

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	13/03/18
		N/A / attached	Cons. Expire:	14/02/18
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Jaspreet Chana			2017/6726/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
75 Lawn Road London NW3 2XB			<i>See draft decision</i>	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of part one/part two storey side and rear extensions, side and rear dormer windows, alterations to driveway and associated works				
Recommendation(s):	Refuse Planning Permission			
Application Type:	Householder application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Reasons for Conditions:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	30	No. of objections	13
Summary of consultations:	<p>One site notice was displayed in front of 75 Lawn Road on 10/01/18 (consultation end date 31/01/18). Neighbours to the rear of the site and adjacent to the property complained that no notice was put up to the rear of the site so two new site notices were put up one in front of No.75 and one to the rear in front of No.20 Downside Crescent on 19/01/18 with the consultation expiring on 09/02/18.</p> <p>The development was also advertised in the local press on the 12/01/2018 (consultation end date 31/01/2018).</p>					
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>13 objections were received from Nos. 6, 73, 74, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83 Lawn Road and 8a Belsize Court and Flat 2 No.18, 20 and 24 Downside Crescent all their comments can be seen summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent of demolition of the original house • Disruption to the symmetry between properties • Use of inappropriate materials • Inconsistencies in drawings and sunlight & daylight report • Scale and mass of proposed rear extension, excessive in size leading to overbearing development and unacceptable send of enclosure • Impact of rear extension on amenity – loss of outlook/overbearing/overlooking to Nos.74, 76 and properties 18 and 20 to the rear • Precedent for two storey rear extensions • Front extension and front dormer would create a sense of enclosure and would be out of keeping with the street scene. • Proposals would be contrary to the Conservation Area. <p><i>Officer response: Please see sections 4 and 5 of the discussion below</i></p>					

**CAAC/Local groups/
Councillor Comments:**

Belsize CAAC sent in a formal objection:

- The proposed extension is too high and too bulky, it extends too far into the rear garden space and would be detrimental to amenity of the neighbouring houses, particularly No.76 where it would be oppressive both from the house and from the garden.

Comments were received from Councillor Boyland:

- Firstly, No.75 is one of a row of 1920s stylised homes that without doubt make a positive contribution to the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. The houses are five, symmetrically laid out, paired dwellings which when viewed as a whole present a unified and striking outlook.
- Secondly, is the request to demolish a large section of the original 1920s property. I am worried that allowing this may set a precedent in the area. It would seem that such demolition is outside of Camden Environmental Planning Guide.
- Thirdly, it seems that the scale and massing for the proposed two storey rear extension is outside the proportion when placed alongside No.74 and other neighbours in the row.

Officer response: Please see sections 4 and 5 of the discussion below

Site Description

No.75 is a 1920s two storey semi-detached dwelling located to the west side of the street. It forms part of 4 paired dwellings which are of similar size and design. The surrounding area is predominantly residential consisting of two storey houses on the west side and five storey town houses to the east side of the street. The site also falls within the 'Parkhill Conservation Area'

Relevant History

No. 77 Lawn Road - 2016/1737/P - Creation of basement to form additional living accommodation for existing dwelling and new 1x self-contained 1-bed flat at lower ground floor level; alterations to driveway and erection of new boundary fencing; erection of part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension; alterations to fenestration; and associated works – Granted – 05/06/17.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

The London Plan (2016)

Camden Local Plan (2017)

- D1 Design
- D2 Heritage
- A1 Managing the impact of development

Camden Planning Guidance:

- CPG 1 – Design
 - Design excellence: sections 2.6 – 2.8, page 10
 - Context & Design: section 2.9 – 2.12, pages 11 – 12
 - Heritage Chapter 3, pages 15 - 27
 - Scale: section 4.8, page 32
 - Roofs, terraces: Section 5, pages 39 - 48
- CPG 6 – Amenity
 - Daylight: section 6.6 page 32
 - Sunlight: section 6.16 page 34 - 35
 - Overlooking and privacy: section 7.4, page 37
 - Outlook: section 7.8 page 38

