

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	27/08/18
		N/A / attached		<b>Cons. Expire:</b>	14/02/18
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Jaspreet Chana			2018/3114/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
75 Lawn Road London NW3 2XB			See draft decision		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
Erection of part one/part two storey side and rear extensions, front, side and rear dormer windows, alterations to driveway and associated works					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	30	No. of objections	10
Summary of consultations:	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 08/08/18 with the consultation expiring on 01/09/18.  The development was also advertised in the local press on the 09/08/2018 (consultation end date 02/09/2018).					
Summary of consultation responses:	The below comments were received from 10 neighbours which are summarised below in relation to this application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is the third of fourth applications since January 2018. Do the applicants not know what they want, its wasting and exhausting everyone’s patience, money and time.</li><li>• Rear extension is still a dominant feature, there is minimal change to the outrigger wall between app 1 and app 3, and it’s only been minimally reduced.</li><li>• The rear extension is still not secondary to the host building, its disproportionate, completely alters the roofscape, and is still bulky and too big in scale.</li><li>• Retention of the white render does not address the design reasons from the first refused application.</li><li>• The extent of demolition of the original house appears to be increased and is not considered acceptable.</li><li>• Overbearing of development and sense of enclosure at the front of the house in relation to No.76.</li><li>• Impact of rear extension on amenity – loss of outlook/overbearing/overlooking to No.74.</li><li>• This application includes the outrigger at the rear which is the same in size and shape as that proposed in applications 1 and 4 with an alteration to reduce the height of a small part to one storey.</li><li>• The rear view 3D image of the proposed outrigger appears to be out of proportion with this architectural drawing, giving the impression of a larger reduction than is actually proposed.</li><li>• The grounds for refusal of application 1 therefore still apply to this minimally reduced application.</li></ul> <b>Officer response:</b> Please see sections 3, 4 and 5 of the officer’s report below.					
Parkhill / Upper Park CAAC	Parkhill/Upper Park CAAC sent in a formal objection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is overdevelopment. The proposals are too large and dominate the original house. The proposed new dormer windows are too wide and out of scale. The reconfigured roof scape and flat top are too dominant.</li></ul> <b>Officer response:</b> Please see sections 4 and 5 below.					

<b>Belsize Residents Association</b>	<p>Belsize Residents Association sent in a formal objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is objectionable on the following grounds: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The compounded effect of the proposed extensions fails the planning requirement for a subordinate extension in a Conservation Area. This is particularly visible with a resulting deformation of the main roof design.</li> <li>2. The proposed extension of the roof destroys the original symmetry the semi-detached houses</li> <li>3. The proposed mansard roof on the side extension destroys the symmetry of the 2 storey side extensions observed from the public highway.</li> <li>4. The proposed extent of demolition is wholly inappropriate and in contrast with the Camden Local Plan 2017.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
<b>Councillor Marcus Boyland</b>	<p>Councillor Marcus Boyland sent in a comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently No.75 is one of a row of 1920s stylised homes that make a positive contribution to the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. The houses are five, symmetrically laid out, and paired dwellings which when viewed as a whole present a unified and striking outlook.</li> <li>• It seems that the scale and massing for the newly proposed two storey rear extension is outside the proportion when placed alongside No.74 and other neighbours in the row. It would seem from drawings that this application would totally upset the designed in symmetry of this row of houses on Lawn Road.</li> <li>• I do not think this application addresses the issues of bulk, scale and mass that would still not be a subordinate addition to the existing dwelling and would still harm the character of the existing dwelling and the surrounding conservation area.</li> <li>• I do not feel this revised application addresses the impact on amenity of No.74 Lawn Road in regards to overbearing, and added sense of enclosure. Therefore I feel this revised application remains contrary to Policies A1 and D1.</li> </ul>

## 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' and is a positive contributor.

## Relevant History

### No.75 Lawn Road –

2017/6726/P - Erection of part one/part two storey side and rear extensions, side and rear dormer windows, alterations to driveway and associated works – Refused on 14/03/18 for the following reasons:

