

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>30/09/2016</b>
			<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>31/08/2016</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Helaina Farthing			2016/4150/P 2016/4367/L	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
Basement Flat 39 Steele's Road London NW3 4RG			Site Location Plan; 700/16/01; 700/16/02 A; 700/16/03 A; 700/16/04; 700/16/05 A; Design and Access Statement.	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Creation of entrance porch to the front facade at lower ground floor level of existing dwelling house (C3).</li> <li>2. Creation of entrance porch to the front facade at lower ground floor level of existing dwelling house (C3).</li> </ol>				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Refuse Planning permission</b> <b>Refuse Listed Building Consent</b>		
<b>Application Type:</b>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Full Planning Permission;</li> <li>2. Listed Building Consent.</li> </ol>		

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	Refer to Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>24</b>	No. of responses	<b>03</b>	No. of objections No. in support	<b>02</b> <b>01</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>A site notice was displayed from 10/08/2016, expiring on the 01/09/2016 and a public notice was published in the Ham &amp; High from the 12/08/2016.</p> <p>One letter of support was received by the applicant at 39 Steele's road:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Noted that the proposed shape of the porch can be seen at numbers 31/32/33 and 34 Steele's Road;</i></li> <li>2. <i>Expressed proposal is common design in Edwardian architecture</i></li> </ol> <p>One objection was received by the Belsize Residents Association:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>The proposal for a faceted footprint extension, resembling an irregular pentagon and a tiled roof to match is foreign to this and neighbouring properties and therefore considered to be inappropriate;</i></li> <li>2. <i>Would welcome a simple rectangular extension, in line the prevalent concept of host building would be recommended.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Officer Response</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Comments noted and discussed in reason for refusal</i></li> </ol>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b> Eton CAAC	<p>The Eton CAAC was notified and an objection was received.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>The group of houses built in the early 1870's form a most important and distinctive presence in the conservation area;</i></li> <li>2. <i>The proposal does not pay attention to the formal arrangements of this elevation, and would adversely affect the qualities of the building;</i></li> <li>3. <i>The proposed flat has its own separate entrance and therefore the justification of the works to the listed building isn't supported.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Officer Response</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>These comments have been noted and taken into consideration as part of the refusal recommendation;</i></li> </ol>					

## Site Description

39 Steele's Road is a Grade II listed building, located within the Eton Conservation Area on the north side of Steele's Road. The street is lined with mature plane trees with buildings set back from the street often behind mid-high level brick boundary walls, with gaps between for driveways and gates. The application site forms part of a group of houses developed in the 1870s by the architects Brydon, Batterbury and Huxley for occupation by artists, in the case of no.39 this was for the occupation of the watercolour painter and wood engraver GG Kilburne. The group (21 – 39 Steele's Road) of listed buildings have a variety in detailing; however employ a consistent approach to building line, height, massing and the general use of materials.

The site is divided into flats; this application specifically relates to the basement flat.

## Relevant History

None

## Relevant policies

### National and Regional Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan (2016) (Sections 7.4 Local Character and 7.6 Architecture).

### 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

CPG1 Design (2015; Section 2, 3, 4 and 5)

CPG2 Housing (2015; Section 4)

CPG6 Amenity (2011; Section 2,3,4,5,6 and 9)

### Eton Conservation Area Statement (2002)

## Assessment

### 1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a new front porch;

- The proposed extension would extend approximately 2m from the front elevation;
- The extension will be a height of 3m at the highest point, sloping to a height of 2m;
- The materials are proposed to match the existing, with a timber sash windows.

### 2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main planning considerations relate to:

- Design (principle of development and detailed design);

- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

### 3.0 Design

3.1 Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within policy DP24 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the quality of materials to be used. Policy DP25 'Conserving Camden's Heritage' states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.

3.2 The Eton Conservation Area Statement states that 'extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials'. Furthermore it notes that 'extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace or group of buildings. The acceptability of larger extensions depends on the particular site and circumstances'.

3.3 The north side of Steele's Road is lined with mature plane trees with buildings set back from the street often behind mid-high level brick boundary walls, with gaps between for driveways and gates. The application site forms part of a group of houses developed in the 1870s by the architects Brydon, Batterbury and Huxley. The group of listed buildings have a variety in detailing; however employ a consistent approach to building line, height, massing and the general use of materials.

3.4 The proposed front extension to 39 Steele's Road is not considered to be acceptable due to the harm caused to the special interest and original design of the Grade II listed building. The addition is considered as an incongruous addition to the striking double height square brick bay window, and would result in disruption to the regular pattern and rhythm of the front elevation of other listed and unlisted properties on the north side of Steele's Road, affecting the group value. Consequently it is viewed as causing undue harm to the value of these properties and the character and appearance of the Eton Conservation Area.

3.5 Whilst there is a mid-height brick wall and vegetation that would obstruct some views of the proposed front extension, the extension would be visible from vantage points along Steele's Road, with the key view point being east up Steele's Road. Although views are also afforded through the gate looking west along Steele's Road. Whilst there is currently a degree of screening provided by the existing vegetation and fencing, given that it is existing it cannot be controlled for retention and therefore the extent of the visibility needs to be assessed taking into account that the vegetation/fencing could be removed. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that the recent appeal decision (ref: APP/X5210/W/16/3141776) stated that 'the significance of the CA derives from the buildings and layout as a whole, regardless of whether particular elements are open to public view. Its significance does not therefore rely only on the elements that can readily be seen'. The appeal decision affirms that the harm does not only rely on whether it is visible rather whether it causes harm to the conservation area, or in this instance listed building. As outlined in paragraph 3.4 the front porch is considered to cause harm to the special interest of the listed building.

3.6 The proposed minor alterations to the positioning of the front stairwell is considered acceptable and would not cause harm to the special interest and original design of the listed building. The extension of the front planters is considered to be acceptable.

3.7 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013 requires for buildings in conservation areas that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. It is considered that this proposal would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and this heritage asset.

### 4.0 Detailed Design

4.1 Policy CS14 aims to ensure the highest design standards for developments. Policy DP24 states that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and respect the character, setting, form and scale of neighbouring properties and the character and proportions of the existing building.

4.2 CPG1 Design states that the materials for alterations should complement the colour and texture of the materials in the existing building. Whilst the use of matching materials would create some harmony with the host dwelling, in view of the design issues discussed above this does not mitigate the harm to the character and appearance of the property.

## **5.0 Amenity**

5.1 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG6 seeks for developments to be "designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree" and that the Council will "aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight caused by a development on the amenity of existing occupiers."

5.2 Given the location of the extension and the positioning at the lower ground level, the proposal is not considered to harm the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of access to sunlight, daylight, visual bulk, sense of enclosure or privacy.

## **6.0 Conclusion**

6.1 The proposal is considered to detract from the appearance of the host building. It would be out of keeping with the terrace buildings within this group of properties and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Eton Conservation Area and is subsequently harmful to the Conservation Area.

## **7.0 Recommendation**

7.1 Refuse planning permission