roof alterations throughout Camden Mews.

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

Intend to Publish London Plan 2019

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)

CPG Home Improvements (Draft) (2020)

Camden Square Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011

Assessment

1.0. Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a mansard style roof extension. The proposed roof extension would provide additional residential floorspace to increase the size of the existing flat, turning it from a 1 bed flat to a 3 bed flat. The mansard would measure approximately 2.4m in height and incorporate two dormer windows on the front roofslope setback from the front parapet of the building. The mansard would be constructed using slate tiles, with 2.5m high brick party walls along the side boundaries.
- 1.2 It is also proposed to use the flat roof of the first floor extension as a roof terrace that would be accessed from the proposed mansard roof extension and would be surrounded by a fake mansard tiled enclosure with open roof. At first floor it is proposed to use the flat roof of the existing rear addition as a terrace surrounded by timber fencing. The proposed first floor terrace would measure 3.0m in depth and 3.2m in width and the roof terrace at second floor level would measure approximately 2.5m in depth x 1.6m in width.

2.0 Design

- 2.1 Local Plan policy D1 (Design) 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).
- 2.2 Local Plan policy D2 states that The Council will preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings.
- 2.3 CPG Home Improvements (Draft 2020) notes that in adding a further storey to a building, applicants should be aware of the prominence of the roof to appreciate what impact an additional roof level would have on the streetscene and wider area.
- 2.4 CPG 'Altering and Extending your Home' states that (para.4.2) roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable in a number of circumstances including where:
- There is an unbroken run of valley roofs;
 - Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a co-ordinated design;
 - Buildings designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level; or
 - Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.
- 2.5 With specific reference to mansard designs, CPG 'Altering and Extending your Home' states that mansards will be generally considered an acceptable form of development where they 'are an established feature within a group of buildings or townscape'.
- 2.6 The applicant has previously referred to other properties within the street that have similar roof extensions. The buildings at nos. 79 and 81-83 were redevelopment sites constructed during the late 1990's and late 1980's respectively for residential purposes only and are representative of their time with more modern features including roof extensions and terraces. Nos. 93-95 Camden Mews were 4 new houses with integral garages that were allowed on appeal in 1982. The character of this part of the mews is very different from the application site with more modern replacement buildings that incorporate roof extensions. This would not set a precedent for roof extensions on an original mews building in this part of the mews.
- 2.7 The proposed mansard roof extension would be introduced into a terrace of buildings that have an unaltered roof profile and uniform parapet line height. The application building is part of a wider group of 2 storey buildings that carries a consistent building line and parapet line that is unaltered on this side of the street. The proposed mansard roof extension would interrupt this consistent parapet line and would detract from the existing largely unaltered roofline and would be considered unacceptable.
- 2.8 The strong and simple parapet line (with no visible roof additions) contributes greatly to the character and appearance of this street. The roof addition would serve to erode this character and fundamentally alter the character and appearance of host building, serving to undermine the composition and architectural style of the building and adjoining mews buildings. The addition would intrude upon this largely unimpaired roofline, in which mansards do not form an established part of the character. Moreover the extension would appear very bulky and incongruous with its steeply pitched roofslopes in this context. The proposal would undermine the architectural style of the property and terrace, failing to accord with the aforementioned policies and CPGs.
- 2.9 Whilst the mansard roof design proposed, with its additional attached rear roof enclosure, is different from the previously refused (and dismissed) scheme, ref 2007/6024/P, the principle remains the same regarding its assessment. The rooflines of the properties within the terrace remain largely unaltered throughout the terrace. Circumstances have not materially changed in terms of policy or site context since the last appeal decision of 31.10.08. The Inspector stated then that 'the proposed second floor

mansard type roof extension would appear prominent and incongruous when compared with the other half of the pair of buildings... When viewed from the south, the significant outline of the end wall of the extension would not be compatible with other existing developments and appear visually incongruous... In my opinion, the principle of the extensions and the details of the scheme would be out of place and not preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area.' It is considered that the same conclusions apply again to this scheme.