1 Reason for Refusal -

*The proposed two storey rear extension, by reason of its, design, bulk, scale mass and use of materials, would not be a subordinate addition to the existing dwelling and would harm the character of the existing dwelling and the surrounding conservation area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of Camden's Local Plan 2017 and CPG1 (Design).*

2 Reason for Refusal -

*The proposed extension of the existing side window into a dormer window, by reason of its, design and size would be out of character with the host building and would harm the character of the terrace it forms part of and the surrounding conservation area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of Camden's Local Plan 2017 and CPG1 (Design).*

3 Reason for Refusal -

*The proposed two storey rear extension, due to its size, scale, massing and position close to the boundary would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of No.74 Lawn Road in regards to overbearing and added sense of enclosure. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies A1 (Managing the Impact of development) and D1 (Design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.*

### 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 (2018)

### 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

## **Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011)**

### **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, side and rear dormer windows, alterations to driveway and associated works.

#### **2. Assessment**

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

- Changes made to current application
- Does the current proposal address previous reasons for refusal
- 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. Changes made to current application**

- 3.1. The proposed works have been amended in response to the previously refused application ref.2017/6726/P, the following amendments were made:

- The extent of demolition had been increased in comparison to the previously refused application. The majority of the house was proposed to be demolished apart from the front façade and part of the side façade by the driveway. However, upon further negotiation the extent of demolition has been reduced back to demolishing the two storey outrigger, the two storey side extension and the whole roof of 75 Lawn Road.
- The proposed two storey rear extension has been reduced at first floor from a 3.6m extension to 2.19m resulted in a decrease of 1.4m.
- The ground floor single storey rear extension will have a roof light above it and will read as a part single, element along with the part two storey rear extension.
- The extensions to the rear will be finished in white render to match the existing rear elevation.
- The obscure leaded window to stairwell which was extended into the roof of the property has now been separated so the stairwell windows stay as existing and a new obscured leaded dormer window is now proposed within the side elevation of the roof.

- The existing bedroom and en-suite above the garage will be converted into a large dressing room to serve the master bedroom this dressing room extends into the new first floor side extension to the front of the property and creates a parapet flat roof on its rear elevation.

#### **4. Does the current proposal address previous reasons for refusal**

##### ***The extent of demolition***

- 4.1. Policy D2 (f) states: *'the council will resist the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area...unless circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention'*.
- 4.2. This proposal is seeking revised demolition of the existing two storey outrigger, the two storey side extension and the whole roof of the existing property. This demolition would be substantially less than what was originally sought, as only the rear and side additions would be removed and the majority of the house will be standing as original. The roof is proposed to be fully removed, although this would be quite major works, it is considered that in order to create side and rear dormer windows and conversion within the roof the works to the roof may result in the existing roof being damaged or replaced anyway therefore the replacement of the roof for a like to like roof would not be considered to cause detrimental harm to the character and appearance of the subject dwelling or the surrounding area.
- 4.3. Therefore, based on the above the current proposal this extent of demolition is deemed acceptable and is in accordance with Policy D2.

##### ***The part single, part two storey rear extension***

- 4.4. It is considered that the proposed setback of the first floor by 1.4m within this revised application does not adequately address the previous refused reasons. There has been no change in circumstances or in planning policy which would enable the council to determine this application differently. Therefore the previous reasons for refusal in regards to the two storey rear extension still stand:

*'The proposed two storey rear extension, by reason of its, design, bulk, scale mass and use of materials, would not be a subordinate addition to the existing dwelling and would harm the character of the existing dwelling and the surrounding conservation area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of Camden's Local Plan 2017 and CPG1 (Design).*

*The proposed two storey rear extension, due to its size, scale, massing and position close to the boundary would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of No.74 Lawn Road in regards to overbearing and added sense of enclosure. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies A1 (Managing the Impact of development) and D1 (Design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017'.*

- 4.5. The part single, part two storey rear extension is still proposing to infill the existing back corner which will square up the rear elevation but the existing would be set back at first floor level. Although the infill extension is a modest infill of 3.6m deep by 3.7m wide, with it being added to the proposed new side and rear outriggers that will take the extension in total to 8.65m deep at ground floor and 7.4m deep at first floor and would be 6.5m wide which would still appear as an incongruously large disproportionate addition.
- 4.6. The design and form of the dwelling although improved by way of introducing a set back at first floor, the use of render on the rear extensions and creating a separation between the new side extension and the first floor rear extension. It is felt that this still does not reduce the bulk and mass on this corner of the site. This is then further exacerbated by the large expanse of crown roof over the rear extensions which makes the rear extensions look even wider and deeper. It is therefore considered that the part single, 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.

