

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	03/10/2005
(Members Briefing)		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	09/09/2005
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Gavin Sexton			2005/2984/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
126 Leighton Road London NW5 2RG			Site Plan; 50122/50123; 50123 A dated 20/09/05, letter dated 23 Sept 2005, 5 sheets unnumbered photographs.		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		Date
	AMC.		P.H. Wheat		3.10.05
Proposal(s)					
Construction of a roof extension, with roof terrace to the rear and enlargement of front lightwell.					
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	21	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultation responses:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enclosure of front lightwell would be out of character with rest of terrace <i>Amended plans no longer seek to enclose the lightwell.</i> • Proposed mansard would be out of character on prominent corner property <i>It is considered that the modifications to the corner house will not detract from the character and appearance of the terrace or conservation area. See the Roof Extension section of the report for details.</i> • Roof terrace will overlook property to rear of 124 Leighton Road. <i>It is considered that the view from the roof terrace will not lead to an invasion of privacy of the property to the rear of 124. See the Roof Extension section of the report for more details.</i> • Proposed lantern light is ugly <i>Amended plans have altered the lantern light to be flush with the roof line.</i> 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>	<p>Kentish Town Conservation Area objection and comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enclosure of front lightwell would be out of character with rest of terrace • The proposed lantern light is obtrusive and unacceptable <i>Amended plans no longer seek to enclose the lightwell, and the roof lantern light has been changed to be flush with the roofline.</i> • Care needs to be exercised in extending and aligning the roof to match the neighbouring property. <i>The amended plans and accompanying letter indicate that the mansard roof extension will be aligned to meet the neighbouring roof line in terms of height and setback, at both the front and rear. This will be a condition on the permission.</i> 					

Site Description

The property is a single dwelling house, probably early to mid 19th century, at the end of a terrace of three storey with basement houses. The property is the western flank of the entrance to Torriano Cottages to the rear. The eastern flank is a larger semi-detached Italianate villa with pedimented gables.

The neighbouring houses of 124 and 122 Leighton Road have roof extensions and their rear gardens have late 20th century dwellings built in them. Number 124 adjoining the site has a roof terrace on the rear. The majority of properties on the terrace have been converted to flats, although in the case of 126 there is no sign of its use as flats.

The property is in the Kentish Town Conservation Area.

Relevant History

Application property: 126 Leighton Road

In 1962 permission was granted to convert the property to two self-contained flats.

In 1980 outline planning permission was granted for the construction of a dwelling in the rear garden.

In 1986 an application for the renewal of outline planning permission was refused on the grounds outline permission was not suitable for development in an area that was designated a conservation area in 1985.

124 Leighton Road

In 1962 permission was granted to build a property in the rear garden. This is now 19 Torriano Cottages.

In 1969 permission was granted to convert the property to 2 self contained flats, and to extend the roof. There is no mention of the existing roof terrace in the application granted permission.

Relevant policies

London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2000

- EN1 General Environmental protection and improvement
- EN13 Design of new development
- EN19 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours
- EN24 Roof alterations and extensions
- EN27 Basement areas
- EN31 Character and appearance of conservation areas
- EN35 Trees in conservation areas

Complementary Planning Guidance 2002

- Section 2.8 Roof extensions and alterations
- Section 2.8 Balconies and terraces

Assessment

Overview

The application seeks to extend the roof of the property from the existing butterfly roof to a mansard with two timber sash windows to the front and a roof terrace on the rear. The application also proposes extending the lightwell further into the front garden and the removal of the unsightly waste pipes from the flank wall.

Roof extension and overlooking

The plans show that the parapet on the flank wall fronting the entrance to Torriano Cottages would be raised to screen the side of the mansard roof. Original plans submitted indicated a projecting rooflight, which received objections during consultation. These plans have been amended so that there will be no projections above the roofline, in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Guidance. The use of natural slate as the roofing material will be made a condition of the planning permission. The roof extension would be designed to match the neighbouring property with regard to the roof ridge, the setback from the front parapet, and the depth of the roof terrace from the rear parapet. These design features would be the subject of a condition.

