

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/6279/P	James Herbertson	29/03/2022 22:04:58	OBJ	<p>1.0 Proposal Use</p> <p>1.1 The proposal seeks to enlarge the existing 'single dwelling house' which has 4 bedrooms, 1 study and 3 living room. Some of the existing layouts suggest that the function of some of the rooms is more that of bedsits, though at present the house is classed and a single dwelling house.</p> <p>1.2 The proposed drawings suggest a layout of a single dwelling house with 2 more bedroom and another living/dining room. Its not clear that there is a strong need in the area for accommodation comprising of 6 bedrooms and 4 living rooms.</p> <p>1.3 The proposed layouts imply that a subsequent application (for conversion to flats) may seek to subdivide the single dwelling house into a series of bedsits which may be of questionable quality. If that is the case the applicant should submit a comprehensive proposal for doing that, so that it can be judged on its merits or shortcomings.</p> <p>2.0 Impact on conservation area</p> <p>2.1 The proposal does not 'preserve or enhance' the character of the conservation area.</p> <p>2.2 The current street scene as shown in the site photographs has a clear and consistent parapet height which includes the site address. This was clearly deliberate and part of the original design intent. The roofscape is almost perfectly original in its form and deliberately recessive. There are no precedents within the terrace for changing this and as soon as one is altered, it may be reasonable to expect other neighbours to wish to do the same for purely economic reasons.</p> <p>2.3 Therefore the mansard roof will result in a form that is not in-keeping with the strict and very coherent street character of parapet walls behind which the small scale roof scape sits.</p> <p>2.4 The proposal also seeks to remove one of the chimney stacks (which appears to have already been diminished in height already). Chimneys are part of the character of the area and removal of these will alter that character. No reasoned justification for doing this has been made and this sort piecemeal erosion should be resisted.</p> <p>2.5 The applicant on the one hand argues that the mansard will be hidden (see elevation 040) and on the other, that increased massing of the mansard will provide emphasis to the corner. It seems that both arguments cannot be simultaneously true. It would be fairer to say that from many angles (particularly the oblique view down Falkland Rd and the head on view from Montpelier Grove) that the overriding impression will be one of increased mass and bulk). This will be the one property with such an addition and will stand out uncomfortably.</p> <p>2.6 The applicant has raised the notion of emphasising the corner. Falkland Road is a quiet street (both in terms of footfall and its urban character) not a thoroughfare and the idea that corners need more emphasising does not feel convincing. Besides, the public house (as it was) already has some special identity by virtue of the stucco and other additional details that the designer and builder gave it when it was made. They clearly did not feel that the addition of a further storey was desirable or appropriate. The fact that the building has lost its communal function of public house further undermines the strength this argument may have.</p> <p>2.7 The materials on the application are shown as slate and lead and a 'membrane'. The membrane should be clarified and how it joins to the sloping section.</p> <p>3.0 Buildability and Safety</p> <p>3.1 The proposal section indicates a floor to ceiling height of 2.4m. While the floor to ceiling height may be adequate as shown, it is possible that once steel sizes are considered and other technical criteria that this may be reduced at construction stage. It would be better therefore to make this a conditional matter.</p> <p>3.2 The flat roof over the extension is 350mm deep which will need to include 1:60 falls, structure and</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

insulation required to meet building control. Its unlikely that this is possible and so its likely that the roof level will rise beyond that shown here or the floor to ceiling height below will be diminished.

3.3 The roof dormers have been drawn with cheeks and roofs that are around 100-150mm. The technical challenges of building this to be structurally sound, meet current Part L requirement of insulation and provide a ventilated moisture safe construction are also challenging. The dormers should either be drawn fatter which may look unsatisfactory, or the applicant should demonstrate now how technical compliance will be met in due course.

3.4 As it stands the existing house has three storeys above ground. As such it may meet Part B Fire Safety by providing a 'protected means of escape' down the existing staircase and perhaps by employing an early warning system. The change to 4-storeys will invoke a much more demanding means of escape strategy (an alternative means of escape is generally recommended) and while that is not strictly a planning matter it is a pity that the applicant has not outlined how they intend to deal with that aspect (as it is a fundamental health and safety issue). The position would be made even more challenging of the applicant wishes to eventually convert into flats. Doing so may require more changes to the external fabric such as the addition of automatic opening smoke vents, which are of course not requested here.

4.0 Sustainability

4.1 There is a climate crisis and Camden have declared an emergency along with 31 other London Boroughs.

4.2 The applicant has not submitted a sustainability statement.

4.3 The new structure should be designed to minimise/reduce operational energy use.

4.4 The new fabric will result in substantial embodied carbon emissions. Steel, slate insulation etc.

4.5 No proposals have been made to improve the energy efficiency of the main building which will be predisposed to high heating demand due to the solid walls, single glazing and the end of terrace typology which presents 3 sides of building fabric to lose heat.

4.6 Proposals such as this should address climate change and seek to minimise embodied emissions and operational. This proposal does neither.

4.7 Given that it is above the existing roofline the new accommodation proposed will be exposed to solar gain throughout the year. The lack of thermal mass in the proposal and the absence of any form of passive shading will tend to lead to overheating. If the internal layout does become bedsits there will not be the possibility of providing cross ventilation either. From spring through to autumn this will lead to overheating within the new spaces. During summer this will be especially severe and will likely force occupants to use cooling.

5.0 Precedent

5.1 The applicant has referred to an approved application for a similar mansard addition at 90 Leverton St (app 2018/3364/P). The decision notice mentions:

Mansard roof extensions are an established feature along Leverton Street and the principle is therefore acceptable.

While that may be true along Leverton, this is definitely not the case along Falkland. Therefore, that application is not an applicable precedent in this instance.

Response created with Robert Prewett, Architect.