Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry	iry Date: 08/04/2016			
		N/A / attached		Consul Expiry		10/03/2016		
Officer				Application Number(s)				
Kate Phillips			2016/0258/P					
Application Address	Drawing Numbe	Drawing Numbers						
21 Boscastle Road								
London NW5 1EE			Refer to Draft De	Refer to Draft Decision Notice				
PO 3/4 Area Team Signature C&UD Authorised Officer Signature								
Proposal(s)								
Variation of condition 3 (approved plans) of planning permission 2015/1434/P dated 06/05/2015 (for a single								
storey rear extension and associated works), namely to allow the lowering of the first floor rear window and								
raising the height of the side sky lantern to cover lowered window, removal of end sky lantern, and introduction of parapet wall to roof terrace								
Recommendation(s):	Refused							
Application Type:	Variation or Removal of Condition(s)							
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice							
Informatives:								
Consultations								
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	6	No. of responses	00	No. of c	bjections	00	
			No. electronic	00				
Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice was displayed on 17/02/2016 (consultation end date 09/03/2016) and a notice was placed in the local press on 18/02/2016 (consultation end date 10/03/2016). No responses have been received.							
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	N/A							

#### **Site Description**

No. 21 Boscastle Road is a three storey, mid terraced, residential dwelling on the western side of the road.

The application site is in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and Nos. 1-33 (odd) Boscastle Road are identified in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

#### **Relevant History**

2016/0953/P - Enlargement of existing basement and creation of lightwell at front of building – Decision pending

2015/1434/P - Erection of a single storey full-width rear extension - Granted 06-05-2015

2015/0644/P - Installation of 1 x rooflight on rear roof slope - Granted 02-03-2015

2014/7318/P - Erection of a single storey rear extension as replacement to existing, replacement of rooflights to rear roofslope, alterations to rear elevation fenestration and balustrade, replacement of rear garden shed and rear landscaping - Granted 20-01-2015

#### **Relevant policies**

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan 2015 consolidated with alterations

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010 CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 Securing high quality design DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

#### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (2015) CPG6 Amenity (2011)

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (January 2009)

#### Assessment

### Proposal

- 1.1 This application seeks planning permission to vary condition 3 (approved plans) of planning permission 2015/1434/P, dated 06/05/2015. The original application was for the erection of a single storey full-width rear extension, and associated works. This application seeks to make the following changes:
  - Lowering of first floor window on rear elevation
  - Raising the height of the side sky lantern above approved extension to cover the above mentioned lowered window
  - Removal of sky lantern at far end of approved extension
  - Introduction of parapet wall along the side of the roof terrace
- 1.2 The rear facing window would be lowered by approximately 0.7 metres, such that the top edge of the window would be 1.9 metres below the window cill of the window above instead of 1.2 metres as it is now. The window opening would remain the same size and the lowered window would have the same appearance.
- 1.3 The enlarged sky lantern would measure 6.1 metres long and 1.9 metres wide. It would be between 2.7 and 3.2 metres taller than the approved single storey side/rear extension. The sky lantern would cover the lowered rear-facing window and it would also cover the side-facing first floor window (which serves a shower room).
- 1.4 The parapet wall along the side of the second floor roof terrace would measure approximately 0.5 metres tall, which is the same height as the parapet wall on the shared boundary with No. 19 Boscastle Road.

# Impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area (including the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area)

- 1.5 The application site is within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, wherein the Council has a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Nos. 1-33 (odd) Boscastle Road are identified in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (DPCAAMS) as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 1.6 Within the Management Plan, the DPCAAMS notes (page 52) that new development, including extensions, must demonstrate high quality design, appropriate scale, form and materials and high quality execution; otherwise, development can harm the character and appearance of the area.
- 1.7 The introduction of a parapet wall along the side of the second floor roof terrace is considered to be acceptable because it would match the existing parapet on the other side and, although the two storey extension would appear marginally taller when viewed from the side, it is not considered that it would detract from the character and appearance of the host building or the wider area.
- 1.8 Similarly, it is not considered that the removal of the sky lantern at the far end of the approved extension would impact on the character and appearance of the host building or the wider area. This element of the proposal is also considered to be acceptable.
- 1.9 The lowering of the first floor rear-facing window and the increase in height of the proposed sky lantern would have a greater impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.
- 1.10 The DPCAAMS notes (page 54) that the appearance of characterful buildings within the conservation area can be harmed by the removal or loss of original architectural features and the use of inappropriate materials. The DPCAAMS goes on to note that, in all cases, the Council will expect original architectural features and detailing to be retained, protected, refurbished in the appropriate manner, and only replaced where it can be demonstrated that they are beyond repair. In this case, no evidence has been provided to suggest the rear-facing window needs to be repaired; the proposal to move the window to a lower position results from the applicants' desire to encompass the window within the raised sky lantern. This does not represent sufficient justification for the loss/alteration of original architectural features and detailing at the rear of the host building.

