

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>18/03/2024</b>
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>27/04/2024</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Sophie Bowden			<b>2024/0245/P</b>	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
15 Montpelier Grove, London NW5 2XD			<i>See draft decision notice</i>	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
Replacement of the existing conservatory with a single storey side/rear extension and a second storey rear extension above existing outrigger				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	<b>Refuse Planning Permission</b>			
<b>Application Type:</b>	<b>Full Planning Permission</b>			

<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. of responses	<b>2</b>	No. of objections	<b>2</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>Press advert and site notices displayed between 29/03/2024 to 27/04/2024</p> <p>1 letter was received from 2 local residents at 14 and 16 Montpelier Grove raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise/disturbance due to construction</li> <li>• Shading/loss of light extension appears to break the 45 degree line</li> <li>• Overlooking/loss of privacy during construction and from the new extension</li> <li>• Increased intensity of residential use</li> <li>• Design – materials are inappropriate (plastic)</li> <li>• Out of scale/character</li> <li>• Overdevelopment</li> <li>• Not in accordance with Kentish Town Conservation appraisal</li> </ul>			
<b>CAAC &amp; Local Groups</b>	No objections received.			

### Site Description

Montpelier Grove is located within the 'Northern Roads' sub-area of Kentish Town Conservation Area. The area was laid out and developed in the latter half of the 19th nineteenth century. All the properties in the street are identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, i.e. identified as Non-Designated Heritage Assets (nos. 7 to 48 (inclusive)).

The host property relates to a three-storey plus lower ground floor and roof extension building on the east side of Montpelier Grove. It is located within the Kentish Town Conservation Area (CA) and is identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA in the Kentish Town Conservation Area Statement.

### Relevant History

2020/2485/P - Installation of front and rear roof dormers and insertion of roof light to front and rear roof slopes – **Granted 19/08/2020. The permission has been implemented and works have been completed on site.**

No.13 - outrigger roof converted to a terrace as part of conversion into 3 self-contained units (**ref 29247**) **granted 26/10/1979.**

No.17 – outrigger roof extension (**ref 2007/5288/P**) **Granted 21/12/2007**

No.18 - outrigger roof extension (ref 2007/2531/P) Granted 31/08/2007

No.19 - outrigger roof converted to a terrace as part of conversion into 3 self-contained units (ref 34734) granted 22/03/1983.

No.20 – No planning record for this extension

No.22 - outrigger roof extension (ref 2016/1082/P) granted 26/04/2016

No.24 - outrigger roof converted to a accommodation as part of conversion into 3 self-contained units (ref 2010/3054/P) granted 25/05/2011

No.25 - conversion into 3 self-contained units (ref 34402) granted 08/11/1983. Extension of roof accommodation (ref 2016/3307/P) granted 04/08/2016

## **Relevant policies**

### **National Planning Policy Framework (2023)**

#### **London Plan 2021**

##### Camden Local Plan (2017)

- G1 – Delivery and location of growth
- A1 – Managing the impact of development
- D1 – Design
- D2 – Heritage

##### Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (2016)

- D3 – Design principles
- D4 – non- designated heritage assets

##### Camden Planning Guidance

- Amenity CPG (2021)  
Section 2 – overlooking, privacy and outlook  
Section 3- sunlight/daylight  
Section 6 – noise and vibration

- Design CPG (2021)  
Section 2 Design Excellence  
Section 3 Heritage

- Home improvements CPG (2021)  
1. Materials  
2.1.1 Rear Extension

### **Kentish Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011)**

## **Assessment**

### **1. PROPOSAL**

- 1.1. Planning permission is sought for the erection of an extension to the existing rear two storey rear extension (referred to as the outrigger) at second floor level and single storey side/rear extension.
- 1.2. The proposed second floor extension would be 3.3m high, 3.4m wide and 2.7m deep. It would be positioned on an existing two storey outrigger and would be constructed using matching materials to

the existing property.

- 1.3. The proposed single storey side/rear extension would have a minimum height of 2.9 metres extending up to 3.8 metres and will incorporate a mono pitch roof. The depth of the extension would be approximately 7.8 metres.