- 2.10 It is proposed to install timber fence along the side (north) elevation and replace the existing side facing window with a new door to use the first floor flat roof as a proposed terrace. At second floor level it is proposed to extend the existing flat roof associated with a new terrace enclosure with inset balustrade. There is no objection to the principle of the first flat roof being used as a terrace or installation of privacy timber fencing. However the open-roofed enclosure proposed at second floor level would be an incongruous addition that would be an alien feature to the building type and general townscape and would contribute to the overall visual bulk at roof level.
- 2.11 Further to the above, the cumulative impact of the proposed mansard and second floor roof extensions would result in a building that is materially out of scale with the original building and adjoining structures. The additional elements are considered to be unacceptable by way of their scale, height and massing and this would be exacerbated by their poor design which appear crudely designed with an incongruous open-roofed enclosure on the rear wing and steep roof pitches to the main mansard. They would affect the character and appearance of the positive contributor buildings at the rear at 208 to 226 Camden Road.
- 2.12 Given the above assessment, the proposal would serve to cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the host property, as well as harming the adjoining terrace, streetscene and surrounding conservation area. Both the principle and the detailed design of the proposal is considered to be unacceptable by reason of its impact on the property and surrounding area.
- 2.13 Considerable importance and weight has been attached to the harm and special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, under s.72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013.
- 2.14 It is acknowledged that the proposal would result in an increase in the size of this market flat, from a two bed to a three bed (which is within Camden's housing mix priority table). As such, there would be some very limited private benefit arising as a result of the proposal. However this would not outweigh the harm caused to the character and appearance of the building and conservation area.
- 2.15 The proposal is thereby considered to constitute 'less than substantial' harm to the host building, with no demonstrable public benefits derived from the scheme which would outweigh such harm. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Section 16 of the NPPF (2019) which seeks to preserve and enhance heritage assets.
- 2.16 The mansard addition and rear enclosure, by reason of its siting, scale, form and design, is considered to represent an uncharacteristic, unsympathetic and harmful addition to the host property, adjoining terrace, and surrounding area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan 2017, and refusal is warranted on this basis.

3. Impact on neighbours

- 3.1 Policy A1 seeks to ensure that the amenity of neighbouring properties is protected. It states that planning permission will not be granted for development that causes harm to the amenity of occupiers and neighbours in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy.
- 3.2 The closest residential properties include 43 Abingdon Close located approximately 11m to the southeast of the site on the opposite side of the street, 214 Camden Road approx. 18m to the northwest and the adjoining properties of 61 and 65 Camden Mews. The proposed mansard roof extension would increase the height of the building by 1.8m. However given the separation distance between the application site and the adjoining properties and their orientation in relation to the application site, it is considered that no harmful loss of daylight or sunlight will be experienced by these properties.

- 3.3 The proposed roof terrace enclosures on the roofs of both ground and 1st floor rear wings would comprise a timber fence and tiled sloped roof form respectively, thus preventing any overlooking from the roof terraces or at least restricting views into the garden areas of the adjoining properties.
- 3.4 The mews here is very narrow and the site has no private forecourt for storing equipment thus, given the constrained nature of the site, construction works would be potentially harmful to local amenity and transport conditions. The construction would be in a sensitive residential area and are likely to take place over an extended period of time. As such, in accordance with Policy A1 (i) of the Local Plan 2017, the applicant will be required to enter into a Section 106 Agreement in respect of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and associated Implementation Support Contribution and refundable CMP Bond. Had the development been otherwise acceptable, details of Construction Management Plan would have been secured by s106 legal agreement.

4. Recommendation

4.1 Refuse planning permission for the following reasons-

The proposed roof extension and attached rear roof enclosure, by reason of their location, scale, height and design, would result in incongruous and bulky additions that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building, the terrace of adjoining buildings, the streetscene and the Camden Square Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing a Construction Management Plan and associated support fees, would be likely to give rise to conflicts with other road users and be detrimental to the amenities of the area generally, contrary to policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.