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1. Planning permission is sought for garage conversion with part single, part two storey side and rear extensions, loft conversion with front and rear dormer windows, obscure leaded window to stairwell extended, alterations to driveway and associated works

2. Assessment

2.1. The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are as follows:

- The visual impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene and Conservation Area;
- Impact upon neighbouring amenities
- Transport
- Trees

3. Design and Conservation

3.1. 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 respect local context and character; comprise details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character; is sustainable in design and construction; integrates well into surrounding townscape and open spaces; and respond to natural features. Policy D2 'Heritage' states that in order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will not permit development within conservation area that fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of that conservation area. Policy D2 similarly requires all developments to preserve the character of listed buildings within the Borough, including by resisting development that would cause harm to significance of a listed building through an effect on its setting.

4. Impact to the character of host building and Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area

4.1. No.75 is part of a pair of semi-detached dwellings (along with no. 74) which were built in the 1920s. The existing garage and rear extension to the side of the property are set further back within its plot, and this is due to post war damage where the garage and first floor were rebuilt in 1925 and therefore form part of the original building.

4.2. The front proposals involve the ground floor garage conversion and extension projecting out alongside the garage with No.76, but would be set back 200mm from No.76s garage and would have a similar flat roof. The first floor extension would be a modest extension which would incorporate a front dormer window within a new pitched roof with lower eaves almost giving the appearance of a cat slide roof. It is noted that there are other examples within the street scene whereby properties have projected forward at ground and first floor (Nos.72, 73 and 74 part of this terrace). Additionally, the front projections are set so far back from the front building line, the impact on the street scene would be minimal. It is therefore considered the design, scale and use of materials for these elements would be considered proportionate to the original dwelling and would not be out of keeping within the street scene.

4.3. The obscure leaded window to the stairwell is proposed to be extended above the eaves into a dormer window. This feature is not one supported by the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy as that states that *'the area's homogeneous character is being eroded where...side windows are replaced with large windows breaking eaves lines, inappropriate dormers...'* it is evident from the street scene that properties further down the road Nos.78, 79, 80, 81, 82 and 83 all have this feature adopted in various size and design. However Nos. 76, 75, 74, 73, and 72 don't have this feature. Furthermore No.76 is built as a detached property which splits the two sets of terraces as the road curves therefore you cannot see the large side element windows until you get further down the road, the first terrace remains without any incongruous front/side window elements. Given this it is considered that the extension of the existing side window into a dormer window would not be supported as it would be dominant addition within the street scene which would not be in keeping with this half of the terrace.

4.4. There are no objections to the driveway being altered and new soft landscaping added to the front garden.

- 4.5. The two storey rear extension is proposing to infill the existing back corner which will square up the rear elevation. This will be achieved by demolishing the existing rear outriggers and replacing them with a new structure to the same depth as existing incorporating the infill of the corner. Although the infill extension is a modest infill of 3.6m deep by 3.7m wide, with it being added to the existing outriggers it takes the extension in total to 8.65m deep by 6.40m wide which appears as an incongruously large disproportionate addition.
- 4.6. The design of the extension would have a crown roof, and be constructed in red brick, and with the combined width would appear very wide and deep, dominating the plot. With the use of the red brick that further adds to extension appearing wide. It is therefore considered that the two storey rear extension would not be a subordinate addition to the existing dwelling, it would not be in keeping with the existing dwelling or this part of Park Hill Conservation Area.
- 4.7. The existing loft space is to be converted to form a second floor that will accommodate a new bedroom with an ensuite, this would include insertion of a new rear dormer window and one rooflight to serve the ensuite. Given the modest side of this dormer and it being set within the middle of the roof above the eaves and below the main ridge it is not considered it would cause a detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area.
- 4.8. Overall, it is not considered the proposed extension of the existing side window into a dormer window and the two storey rear extension would be appropriate additions to the existing dwelling due to their design, size, scale and massing; and they would not preserve the existing character of the existing dwelling or the surrounding conservation area.