## 2. ASSESSMENT

### Design and Conservation

- 2.1. Local Plan Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage), and Kentish Town Conservation area statement are aimed at achieving the highest standard of 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. Policy D2 'Heritage' states that The Council will preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings.
- 2.2. Policy D3 of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals must identify and draw upon key aspects of character, or design cues from the surrounding area. Appropriate design cues include grain, building form (shape), scale, height and massing, alignment, modulation, architectural detailing, materials, public realm and boundary treatments.
- 2.3. Paragraph 7.2 of the Kentish Town Conservation statement aims to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Kentish Town Conservation Area. This requirement applies equally to developments which are outside the Conservation Area but would affect its setting or views into or out of the area. High Quality Design and high quality execution will be required of all new development at all scales.
- 2.4. Special regard has to be given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 2.5. In relation to rear extensions, CPG Home Improvements indicates that they should: *'Be subordinate to the building being extended, in relation to its location, form, footprint, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing; and be carefully scaled in terms of its height, width and depth'*.
- 2.6. No.15 is part of a long terrace of three-storey Italianate houses that sits on the east side of Montpelier Grove. To the rear these houses originally had paired part-width two storey outriggers with opposing sloped roofs to form an elegant gable
- 2.7. The rear elevations of this terrace can be appreciated from collective views within the rear gardens (from within the conservation area) and also looking west from more prominent views from Montpelier Gardens (which lies outside of the conservation area). The consistency and patterns of the rear of these buildings contribute to the cohesive architectural significance of the conservation area. A minority of the outriggers have seen change (see planning history above), mostly associated with the subdivision of these properties into self-contained units. Where these alterations exist, they often erode the significance of the conservation area.
- 2.8. There are a number of properties in this row of terraces that have extensions not too dissimilar from the one proposed. More information regarding these extensions are outlined in the relevant history section above. It could be argued that there is an element of precedence set by these upward extensions, a minority of the extensions have previously failed to meet our CPG guidance at the time but due to the permissions for the same works at neighbouring properties, on balance, it was considered acceptable. It is also important to note, all of the permissions for the extensions were approved under previous local plans and planning guidance.
- 2.9. The proposal to add a second storey in this location, which would be more prominent from views from Montpelier Gardens into the conservation area and would have a negative impact of the scale and

character of the repeated terraced forms and the prevailing scale, mass, roof line and rhythm created by the historic pattern of development. This upward extension does not comply with the advice set out within Camden's Supplementary Guidance on home improvement and design. The proposed extension would be considered harmful to the character of the conservation area and would further erode the significance of the Conservation Area.

2.10. It is therefore considered that the erection of an additional storey above the outrigger would be overbearing and over-dominant in this location. The proposed extension would cause visual harm as seen from neighbouring properties and from views towards the conservation area from Montpelier Gardens at the rear, with negative impacts on the character and appearance of the Kentish Town Conservation Area.

2.11. Given the existing single storey side/rear lean to at the site it is considered that the proposed single storey extension would be subordinate to the property and would be of an acceptable scale and design. The extension would not be visible from the public realm or would there be significant views from private neighbouring gardens and would be of a minor scale that it would not impact the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2.12. The proposed materials would match the existing building and would be considered acceptable for both the upward and single storey extension.

2.13. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF states:  
*208. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.*

2.14. Furthermore, the impact of the proposal will undermine the host building itself which currently makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. The building itself is a non-designated heritage asset and the works will harm it as identified – this is a matter of planning balance as set out in paragraph 209 of the NPPF:

*209. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. 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.*

2.15. As an extension to a private home, the benefits of the scheme are largely private and any public benefits associated with the proposals would not be capable of outweighing the harm to the Conservation Area. As a matter of general planning balance, the harm to the building itself is also unacceptable and would not outweighed by any benefits. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the LB Camden Local Plan 2017, D3 and D4 of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan, as well as the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF 2023.

### **3. Amenity**

3.1. Policy A1 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting planning permission to development that would not harm the amenity of residents. This includes factors such as privacy, outlook, and implications to natural light, artificial light spill, odour and fumes as well as impacts caused from the construction phase of development. Policy A4 seeks to ensure that developments have no adverse impacts by virtue of noise or vibrations.

3.2. The matters to be considered are therefore: loss of daylight, outlook and privacy.

3.3. Due to the orientation of the development there should be no impacts on direct sunlight at any neighbouring properties. Whilst the adjoining neighbour No. 14 does not have an outrigger, it is noted that the windows closest to No. 15 at first and second floor level serve a hallway and bathroom. As such, it is considered that a second floor extension to the outrigger would not significantly harm the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers at No. 14 in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

3.4. In terms of impact on No. 16 relating to the single storey rear/side extension, the ground levels of the host property are lower than No 16 meaning that the extension would extend an additional 600mm above the existing boundary wall. Given the existing conservatory in this location, the size/design and roof slope it is considered that the extension would not significantly harm the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers at No16 in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

#### **4. Recommendation**

4.1. Refuse Planning Permission for the following reason:

“The proposal, by way of its siting, design and height the second storey rear extension would represent an incongruous and inappropriate addition to the building, detracting from its character and appearance in the Kentish Town Conservation Area. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the LB Camden Local Plan, policies D3 and D4 of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (2016), the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF 2023”.