

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		09/11/2020	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		15/11/2020	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Nora-Andreea Constantinescu				2020/4114/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
138 Fleet Road London NW3 2QX				See draft decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>		<b>Area Team Signature</b>		<b>C&amp;UD</b>		<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Erection of mansard roof extension, replacement of existing terrace railings, increase in side parapets height and chimney, and like for like replacement of all windows, all to top flat.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refused					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>Site notices were posted on 21/10/2020 and expired on 14/11/2020. Press notices were issued on 22/10/2020 and expired on 15/11/2020.</p> <p>No responses were received in relation to the proposed development from neighbouring occupiers.</p>					
<b>Mansfield Conservation Area Committee</b>		<p>Mansfield CAAC objected to the proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsympathetic to the age and character of the building</li> <li>• Other examples seem to pre-date the CA.</li> </ul>					

## Site Description

The application site is located on the northern side of Fleet Road. The property is not listed and lies within Mansfield Conservation Area.

The property has three storeys and is part of a group of 19 terraced buildings identified in the Mansfield Conservation Area Appraisal as being significant for their front parapets and pediments above the front bay windows. This group sits within a larger terrace group with buildings of different typologies and architectural detailing.

## Relevant History

Relevant planning records at the application site:

**29431** - The formation of self-contained flats on the ground and second floors - **Grated 27/11/1979**

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

### London Plan (2021)

### Camden Local Plan (2017)

Policy A1 – Managing the impact of development

Policy D1 – Design

Policy D2 - Heritage

Policy DM1 – Delivery and monitoring

Policy CC1- Climate change mitigation

Policy CC2 – Adapting to climate change

Policy CC3 – Water and flooding

### Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance (2021)

CGP - Design

CPG – Home Improvements

CPG6 - Amenity

### 1. Proposal

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning consent to erect mansard type roof extension at the application site and replace the railings to the rear terrace.
- 1.2 The proposed roof extension would sit behind the front pediment with a front wall at an angle of 80 degrees with two front dormers. To the rear, the extension would have a dormer projecting full width of the building, flush with the rear elevation below. The proposal would have a flat roof with two small rooflights and a larger one in the middle of the roof. The internal head height would be of 2m and 2.1m. The extension would increase the size of the existing flat, providing another bedroom with en-suite and walk-in wardrobe.
- 1.3 The site has an existing roof terrace on the top of the three-storey rear projection. Initial proposal included glass balustrade which has been revised to traditional railings. There are no previous planning records in relation to the rear terrace and no information has been submitted to determine if this should be lawful by the passage of time.
- 1.4 The proposal also includes like for like replacement of existing single glazed timber sash windows at upper floor with double glazed timber sash windows.

### 2. Design

- 2.1 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 consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of host building and neighbouring ones, and the quality of materials to be used.
- 2.2 Policy D2 states that the Council will seek to manage development in a way that retains the distinctive character of conservation areas and their significance and will therefore only grant planning permission for development that preserves or enhances the special character or appearance of the area.
- 2.3 In relation to roof extensions, CPG Home Improvements indicates that: *Erecting a roof extension on a building within a complete terrace or group that currently has no extensions and it is not identified in Conservation Area Appraisals as being significant for its roofline, it is likely to be acceptable, generally, in a traditional form. If the complete terrace or group is identified as significant for its roofline, a new roof level is likely to not be acceptable regardless of its form.*
- 2.4 In considering developments affecting a conservation area, Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) requires that local authorities shall pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. In this case the site forms part of Mansfield Conservation Area. In line with the above statutory duties, considerable importance and weight has to be attached to the impact of proposed development to heritage assets.
- 2.5 The south boundary of the Mansfield Conservation Area (CA) runs along Fleet Road. As established in the CA Appraisal, the application site is part of Sub Area1: Fleet Road from west to east. The long terrace row the application site is part of includes different typologies of buildings in terms of their architectural detailing, height, overall character and appearance as identified in the Appraisal in groups for their particular significance. Notably in relation nos. 108-144 Fleet Road, the Appraisal states *3 storey late 19<sup>th</sup> century terrace houses constructed of grey brick with full height projecting square bay windows containing*

