

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

1. Individual consultation responses (not including petitions)

Level of support and opposition to the proposed addendums

A total of 250 individual consultation responses were received. Of these, **34% (84) supported the proposed addendums and 66% (166) objected to them.**

The number of individual responses received from residents of the eight consultation conservation areas was as follows:

- Driffield Road: 66 responses (of which 29% supported the addendum and 71% objected to it)
- Medway Road: 55 responses (of which 40% supported the addendum and 60% objected to it)
- Tredegar Square: 40 (of which 45% supported the addendum and 55% objected to it)
- Jesus Hospital Estate: 27 (of which 19% supported the addendum and 81% objected to it)
- Victoria Park: 11 (of which 63% supported the addendum and 37% objected to it)
- York Square: 10 (of which 20% supported the addendum and 80% objected to it)
- Chapel House: 6 (of which 50% supported the addendum and 50% objected to it)
- Fairfield Road: 5 (of which 0% supported the addendum and 100% objected to it)

19 responses were received that were not attributable to any conservation area as not address was given (of which 26% supported the addendums and 74% objected to them).

11 responses were received from residents in conservation areas other than those subject to the consultation. These requested that additional guidance regarding domestic extensions also be prepared for those conservation areas, with 27% seeking a restrictive approach to mansard extensions being maintained and 73% seeking a more permissive approach to mansard extensions.

Reasons given in support of the addendums

- 73% of those who supported the addendums considered that mansard roofs would result in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation areas.
- 25% thought that construction work related to mansard roof extensions would be disruptive, this included the need for underpinning of buildings and the potential for disputes between neighbours.
- 23% thought that a more permissive approach to mansard roofs would encourage buy-to-let investment and increase the incidence of multi-tenanted homes. This, it is thought, would harm social cohesion in the conservation areas.
- 13% considered there to be other options for extending homes, without harming the appearance of the street frontage, for example, extending to the rear of properties.
- 13% noted that householders would or should have been aware of the development constraints arising from the conservation area designation when they moved into the area.
- 7% thought that existing examples of mansard roof extensions were a mistake that should not be repeated.
- 4% thought that the houses in the conservation areas were already large enough to accommodate families and did not require extension.

- 4% thought that mansard roof extensions would have an adverse impact on the amount of daylight and sunlight received by neighbouring properties and/or would reduce views of the sky.
- 1% considered that houses in the conservation areas were often under occupied. One resident cited census data to illustrate that the average occupancy of properties in the Bow West ward in 2011 was 2.6 people.

Reasons given in objection of the addendums

- 74% of those who objected to the addendums thought that using mansard roofs to extend homes was necessary for social cohesion. That is, it would allow families to expand in their current homes, rather than being forced to move to other areas with larger homes more suitable for families.
- 28% considered mansard roofs to be a traditional and sympathetic addition to historic buildings in the conservation areas.
- 19% thought that basement extensions were an inappropriate and/or prohibitively expensive alternative to mansard roof extensions.
- 16% thought that mansard roofs were already a feature of the conservation areas and set a precedent for further similar extensions
- 10% thought that the existing townscape character of the conservation areas was already poor and lacked consistency.
- 7% considered rear extensions on their own to be an inadequate and/or inappropriate way of extending homes.
- 6% noted that other London boroughs have taken a more permissive approach to mansard extensions in conservation areas.
- 3% noted that allowing people to extend their homes would increase their ability to work from home.
- 2% thought that the structure and fabric of the existing London/butterfly roofs was of a poor quality and would benefit from being replaced by a mansard extension.
- 1% considered the existing building stock in the conservation areas to be an underuse of valuable London land and that mansard extensions would make better use of it.

2. Petitions

Two petitions were also received as part of the consultation process. One, containing 32 names, rejects the draft addendums and guidance for roof and rear extensions. Another, containing 19 names rejects the draft addendum specifically for the Driffield Road Conservation Area (and the guidance for roof and rear extensions). There is some degree of overlap between the names on the two petitions, and between the names on the petitions and the individual consultation responses received.

3. Views of amenity societies

The views of various amenity societies were sought during the preparation of the proposed addendums and guidance, and there has been general support for the proposed approach. In particular Historic England (formerly English Heritage) commented that the proposed methodology was:

“...well considered, very thorough, and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework requirement that local planning authorities set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.”

In their response, the Georgian Group (whose remit covers buildings dating from 1700 to 1840) noted they have never condoned the removal of an original historic roof structure, for a listed building or a non-listed building within a conservation area, simply to provide an additional mansard storey.

At a local level, the Mile End Old Town Residents Association noted that terraces of houses of uniform height with “butterfly” roofs hidden behind a parapet provide an essential ingredient to the architectural character of the Tredegar Square Conservation Area. It also recommended that present planning rules be maintained or the reasonable proposals for change in addendums be adopted.