

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	18/12/2020
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	27/12/2020
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Nora-Andreea Constantinescu			2020/4847/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
Flat B 41 Leverton Street London NW5 2PE			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, to dwelling.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Refused			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Full Planning Permission			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>Site notices were posted on 02/12/2020 and expired on 26/12/2020. Press notices were issued on 03/12/2020 and expired on 27/12/2020.</p> <p>The neighbouring occupier at no. 13 Leverton Street has objected to the proposed scheme on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Visible from the front elevation in Leverton Street, contrary to the arguments provided</li> <li>- The continuous rooflines at nos. 31-47 would be destroyed.</li> <li>- Rear valley rooflines, looking out over Railey Mews would be destroyed</li> </ul>					
<b>Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum</b>	<p>KTNF confirmed that have no comments to make on this application, neither oppose or endorse.</p>					

## Site Description

The application site is located on the western side of Leverton Street. The property has three storey, mid-terrace property, divided into two flats. The proposal relates to the maisonette at the upper floors.

The property is not listed but it lies within Kentish Town Conservation Area, and is considered to make a positive contribution to it.

## Relevant History

No planning records at the application site.

Relevant planning records at the neighbouring sites:

**2019/2217/P** – 73 Leverton St – Erection of mansard roof extension - **Refused – Appeal dismissed 15/10/2019**

**2018/3364/P** – 90 Leverton St –Erection of two storey rear extension following demolition of existing; single storey rear extension at ground floor level; mansard roof extension with dormer windows to front and rear; and various alterations including replacement of single glazed windows with double glazed units, erection of bin store and alteration to boundary treatment to front of property second floor levels; replacement of single glazed windows with double glazed units, erection of bin store and alteration to boundary treatment to front of property - **Granted 15/10/2018**

**2015/0112/P** – 76 Leverton St – Erection of a single storey rear extension with green roof, mansard roof extension with 2 front rooflights, 3 rear rooflights and 6 photovoltaic panels, and alterations to fenestration to include creation of rear Juliet balcony.- **Granted – 17/03/2015**

**2007/5472/P** – 87 Leverton Street – Granted – Erection of a mansard roof extension and rear extension at ground floor level to dwellinghouse – **Granted 20/12/2007**

**9300698** - 91 Leverton Street NW5 - Erection of a roof extension – **Refused 08/04/1994**

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

### 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

### Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan

D3 – Innovative Design

### Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance (2021)

CGP - Design

CPG – Home Improvements

CPG - Amenity

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

The applicant seeks planning consent to erect mansard type roof extension at the application site.

The front wall of the proposed extension would sit just behind the front parapet, sloped at an angle of 53 degrees. It would have a flat roof and would have a rear elevation sitting immediately behind the rear valley roof style parapet rising vertically upwards (without sloping back in a mansard style). The addition would have an internal head height of 2.3m, with two front dormer windows which would be aligned with the windows of the floors below, and full width glazed rear dormer. The extension would increase the size of the existing flat, turning it from a 2 bed flat to a 3 bed flat.

### 2. Design

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.

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.

Policy D3 (Innovative building design) of Kentish Town Neighbourhood plan states that proposals will be supported where they demonstrate a deep understanding of the site and its context, to be well integrated in their surroundings and reinforce and enhance local character, must identify and draw upon key aspects of character, or design cues from the surrounding area, must be of highest quality and sustainable. The proposed mansard extension, due to its position, projection and detailed design has failed to demonstrate a deep understanding of the site and its context, and how it is integrated within its surroundings. The proposal does not indicate to be part of a sustainability strategy for the building and the proposed expanse of glazing would challenge the energy efficiency of the building.

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.*

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 Kentish Town 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.

The application buildings and those along Leverton Street are some of the oldest within Kentish Town

Conservation Area. The CA Appraisal identifies Leverton Street *to be lined with terraced uniform developments*, which is further detailed as *coloured stucco houses with narrow front gardens. Some houses retain 'greek' detailing in the window detailed metalwork. There is a homogeneous design of house and detailed joinery.*

Within the terrace which the application site is part of, there are no other roof extensions or alterations. The proposed extension would therefore sit within a roof largely unaltered by roof extensions or alterations. The CA Appraisal mentions in terms of special character of the CA that *extensions to front or side roof slopes are likely to break the important, regular composition to the roof lines and so harm the appearance of the conservation area.*

The group of terraced buildings the application site is part of has a strong character to the front created by the intricate brickwork parapets, and to the rear by the butterfly roofs seen from Railey Mews. To the front, the proposed roof extension would project closely behind the front parapet. The dormers would appear proportionate to the windows below and roof extension; however, they would sit on a partially vertical cill, which does not relate to a traditional mansard scale and dimensions. The proposal shows the party walls raised to frame the main body of the roof extension but not the projecting dormers. Whilst this would diminish its visibility, nevertheless the dormer projection would still be visible. Overall, it is considered that any additional height would be visible in this location and harmful to the host building and the streetcene, and therefore the principle of extending at this level would not be supported.

The proposed straight rear elevation would project as a full width dormer from the top of the mansard and sit behind the butterfly shaped rear parapet and with a full glazed wall. The rear of the application site and neighbouring buildings within the row can be greatly visible from Railey Mews, at the rear. Due to the expanse of glazing the proposal would appear overly dominant and disproportionate to the host building. In terms of sustainability, the expanse of glazing raises concerns in relation to the energy efficiency of the extension and building below.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed mansard extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, terrace row and the significance of the Conservation Area, given it sits in an unimpaired roof line within a group of terraced buildings in a Conservation Area, which indicates that the uniformity of the buildings and their roof line are of significance. Due to its detailed design and overall appearance the proposed mansard extension would be an incongruous addition, out of context with the host building and terrace row.

There are number of mansard extensions along Leverton Street, granted consent historically and in more recent years (see planning history); however, there are none within the terrace row the application site is part of. The uniformity of the roofline along the group of buildings the application site is part of, is one to be preserved by if not enhanced by any future development. The proposed mansard extension, due to its principle, position, projection, and detailed design would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and therefore is recommended to be refused.

### **3. Amenity**

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.

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.

### **4. Recommendation**

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, group of buildings it is part of, streetscene and surrounding Conservation Area contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017) and policy D3 of Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (2015).

**Refuse planning permission**