To the rear, the proposal is for the addition of a roof terrace. Number 124 has a roof terrace on the rear, with a glass balustrade. The application seeks to maintain the existing eaves and parapet, and to enclose the terrace with a painted-black wrought iron balustrade with clear glass infill panels. The terrace alignment is designed to match the neighbouring property, with the doors recessed and unlikely to be prominently visible from the rear. Number 126 is a large building when viewed from the rear, and the terrace will be subservient to the elevation. The entrance road to Torriano cottages is used for access to the rear properties only and is not a main thoroughfare. The raised height of the flank wall would reduce the impact of the roof changes to the properties to the east of the side road, and would mean that the rear roof terrace would not be visible from Leighton Road.

The proposed design does not have a roof apron separating the terrace from the parapet which would be a departure from the Supplementary Planning Guidance. However due to the precedent set by the design of the neighbouring terrace it is considered that a departure from the SPG is acceptable in this case because a terrace set into a sloping roof to the rear would appear peculiar in this setting. The design details seek to harmonise the proposed roof terrace with that of the neighbouring property. The concertina doors are considered to add a lightweight feel to the roof extension and are therefore considered acceptable.

An objection has been raised to the possibility of overlooking of 19 Torriano Cottages. The diagonal distance from the proposed terrace to the rear of 19 Torriano Cottages is approximately 20 metres. Contrary to the objection there does appear to be some foliage and tree screening to the rear of numbers 124 and 126. It is expected that the terrace will be used as a seating area and its recessed nature, the parapet and balustrade screening, and its distance from the property to the rear of number 124 would mean that overlooking would be unlikely, and would be no more intrusive than observations from the rear windows of the existing elevation. The party wall between 126 and 124 at roof level would also be raised, minimising the loss of privacy to the neighbour's roof terrace.

It is therefore considered that the amenity of neighbours would not be harmed by the addition of the balcony.

Basement Lightwell

Following objections to the proposal to cover the front lightwell, the original plans have been amended to merely extend the lightwell forward into the front garden by approximately 1 metre. As the majority of the neighbouring terrace properties have been converted to flats the lightwells are generally exposed and provide steps down to the lower-ground floor flats. Extending the existing lightwell opening forward by this distance to meet the line of the entrance steps and enclosing it with a low protective screen would not be an uncharacteristic development on the terrace. Therefore it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and not harmful to the character of the terrace or the conservation area, in accordance with policy EN31 and EN27.

There is a tree in the front garden which is not indicated on the plans. As the proposed development in the front garden simply expands the lightwell out into part of the existing underground coal bunker and no new excavation is going to take place, it is not expected that the development is likely to cause any harm to the tree, in accordance with policy EN35.

Summary

The proposed roof extension will be a noticeable addition to this prominent corner property. However the proposed removal of the waste pipes from the flank wall, the raised gable and the construction of the roof to match the ridge height and mansard setback of the neighbouring property would mean that the development would be sensitive to its setting and would not constitute a harmful addition to the building. Number 128 which flanks the other side of the entrance to Torriano Cottages is substantially different in design to number 126, which means that the proposal would not constitute changes to part of a matching pair of end-terrace properties thus altering any existing symmetry.

The terrace to the rear of the property is also a noticeable alteration to the roofscape. While the design of the terrace is not in full accordance with the SPG, the property is substantial and the balcony is considered to be subservient to the rear

elevation, and the detail of the design shows a consideration of the neighbouring context. Given the presence of an existing and much-used roof terrace on the rear of 124 it would be considered difficult to refuse a similar proposal to 126. The balustrade and roof ridge height would match the neighbouring terrace and the setback of the doors onto the balcony which would reduce the impact on the roof extension.

Recommendation

Grant Planning Permission