### **Front/side extensions**

- 4.7. 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 (2m) 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.
- 4.8. 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, 74 and 76 part of this terrace). Additionally, the front projections are set so far back from the front building line (between 10-15m), 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.
- 4.9. Within the previous refused application the obscure leaded window to the stairwell was to be extended above the eaves into a dormer window. This feature was not supported by the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy as that stated that *'the area's homogeneous character is being eroded where...side windows are replaced with large windows breaking eaves lines, inappropriate dormers...'* it was further 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.
- 4.10. Nonetheless the current proposal has now changed the proposal by leaving the large existing stairwell windows as they are and proposes a dormer window within the side roof slope above the stairwell window. The dormer window would be set above the eaves and set in from all side roof slopes which would be considered as an appropriate addition. Furthermore other properties within the street such as No.73 have a side dormer window within their roof slopes and properties opposite the subject site have side dormer windows therefore it would be a feature that would be in keeping with the street scene.
- 4.11. There are no objections to the driveway being altered and new soft landscaping added to the front garden.
- 4.12. 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 roof light to serve the ensuite. Given the modest size 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.
- 4.13. Overall, this current proposal has not addressed the previous reasons (1 & 3) for refusal and therefore they still stand. The proposed demolition would not be acceptable and the part single, part two storey rear extension would not be considered an 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's garden along its rear boundary, the two storey extension would not be projecting any further rearward 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 windows 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 attached 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 bedroom room and through this window one would see the sloping cat slide roof of the new first floor side extension with the edge of the dormer window. The existing view from this window already has a tunnel like view caused by No. 75 and 76s side walls, by proposing this modest extension at No. 75s first floor it would partially change the view but not completely block or enclose the view. 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, sufficient to warrant a refusal of the application on this basis.
- 5.4. The part single, part two storey side and 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 a four paned window to just one window closest to No. 76 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 be any different to those that currently exist. Therefore no additional impact would be had on No. 76s privacy.
- 5.5. No. 74 is the attached semi-detached dwelling 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 revised part single, part two storey infill extension would not extend any closer to the boundary with No. 74 but by infilling the corner the combined length (of between 7.4 - 8.5m) and width (6.40m). Although the first floor extension has been set back by 1.4m leaving the proposed extension at 2.2m the first floor still projects a combined 7.4m which is still considered to be an extortionate depth at two storey level. It is noted that the existing outrigger project 5.2m currently and with the addition of 2.2m extension it will take it to the new depth however as the existing outrigger would be demolished and rebuilt it would be a whole new addition added not just an extension to an existing addition. It is considered that the extension would be an incongruous addition which would be overbearing to No.74 and would still create a sense of enclosure and poor outlook to their adjacent rear and side windows.
- 5.6. As the two storey rear extension has been reduced at first floor level, the extension would no longer intrude into No.74s visibility zone when applying the 45 degree rule. Although this would slightly lessen the impact had on the amenities of No.74 it doesn't eliminate the harm completely, and due to the remaining depth of 7.4m at two stories it is still considered there would be overbearing and possible overshadowing caused by the extension to Nos.74s side and rear windows. It is therefore evident that the size, scale, massing and position of the extension would still have a detrimental impact on the amenities of No.74 in regards to overbearing, overshadowing and sense of enclosure which is 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 this proposal has addressed the previous reasons for refusal the proposed part single, part two storey rear extension would not be appropriate additions to the existing dwelling due to their size, bulk, 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 still have a detrimental impact on the amenities of No.74 Lawn Road in regards to an added sense of enclosure.

**Recommendation:** Refuse planning permission