- 1.11 Furthermore, the DPCAAMS notes (page 56) that the original historic pattern of rear elevations within a street or group of buildings is an integral part of the character of the area. The lowering of the rear-facing window (and its covering by the raised sky lantern) would detract from the historic pattern of rear elevations along this part of Boscastle Road, which would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the group of buildings and the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.
- 1.12 The proposed raised sky lantern would measure 6.1 metres long and 1.9 metres wide and it would be up to 3.2 metres taller than the approved single storey side/rear extension. Although the glazing would give the structure a lightweight appearance when viewed next to the brick two storey rear projection, it is considered that the glazed structure would appear incongruous and it is considered that, by virtue of its excessive size and bulk, the raised sky lantern would detract from the character and appearance of the host building, the group of buildings and the wider area.
- 1.13 The rear elevation of the approved single storey side/rear extension already features a large expanse of glazing (2.9 metres by 5.5 metres) and it is also considered that the introduction of more glazing would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building. At the time of the original application (2015/1434/P), the Officer's Report (para 4.4) specifically noted that the modern detailing and materials on the proposed extension are considered to be acceptable given that the extension is at ground floor level and the materials would be similar to those used in neighbouring extensions along the terrace. The report goes on to note that the proposed side extension would represent a subordinate structure which would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding conservation area. It is considered that the use of excessive glazing at a higher level on the host building would detract significantly from the historic character of the building and there are no similar examples in the street. It is also considered that the raised sky lantern would detract from the subordinance of the approved extension, which is contrary to the guidance in the DPCAAMS and CPG1 (Design).
- 1.14 The applicant has referred to 20 Grafton Crescent, where the Council approved a planning application for a modern rear extension with a raised glazed box to the side (planning reference 2006/5890/P). However, 20 Grafton Crescent is not within a conservation area (although the buildings in the terrace are all locally listed) and the proposal involved comprehensive redevelopment of the rear of the building, such that the glazed box is viewed as part of the overall extension, which would not be the case at Boscastle Road where the raised sky lantern would appear at odds with the existing brick-built rear projection. Furthermore, 20 Grafton Crescent is a different type of building (with a lower ground floor level at the rear) such that the extension and glazed element sit at a relatively lower position on the rear elevation of the building (i.e. two floor levels above the glazed element instead of just one).
- 1.15 To conclude, it is considered that the lowering of the first floor rear-facing window and the increase in height of the proposed sky lantern would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the group of buildings and the proposal would fail to preserve and enhance, but instead would detract from the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DP24 and DP25 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies. The proposal also fails to comply with Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2015; and the provisions of paragraphs 14, 17, 56-66 and 126-141 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. The application is recommended for refusal on this basis.

## Impact on the visual and residential amenities of the neighbouring properties

- 1.16 Policy DP26 notes that the Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. Given the nature of the proposed works, the main residential property that is likely to be affected by the proposal is the attached neighbouring property to the north, No. 23 Boscastle Road. All other nearby and neighbouring properties are considered to be sufficiently removed from the application site so as not to be unduly affected by the proposed works.
- 1.17 It is not considered that the removal of the sky lantern at the far end of the approved extension or the lowering of the rear-facing window would impact on the visual and residential amenities of the neighbouring property.
- 1.18 CPG1 (Design) advises that rear extensions should not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, or a

sense of enclosure. It is not considered that the introduction of a parapet wall along the side of the second floor roof terrace would cause undue harm to the visual and residential amenities of the neighbouring property. Although the two storey extension would appear marginally taller when viewed from the side, it is not considered that the increased height would give rise to undue loss of light or outlook, overshadowing, or a sense of enclosure.

- 1.19 The proposed raised sky lantern to the side would measure up to 6.1 metres above ground level (up to 3.2 metres above the height of the approved side/rear extension) and it would be set off the shared boundary with No. 23 by 1.1 metres. Although the glazing would give the structure a lightweight appearance, it is considered that the structure would appear overbearing when viewed from No. 23. The structure would dominate views from the rear and side facing windows at No. 23, which would be to the detriment of the residential enjoyment of this dwelling.
- 1.20 Furthermore, the proposed raised sky lantern is likely to cause harm by reason of light pollution/spillage. The structure would be entirely glazed and the size of the structure is considered to be excessive for a tightknit, built-up residential setting such as this. Light from inside the structure would be discernible from the ground and first floor rear and side facing windows at No. 23, which again would be detrimental to the residential enjoyment of this dwelling.
- 1.21 To conclude, it is considered that the increase in height of the proposed sky lantern would cause harm to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of No. 23 Boscatle Road, by virtue of its overbearing appearance and as a result of light pollution/spillage. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DP26 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies. The proposal also fails to comply with the provisions of paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. The application is also recommended for refusal on this basis.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.