

<b>Delegated Report (Refusal)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b> N/A / attached	<b>Expiry Date:</b> <b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>10/11/2020</b> <b>05/12/2020</b>
<b>Officer</b> Joshua Ogunleye		<b>Application Number(s)</b> 2020/4205/P		
<b>Application Address</b> 111 Torriano Avenue London NW5 2RX		<b>Drawing Numbers</b> Refer to 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> Alterations and extension to existing mansard to create roof terrace (including raising the chimneystacks)				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Refuse Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses No. electronic	00 00	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Site notice consultation: 11/11/2020 until 05/12/2020</p> <p><b>Two objections were received from the neighbouring property at No.113 Torriano Avenue, details of which have been summarised below.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object to the proposed upward extension of the mansard roof at 111 Torriano Avenue in order to create a roof level terrace. I am very anxious that people using the proposed terrace, which extends up to the party wall, will overlook my bathroom. I am concerned by this potential invasion of our privacy.</li> <li>• I am also anxious about the potential loss of natural light in my bathroom. In 2017 an additional floor was added to 111 Torriano Avenue with the creation of a mansard roof. This involved raising the party wall and resulted in a significant reduction of natural light. I am concerned that a further extension on top of the existing extension, raising the party wall again, will further reduce the amount of natural light we are getting.</li> <li>• The new mansard is taller than all other roofs in the terrace. The buildings are already tall and this increase in height is out of keeping with this part of the street and will not improve the look of the street.</li> <li>• Further development is over-development of the building and in particular will create a precedent for roof terraces at a very high level. This building already has a terrace at the back. A high level terrace will give wide views into gardens and into the velux windows in our London roof. The potential for noise is also increased by a terrace at high level.</li> <li>• Looking at the Camden Planning Guidance under 4.2 - under the Balconies and roof section/roof level terrace - . A roof alteration is likely to be unacceptable where buildings have an additional storey or mansard roof which is the case here and where buildings are already higher than neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• A terrace will only normally be acceptable on the rear of the property. It is normally inappropriate to set back a mansard roof to provide a terrace.</li> <li>• It should not result in the parapet height being altered.</li> <li>• It should not result in the overlooking of habitable rooms.</li> </ul>					

Kentish Town  
Neighbourhood Forum  
were consulted on  
08/11/2020.

**No comments were received.**

### Site Description

The application site is a mid-terrace three storey property (with basement and mansard extension) on the western side of Torriano Avenue. The building is constructed with a combination of Yellow bricks, Stucco render, and slate roof. Although recent works to the property have replaced the front elevation bricks with white render.

The host building retains timber sash windows with 3/3 glazing bars on its front elevation. The property is in use as residential self-contained flats.

The property is not located within a conservation area, although a number of buildings in the surrounding area are identified as locally listed building, nor is it listed. The property does sit within the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum. The area was laid out in the first half of the 19th century and the terrace that includes No. 111 is considered a fine example of architecture from this period. Given the quality of the architecture it is considered that the housing on the western side of Torriano Avenue makes a positive contributions to the streetscape.

### Relevant History

Application site

**2014/5241/P** – Construction of a mansard roof and alterations to facade. **Granted on 14/10/2014**

### Relevant policies

**National Planning Policy Framework 2021**

**London Plan 2021**

**Camden Plan 2017**

A1 Managing the impact of development  
D1 Design

**Other Planning Policies / Guidance**

CPG Home Improvement (2021)

CPG Design (2021)

CPG Amenity (2021)

**Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (2016)**

Policy D3: Design Principles.

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

- 1.1. This application seeks to alter the flat roof area of the existing mansard roof extension (to the front and rear) to create a sunken area within the mansard to be used as a roof terrace areas.
- 1.2. The key difference between this application and the previously approved and constructed is the proposed mansard roof design which would be 0.88mm higher than existing and would appear as a traditional mansard, rather than a flat top mansard which is more common in the prevailing pattern of development. The height increase is in order to form a parapet enclosure around the proposed roof terrace. The proposed roof terrace would be accessed via an internal ladder and would measure 4.755m (W) x 3.131m(L).
- 1.3. There would be an increase to the flank wall (party wall upstand) height.

### 2. Design

- 2.1. Local Plan policy D1 seeks to achieve high quality design in all developments. Policy D1 requires development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, which improves the function, appearance and character of the area. The Council welcomes high quality contemporary design which responds to its context.
- 2.2. Policy D3 of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (KTNP), supports opportunities for high quality innovative design unless this will be harmful to areas of homogeneous architectural style. NPPF paragraph 134 identifies the value of outstanding or innovative designs in raising the standard of design more generally in an area. Development must respect the historic appearance of Kentish Town in order to reinforce rather than detract from its local distinctiveness. Inappropriate development over the decades has left a legacy of poorly designed frontages that are out of keeping with the local area and have a negative impact on the visual amenity and sense of the area. KTNP requires new development to be design-led, determined by the nature of the site, its context, the proposed use(s) and urban design objectives.

