

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		14/06/2022	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		09/07/2022	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Nora-Andreea Constantinescu				2022/1659/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
43 Hadley Street London Camden NW1 8TA				See draft decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Roof extension with front roof terrace, to dwelling.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Householder Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:				No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		Site notices were posted on 15.06.2022 and expired on 09.07.2022. No responses have been received from neighbouring occupiers.					
CAAC & Local groups		No responses have been received.					

Site Description

The application site is located on the eastern side of Hadley Street, a cul-de-sac road. The property is a two storey mid-terrace property, in use as a single family dwelling.

The application property does not lie within a conservation area but it is a locally listed building. Nos. 39-49 (odd) and 54-76 (even) are included as a group listing for their architectural and townscape significance. The description notes how they form an intact and visually attractive small group, with a consistent roofscape, and that the view of the group is enhanced by the tower of Holy Trinity church and the roofscape of Holy Trinity and St Giles Primary school visible over the roofs of the houses.

Relevant History

Relevant planning records at the application site:

PEX0000825 - The erection of a mansard roof extension and a single storey extension at rear. – **Refuse 07/11/2000 – Appeal dismissed**

RfR:

1. *The proposed roof extension would be detrimental to the appearance of the main building and the terrace of which it forms a part as it would upset the proportions of this two-storey building. The proposed roof extension, by reason of its detailed design, size, siting and form, would be inappropriate and fail to respect the visual importance of this property in the streetscene.*

Inspector comment:

Extremely concerned that whilst the implementation of one such proposal may not be considered in itself to be unduly harmful to the street scene, the establishment of a precedent in this section of the street would soon give rise to other similar proposals as has already happened in the north end of the street. In this case, however, the traditional scale and appearance of the existing buildings has been largely maintained. [...] the combined effect of a rash of other proposals would detract significantly from modest scale, character and appearance of the terraces and as a result, the streetscene.

PE9901034 - The erection of a mansard roof extension and a single storey extension at the rear. – **Refuse 25/04/2000**

RfR:

1. *The proposed roof extension would be detrimental to the appearance of the main building and the terrace of which it forms a part as it would upset the proportions of this two-storey building. The proposed roof extension, by reason of its detailed design, size, siting and form, would be inappropriate and fail to respect the visual importance of this property in the streetscene.*

Relevant planning records at neighbouring sites:

8602432 - 45 Hadley Street, NW1 - The erection of a roof extension at second-floor level including the construction of a roof terrace – **Granted 04/03/1987**

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

Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance (2021)

CPG - Design

CPG – Home Improvements

CPG - Amenity

Assessment

1. Proposal

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission to erect a single storey roof extension. The proposed extension would have dual pitch roof, and would be set back from the front parapet by 1.5m to create a terrace. The existing front parapet would act as balustrade. The new structure would project from the roof level with a maximum height of 2.9m. To the rear it would project with a dormer window, sitting on the V shaped parapet, slightly set back, retaining this visually.

2. Design and heritage

- 2.1 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 the host building and neighbouring ones, and the quality of materials to be used.
- 2.2 Given the application building along with the terrace row it is part of, and the others at the end of Hadley street are locally listed buildings, Policy D2 is relevant in this instance. This states that the Council will seek to protect other heritage assets including non-designated heritage assets, including those on the local list. The effect of a proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, balancing the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- 2.3 The application site backs onto Holy Trinity Church which is Grade II listed, and Holy Trinity and St Giles Primary school which has particularly handsome pitched roofs, and therefore the impact on the setting of the listed building should also be considered.
- 2.4 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.*
- 2.5 Whilst the application site does not lie within a conservation area, the guidance highlights the weight given to the significance of the roofline within a uniform group of buildings. A large part of the significance of the locally listed group lies in its uniformity, as mentioned in the listing these are 19th century houses, built in stock brick with stucco to windows architraves and parapet cornice, where most ground and first floor windows retained bracketed cornices to windows. The existing terraced row the application site is part of, has been impaired by one roof extension at no. 45, which is considered insensitive and an anomaly, and demonstrates how adhoc roof extensions can be harmful.
- 2.6 Officers acknowledge that a number of properties on the western side of the road towards the junction with Castle Road, have been extended at roof level; however, the majority of the properties within the terrace row that the site sits within (nos. 39-49), are not extended and they retain a rhythm and sense of scale within the terrace.
- 2.7 A similar proposal was refused and dismissed at appeal in 2000, where the inspector noted that 'Whilst the ridge of the second-floor roof of no. 45 is clearly visible, the skyline and streetscene are generally dominated by the profile of the parapets of nos. 39-49 and nos. 70-74 at the end of the street'. Furthermore, they state that 'the open views towards the end of the street with the backcloth of the stone tower of the Holy Trinity Church and the high pitched gables of the nearby Victorian school buildings provide a particularly attractive setting for these traditional terraces at the southern end of the street'. This setting is of particular importance given it is mentioned in the description of the properties in the Local List. This view, and the location of the site in front of the Holy Trinity Church is illustrated in the images below.