5. Impact upon neighbours amenities

- 5.1. The adjacent properties either side to the host dwelling Nos.74, 76 Lawn Road and Nos. 20 and 22 Downside Crescent may be impacted by the proposed development.
- 5.2. Nos.20 and 22 adjoin the host property along its rear boundary, the two storey extension would not be projecting any further forward into the garden than the existing two storey additions but infill the corner becoming wider. Firstly Nos. 20 and 22 are set on higher ground level than No.75; secondly they are set between 26-30m back to back from the new development and thirdly there are large trees on the boundary as screening. Lastly, any overlooking that would be incurred from the new dormer window or new first floor window in the two storey extension would be no worse than the views from the existing first floor windows from Nos. 74, 75 and 76. Given this it is not considered there would be a detrimental impact to the amenities of Nos.20 and 22 in regards to overlooking and privacy impacts.
- 5.3. No.76 lies to the south of No.75 and attaches to the two storey side extension to No.75. No.76 has a ground floor garage extension and the proposed ground floor garage extension would adjoin this but would be set back by 200mm. The first floor extension would be 2m deep incorporating a dormer window within a pitched roof and would come forward of No.76s first floor window. No.76s first floor has dual aspect windows to the first floor room and if it's a bathroom then that is not a habitable room. Therefore it is not considered the first floor extension would have a detrimental impact to the amenities of No.76 in regards to loss of light, overbearing, overshadowing or privacy impacts. The two storey rear extension would not project any deeper than the existing two storey extension and would not come further forward than No.76s two storey rear addition. The first floor window will be reduced from two windows to just one window that would be more centrally located within the extension, as the extension is not projecting any further forward it is not considered its views from the first floor would not be any different to those that currently exist. Therefore no additional impact would be had on No.76s privacy.
- 5.4. No.74 is the attached semi which lies to the north of No.75. It will not be impacted by the proposed works to the front of the property. The existing two storey garage and kitchen elements at No.75 are set between 7.4m – 11m away from No.74s side and rear elevation. The proposed two storey infill extension would not extend any closer to the boundary with No.74 but by infilling the corner the combined length (8.5m) and width (6.40m) of the extension would be considered to be overbearing to No.74 and would create a sense of enclosure and poor outlook to their adjacent rear and side windows. Although no first floor side windows are proposed towards No.74 the extension intrudes into the 45 degree visibility zone of No.74s ground floor rear living room windows demonstrating that there would be overbearing and possible overshadowing caused by the extension to Nos.74s side and rear windows. The submitted daylight and sunlight report suggests that the assessment carried out confirms that No.74 Lawn Road meets the BRE recommendations for daylight although this may be the case in regards to light components, but by plan it is evident that the size, scale, massing and position of the extension would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of No.74 in regards to overbearing, overshadowing and sense of enclosure contrary to policy A1.

6. Transport

- 6.1. The application site has a PTAL level of 4, which means it has good access to public transport. With the conversion of the existing garage this would remove the amount of on-site car parking, however there would still be room for one space on the drive way, this would be in accordance with the Local Plan Policies T1 and T2.
- 6.2. The proposed alterations to the driveway and soft landscaping to the front garden would not impact on the highway.

7. Trees

- 7.1. An arboricultural report has been undertaken by Landmark Trees, this states that the proposed extension would not encroach into the route protection area of any retained trees therefore no impact would be had to any trees. Alterations to the front garden will ensure that soft landscaping is maintained.

8. Conclusion

- 8.1. Overall, it is not considered the proposed extension of the existing side window into a dormer window and the two storey rear extension would be appropriate additions to the existing dwelling due to their design, size, scale and massing; and they would not preserve the existing character of the existing dwelling or the surrounding conservation area.
- 8.2. In addition to the above the proposed rear extension due to its size, scale, massing and position of the extension would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of No.74 Lawn Road in regards to an added sense of enclosure.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission