

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>31/03/2021</b>
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>3/04/2021</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Sofie Fieldsend			2021/0498/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
91 Messina Avenue London NW6 4LG			See 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				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Refuse Planning Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Householder Planning Permission			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>02</b>	No. of objections	<b>02</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>A site notice was displayed on the 10/03/2021 and the consultation period expired on the 03/04/2021.</p> <p>2 objections from 87 and 93 Messina Avenue, were received during the consultation period. Their objections can be summarised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Roofline on this side largely unimpaired by additions and extensions</li> <li>2. Concerns about loss of light to garden of No.93 Messina Ave and other gardens on Messina Ave and Cotleigh Road</li> <li>3. Concerns property will be used as holiday lets as with No.89 and the site cannot cope with additional plumbing and will result in their cellars being flooded with sewage.</li> </ol> <p>Officer response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See design section</li> <li>2. See section 4.2</li> <li>3. See section 4.4</li> </ol>					

<b>Site Description</b>
<p>The application site is a single family dwelling house which is a three storey mid terrace building on the northern side of Messina Avenue.</p> <p>The building is not listed or within a conservation area. The site is in a local flood risk zone 'Kingsgate'.</p>
<b>Relevant History</b>
<b><u>Application site</u></b>
<b>2021/0609/P - Erection of rear/side ground floor extension. – Pending decision</b>

## Relevant policies

**National Planning Policy Framework (2019)**  
**London Plan (2021)**

### **Camden's Local Plan (2017)**

Policy G1 Delivery and location of growth  
Policy A1 Managing the impact of development  
Policy D1 Design

### **Supplementary Guidance**

CPG Design (January 2021)  
CPG Amenity (January 2021)  
CPG Home Improvements (January 2021)

## Assessment

### **1.0 Proposal**

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a traditional mansard roof extension to create an additional bedroom, bathroom and study.

### **2.0 Assessment**

2.1 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:

- Design and Appearance
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers
- Transport

### **3.0 Design and Appearance**

#### Relevant policies

3.1 Local Plan Policy D1 (Design) requires development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, which improves the function, appearance and character of the area.

3.2 Camden's Design Guidance indicates that proposals should have regard to the scale, form and massing of neighbouring buildings and respect and preserve the historic pattern where it exists.

3.3 CPG 'Home Improvements' recommends that roof extensions should consider the following:

- The existing roof form and any previous extensions to it;
- The roof visibility and prominence in relation to gardens, streetscene and wider area, considering land topography;
- The pattern of development of neighbouring buildings to include historic extensions and new types of development;
- Other roof extensions present at the neighbouring buildings which obtained permission though planning application or permitted development.

3.4 While the guidance acknowledges that not every roofline is of value that requires preservation, in this instance its form and detail is worth preservation as it adds value to the building.

## Assessment

3.5 The proposed mansard roof extension would be a flat-topped mansard which covers the entire footprint of the roof and would have front and rear roofslopes pitched at 70 degrees. The windows would broadly align with the windows below. The mansard extension would measure 6.8m deep, 5.75m wide and 2.7m high (internal height 2.3m). The materials would match the existing. The mansard roof in itself is considered acceptable in terms of its detailed design being traditionally appropriate for valley roofs.

3.6 While the design does comply with the mansard design guidance set out in the CPG, it is noted that along the terrace on this side of the road that not a single butterfly roof has been altered and that the roofline is unimpaired. It is considered that this roof extension would dominate the terrace of properties and streetscene and would appear as an incongruous feature completely out of character with this unaltered roofslope which adds to the architectural merit of this terrace, even though it is not listed or within a conservation area. Therefore it is considered that the development would detract from the character and appearance of this building, terrace and the wider area.

3.7 It is considered that a mansard roof extension on the application site would serve to unbalance this group of buildings, of which the site forms a part, and also mar the uniformity of this particular group of buildings, by introducing raised parapet walls, rising above those within this group of buildings and present an incongruent feature within this group of buildings.

3.8 Overall, therefore, the proposed roof extension by reason of its position, height and scale would be a highly prominent and incongruous addition to this building and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and the local streetscape.

3.9 The development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the site and wider area. It would be contrary to policy D1 of Camden's Local Plan.

## **4.0 Neighbouring Amenity**

4.1 Local Plan Policy A1 seeks to ensure that the amenity of neighbours is protected including visual privacy, outlook, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing.

4.2 No.93 Messina Avenue raised concerns about loss of light to their garden and other gardens on Messina Ave and Cotleigh Road. This property lies east of the site and so, given the siting and scale of the roof extension, it is unlikely to have a material impact on loss of light to their garden and will not impact on light to habitable rooms within their house.

4.3 The proposed mansard roof, on account of its size and location, would not cause any reduced daylight and sunlight, privacy or outlook to the surrounding dwellings.

4.4 Concerns were raised that the property will be used as holiday lets as with No.89 and the site cannot cope with additional plumbing and will result in their cellars being flooded with sewage. It is noted that the proposal is not for a change of use to HMO or C1 (Holiday lets), so either option would require planning permission (although HMO depending on number of bedrooms). The agent has stated that the building will remain in use as a single family dwellinghouse.

## **5.0 Transport**

5.1 The Council's transport team concluded that, due to the scale of the construction, a CMP is not necessary. The proposal does not involve a change of use so car-free development and cycle parking does not need to be secured.

## **6.0 Recommendation**

6.1 Refuse planning permission for following reason-

The proposed mansard roof extension by reason of its location, height, bulk and design, would result in an incongruous and bulky addition that would harm the unimpaired roof line of this terrace of buildings and so would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building, the terrace of adjoining buildings and the streetscene, contrary to policy D1 (Design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.