Street view along Hadley Street looking towards Holy Trinity Church.

- 2.8 At the rear of the terrace, the unbroken run of valley roofs is visible through gaps between buildings on Lewis Road, from Hartland Road and through the Holy Trinity School playground (see image below). The proposed roof extension would infill the valley roof and project with a dormer on the parapet line, reducing its visual prominence, rhythm, and character. Overall, the proposed roof extension would impact adversely on the uniformity of the terrace and the unified composition of the elevation, contrary to policy D1.



View from Harland Road through the playground at Holy Trinity School.

- 2.9 The existing extension at no. 45 has been granted consent under previous development plan policies and guidance and prior to the buildings being locally listed. As such, in the assessment of the current submission we give limited weight to extension at no. 45 and is not considered an appropriate precedent in this instance.
- 2.10 NPPF (2021) states at para 203, that “in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”.
- 2.11 The proposed detailed design of the roof extension is considered incongruous and out of character for a building of this type and age. Whilst it is understood that this is inspired by the existing long and rhythmic pitched roofs in the background of the end of Hadley Street, and the historic extension to no. 45, in this instance, its shape and projection would disrupt the proportions of the host building, and harmfully affect its character and appearance. Given the uniformity of the

terrace row at large, the proposed extension would result in harm to the appearance of the host building and wider terrace.

- 2.12 In the background of the application site lies the Grade II listed Holy Trinity Church, and as such, special regard has been attached to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, under s.66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013.
- 2.13 The architectural detailing of the church and its tower contribute towards its significance, with the Historic England listing describing the details as including “pointed arch main entrance, diagonal buttresses to belfry level, blind arcading and gargoyles at angles below the crenelated parapet”.
- 2.14 The application site is not highly visible in the setting of the church, and nevertheless, forms part of a general character of residential streets in the surrounding area. An additional storey to the application site would not impact or harm the setting of the church.
- 2.15 Although the proposals would not harm the setting of the church, conversely, the church is an important component in the setting of the application site, contributing to the character and appearance of this part of the terrace. The Local List description mentions the tower and the views of it from Hadley Street above the roofs of the terrace row as being important and enhancing the view of this group of houses. When viewed from the north (arguably the most important view of the application site and its neighbours, with the tower behind), the roof extension would likely significantly impact views of the tower. The proposed roof extension along with the existing extension at no. 45, would create an unsympathetic skyline which impacts on views to the listed church tower and in doing so harms the setting of the terraced buildings it is part of, contrary to policy D2.
- 2.16 Overall, the proposed roof extension, due to its position, height, bulk and detailed design would appear as an incongruous addition, out of context with its surroundings and would interrupt views to the Holy Trinity Church Tower as seen from Hadley Street, resulting in harm to the appearance of the host building and wider terrace row.

3. Amenity

- 3.1 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, sense of enclosure, implications on daylight, sunlight, light pollution and noise.
- 3.2 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, privacy or pollution by light or noise.

4. Recommendations

4.1 Refuse planning permission:

The proposed roof extension, by reason of its bulk, scale, detailed design and siting within a largely unimpaired roofline, would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building, the terraced group of buildings of which it is part, and the visual importance of the property within the surrounding streetscene, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.