*pairs of sliding sashes. The roofs are hidden behind a decorative brickwork parapet and small pediments over the bay windows.*

- 2.6 Within the terrace which the application site forms part of, there are no other roof extensions or alterations, except for a glazed projecting hatch at no. 116 Fleet Road. The proposed extension would therefore sit within a roof largely unaltered by roof extensions or alterations. The CA Appraisal mentions that *the conservation area retains its clearly visible historic rooflines, which it is important to preserve. Fundamental changes to the roofline, insensitive alterations, poor materials, intrusive dormers or inappropriate windows can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will be resisted.* Furthermore, it states that *roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable where buildings form part of a complete terrace or group of buildings which have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations.* Whilst the proposal appears to be screened to some extent by the front parapet and pediment, due to its form and projection, the side upstands which framed the extension would project beyond the existing roofline which would harm, interrupt and undermine the prominence and significance of the front pediment and parapet.
- 2.7 The group the application site is part of has a strong character to the front created by the brickwork parapets and pediments over the bay windows, and to the rear by the butterfly roofs and three storey outriggers. To the front, the proposed roof extension would project closely behind the front pediment and parapet, with two front dormers which sit awkwardly behind it. Given the height of the parapet and pediment, one of the dormers would have very limited outlook and one would be blocked by the front parapet. The design of the roof extension and front dormers due to their position appear out of context and incongruous in relation to the existing elements identified of significance at this site and the terrace group of which it is part of.
- 2.8 The applicant has provided a set of 3D images showing the existing situation and the proposed development as seen from Fleet Road and Byron Mews. The views demonstrate that the upstands required to frame the proposed extension would be visible from Fleet Road and Byron Mews, which would result in an insensitive alteration in a roof largely unimpaired by alterations.
- 2.9 To the rear the proposed roof extension opens with an expansive rear dormer, full width and flush with the elevation below. The dormer would have along its full extent large panes of glass, one of which provides access onto an existing rear terrace. The rear elevations of the properties within the terrace row is characterised by traditional timber sash windows, proportionate to the rear elevation and host building overall. CPG Home improvements advises that additional roof levels should include features informed by the host building and surrounding context. The rear of the proposed extension would be flush with the rear elevation, with no reference to the existing valley roof. As such, due to the great expanse of glazing and the projection of the extension in line with the rear elevation, this would appear out of context and incongruous addition to the host building and wider terrace row.
- 2.10 The proposal also includes rooflights on top of the roof extension which project above the roof of the extension. They appear to add to the bulk of the roof extension overall which is not supported.

### **Rear terrace**

- 2.11 The application site, as well as a large number of properties within the terrace row benefit from the roof terraces on top of the three storey outrigger. Given their extended proliferation along the terrace row, they form part of the character of the area. The proposal would replace the existing railings with a new type of railings of similar appearance. Overall this alteration is considered acceptable.

## **Windows**

2.12 The proposed like for like replacement of existing single glazed timber sash windows at upper floors of the building, to double glazed timber sash windows would be considered to preserve the character and appearance of the host building and therefore acceptable.

### **3. Amenity**

3.1 Policy A1 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbouring ones by only granting permission for development that would not harm their amenity. The main factors which are considered the impact the amenity of neighbouring residents are overlooking, loss of outlook and sense of enclosure, implications on daylight, sunlight, light pollution and noise.

3.2 The proposed roof extension, due to its nature, design and position, would not result in harm to the neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light, outlook, light pollution or noise.

3.3 In relation to the roof terrace, it is noted that the adjoining neighbouring property at no. 136 Fleet Road has a similar one in terms of expansion and location. Some level of mutual overlooking would take place, however this is not be considered harmful to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Given the pattern of development and distance between buildings, the use of the proposed terrace would not result in harm to the neighbouring amenity.

### **4. Recommendation**

4.1 The proposed roof extension by reason of its bulk, detailed design, scale and siting within a largely unimpaired roofline, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building, streetscene and surrounding Conservation Area contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017).

#### **4.2 Refuse planning permission**