



**Planning Solutions Team**  
**Planning and Regeneration**  
 Culture & Environment  
 Directorate  
 London Borough of Camden  
 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
 5 Pancras Square  
 London  
 N1C 4AG

**Date: 27/01/2021**  
**Our ref: 2020/5750/PRE**  
**Contact: Adam Greenhalgh**

**Email: Adam.Greenhalgh@camden.gov.uk**

Dear Mr Koyoumjian

[www.camden.gov.uk/planning](http://www.camden.gov.uk/planning)

**Re: 206 Grafton Road, NW5 4AX**

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry for the above property which was received on 10/12/2020 together with the required fee of £441.34

**1. Drawings and documents**

10(M)-101, 20(M)-201, 20(M)-401, 25(M)-401, 26(M)-401, Pre-app support statement

**2. Proposal**

Removal of rear of single storey rear extension and erection of a single storey side/rear 'infill' extension; erection of first floor rear extension on part of existing first floor roof terrace; formation of second floor roof terrace above first floor rear extension, erection of a roof extension on rear part of roof with height above existing rear parapet wall.

**3. Site description**

The property is a three storey Victorian mid-terrace townhouse. A parapet at roof level conceals a butterfly roof with central valley running from front to rear. Like the other houses in the terrace, the property has a single storey rear outrigger. The roof of this is used as a first floor terrace (a door has been installed at first floor level to provide access). Rear roof terraces are a common feature on this side of Grafton Road.

The building is not locally or statutorily listed, and the site is not in a conservation area.

**4. Relevant planning history**

There are no records of any previous planning permissions on the LB Camden website.

**5. Relevant policies and guidance**

[National Planning Policy Framework 2019](#)

[The London Plan March 2016](#)

[Publication version 2020](#)

[LB Camden Local Plan \(2017\):](#)

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development  
 Policy D1 Design

### **Camden Planning Guidance:**

Design (2019)

Amenity (March 2018)

Altering and extending your home (March 2019)

## **6. Assessment**

### Removal of rear of single storey rear extension and erection of a single storey side/rear 'infill' extension:

There are two main considerations:- The effects on the character and appearance of the area, and the impacts on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

In terms of the effects on the character and appearance of the area, Officers consider that this part of the proposal would not result in significant harm to the form of the original building or the physical characteristics of the terrace. There are other similar infill extensions along the terrace including at both the immediately neighbouring dwellings, and, aligning with those and single storey in height, it would not fundamentally change the scale, form or appearance of the building or the character of the terrace.

I can see that the single storey side/rear infill extension would be screened from the properties to the east by the existing single storey rear element. It would also not project any nearer to the properties at the rear in Cressfield Close than existing rear elements at the rear of the terrace. Given that the proposal would not project significantly beyond the side/rear infill extension at no. 204 Grafton Road, and that the roof would be sloped down towards the boundary with this property it would appear not to result in any significant overshadowing or loss of outlook or privacy. Consequently, this part of the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the amenity of any neighbouring occupiers, contrary to policy A1.

### Erection of first floor rear extension on part of existing first floor roof terrace; and formation of roof terrace on remainder

As you point out, there are two first floor rear extensions further along the terrace (at nos. 218 and 226). However these are both old extensions which pre-date currently adopted planning policies.

Officers consider that the proposed first floor extension is of a suitably modest size such that it would not detract from the form or visual amenity of the terrace. However, the proposed design would be inappropriate on the Victorian terrace and it would therefore be out of context with the character of the area, contrary to policy D1. The particular areas of concern are the double doors and glazed balustrade. Omitting the glazed balustrade and including a single door would be more in keeping with the character of the terrace..

In terms of amenity, I can see that you have designed and set back the first floor rear extension so that it does not project beyond 45 degree lines drawn horizontally (in plan) or vertically (in elevation) from the centre of the neighbouring window at 208 Grafton Road. It would therefore appear not to result in a significant loss of light at this or any other property. Also, given the dimensions and siting, Officers do not consider that it would be overbearing or result in a loss of outlook for any neighbouring occupiers. However, the proposed second floor terrace would result in increased overlooking of adjoining terraces and together with its incongruous balustrade this would be contrary to policies A1 and D1.

### Erection of full width rear roof extension with height above existing rear parapet wall

The proposed rear roof extension would be contrary to the Council's policies and guidance for design.

The Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) on Altering and Extending your Home advises that a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable where there is likely to be an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding streetscene, such as:

- Complete terraces or groups of buildings that have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions
- Buildings designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level
- Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by an additional extension
- Buildings whose roof form or construction are unsuitable for roof additions

The proposed roof extension would be contrary to the design policies and guidance because it would result in harm to a distinctive run of V-shaped valley roofs which shape the character of the terrace. It would also be an incongruous, overbearing, bulky and discordant feature on the building which would be harmful to the form and aesthetic qualities of the building. In addition the size and siting resulting in harm to the profile of the roof and character of the building, the proposed materials and architectural design, with raised party wall, full height aluminium windows and balustrade, would also harm the architectural style of the building, the appearance of the terrace and the quality of the townscape.

You have pointed to the roof extension which has been undertaken at no. 146 Grafton Road but this differs from your proposal in that the approved drawings (planning permission 2015/3358/P) shown it as being set back from the rear elevation and lower than your proposal such that the impact on the original roof profile, and the building, is less. Notwithstanding these differences, your site is also within a different run of properties which appears to have all 15 valley roofs intact and which, in accordance with the design policies and guidance, should be preserved.

In terms of amenity, given the size, siting and design, the roof extension would not appear to result in any overshadowing of any neighbouring rooms or gardens. Also, given the siting, it would not result in any significant loss of outlook from any neighbouring rooms or gardens. It would introduce new windows at roof level but as there are already first and second floor windows at the same distance from neighbouring amenity areas, it is not considered likely to give rise to any increase in direct overlooking.

## **7. Conclusion**

Officers consider that the proposed single storey rear/side infill extension would not be contrary to the policies on design and amenity and it would be favourably recommended. Subject to design changes, the proposed first floor rear extension would also potentially not harm the design or amenity of the area. However, the glazed balustrade and terrace at second floor level would be resisted on grounds of amenity and design. The proposed roof extension would also be contrary to the policies and guidance on design as it would introduce a roof extension on an otherwise unimpaired roofline and represent an incongruous, insensitive design that conceals the valley roof and fails to respect the

architecture of the host building. These two elements would therefore be unlikely to be recommended for planning permission.

## **8. Planning application information**

If you submit a planning application, I would advise you to submit the following for a valid planning application:

- Completed form (Householder)
- An Ordnance Survey based location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red.
- Floor plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Roof plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Elevation drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Section drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Design and access statement
- Photographs of the site
- The appropriate fee
- Please see [supporting information for planning applications](#) for more information.

We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would notify neighbours by putting up a notice on or near the site. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.

It is likely that that a proposal of this size would be determined under delegated powers, however, if more than 3 objections from neighbours or an objection from a local amenity group is received the application will be referred to the Members Briefing Panel should it be recommended for approval by officers.

This document represents an initial informal officer view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage and would not be binding upon the Council, nor prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact Adam Greenhalgh

Thank you for using Camden's pre-application advice service.

Yours sincerely,

Adam Greenhalgh  
Planning Officer