#### **Local Character**

- 2.3. The section of Torriano Avenue comprises predominantly three storey properties in residential use. These properties consist of similar scale and massing presenting a sense of uniformity within the streetscene. Despite many of these properties having had interventions by means of various mansard roof extension their scale and massing remain proportionate within their context. There are a number of flat roof mansard extensions in the host property's terrace.
- 2.4. The application property is readily visible along its terrace from Torriano Avenue, including sections of its roof and the flank parapet wall. This is due to the scale and proportion of properties along this section of the road. It is also visible from the rear from Torriano Mews and properties at Leighton Grove.

#### **Roof Extension**

- 2.5. Section 2.2.3 of the Home improvement CPG states that the most common type of extensions to the roof are mansards, traditionally associated with Georgian or Victorian buildings, as the existing roof structure with front parapets or valley roofs allow for a simple insertion of a new level in this traditional form.
- 2.6. The prevailing character of roof extension on this terrace has been single storey in form, set back behind the existing parapets on the front and rear walls of the building. The height (less than 2.3m) and lower slope (70 degrees) covered by a flat topped mansard roofs.
- 2.7. The applicant has referenced a traditional mansard extension on 135 Torriano Avenue

(reference 2006/1824/P approved in 2006). This decision is given limited weight as it was consented under a materially different policy period (i.e. a different local plan, prior to the NPPF, the KTNP and CPG). The prevailing mansards are flat topped and 135 is seen as an anomaly in the streetscape. Furthermore, the current proposal is not considered to be a genuine traditional mansard, by virtue of its incomplete roof form. Therefore, officers consider this to be a disingenuous attempt given the void within the roof space. The proposed design would appear out of character with the prevailing pattern of development along this group of properties. The additional hipped roof form, as well as its height projection above the roofline of neighbouring properties, would emphasise its bulky form within its context. Overall, the proposed increase in the height of the mansard roof would detrimentally unbalance the existing proportions of the mansard and thus the façade and would render the mansard roof even more prominent in middle-distance views along the street.

- 2.8. The extension would be built with matching slate tiles and include inset decking on its flat roof area. Officers consider their use in this instance would do little to lessen the extension's bulky appearance within this context.

### **Roof Terrace**

- 2.9. Section 2.2.3 of the Home improvement CPG states that Balconies can provide valuable amenity space, especially for flats that would otherwise have little or no private exterior space. When considering a balcony, proposals must appreciate the impact of this alteration on the roof form, host building, wider area and neighbouring amenity. The guidance states they must:

- Be subordinate to the roof slope being altered, and roof form overall;
- Preserve the roof form and complement the elevation upon which they are to be located;
- In case of pitched roofs, be set in within the roof slope, when possible;
- Should maintain the existing parapet height;

- 2.10. The proposed roof level terrace would be located within the proposed extension and be enclosed by 1.1m high slate cladded vertical upstands to the front and rear. The side enclosures would consist of the flank parapet walls being raised with bricks matching existing. Whilst the proposed materials would be considered high quality, officers do not consider their use would be cohesive with the character and appearance of the building nor the wider terrace.

- 2.11. Balconies and roof terraces are not a characteristic of the properties along this section of Torriano Avenue. It is also noted that there are no other visible instances along the terrace whereby the roofs include roof terraces at above mansard level. Therefore, officers consider the proposed roof terrace would constitute visual clutter in its setting, as it would be uncharacteristic of properties within the terrace and surrounding area.

- 2.12. The proposed roof extension and terrace, as presented, would have a materially harmful impact on the prevailing character and appearance of the wider streetscene.

### **3. Amenity**

- 3.1. Policy A1 states that the council will seek to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours and ensure the amenities of occupiers and neighbouring is protected. Paragraph e further states that factors impacting visual privacy and outlook would be considered.

- 3.2. Officers consider the proposed roof extension would not give rise to adverse loss of light or overbearing impact.

- 3.3. Whilst it is considered that the proposed terrace would generate some overlooking impact on the rooflights of neighbouring properties, officers do not consider these impact would be significant enough to warrant a refusal.

- 3.4. Officers consider that the use of the proposed roof terrace would generate some level of

increased noise and disturbance; however, not to a materially harmful level that would be out of character within the context. Therefore, the noise and disturbance associated with the proposed use would not be considered significant enough to warrant a refusal.

4. Conclusion

The proposed alterations and extensions to the mansard roof, by reason of increased height, scale, massing, form and detailed design, would appear as an unduly dominant and visually intrusive addition detracting from the character and appearance of the host building, and the surrounding streetscene contrary to Policy D3 of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (2016) and Policy D1 (Design) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

5. Recommendation:

**Refuse planning permission**