

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	21/01/2019
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	21/02/2019
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Kate Henry			2018/5842/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
Flat 1, Sussex House 14-26 Glenilla Road London NW3 4AR			Refer to Draft Decision Notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Single storey rear extension					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed on 28/01/2019 (expiry date 21/02/2019) and a notice was published in the local press on 24/01/2019 (expiry date 17/02/2019).</p> <p>An objection has been received from the neighbouring property, No. 12 Glenilla Road, summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Sussex House has a strong architectural character and the proposed glazed extension would detract from the character and appearance of the building.Overbearing impact on No. 12 Glenilla Road and its gardenLight pollution from glazed extensionNoise transfer to No. 12 Glenilla RoadImpact on treesUnable to discern from the plans how the proposed extension would attach to the neighbouring property, No. 12 Glenilla Road.The proposal will turn the side wall of 12 Glenilla Road into a party wall and also prevent sun shining on that wallImpact on property values <p>Officer comment <i>Please see the Officer's Report below.</i></p> <p><i>The plans have been revised during the course of the application so that the extension would no longer be fully glazed; however, the comments above have been taken into consideration insofar as they are relevant to the revised scheme.</i></p> <p><i>Party wall issues and the impact on property values are not material planning considerations and cannot therefore be taken into consideration in the determination of the application.</i></p>					
Belsize CAAC	No objection					

Belsize Resident's Association

Object to this application as there is insufficient information to assess the design.

Site Description

The application site is Flat 1, Sussex House on Glenilla Road. Sussex House is a 5 storey (plus basement), red brick housing block on the south-western side of the road. The main entrance to the building is centrally placed on the front elevation and there is a communal garden to the rear, with gated access at the southern side of the building. Flat 1 is located at the rear at ground floor level at the northern end of the building and benefits from its own private terrace area, which then leads onto the communal garden.

The application site is located within the Belsize Conservation Area. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. Glenilla Road features a variety of buildings of different ages, materials, styles and heights.

Relevant History

None relevant

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2018)

London Plan (2016)

Camden Local Plan (2017)

A1 Managing the impact of development

A4 Noise and vibration

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG Altering and extending your home (2019)

Chapter 2: Design excellence for houses and flats

Chapter 3: Extensions: rear and side

Chapter 4: Roofs, terraces and balconies

CPG Design (2019)

Chapter 2: Design excellence

Chapter 3: Heritage

CPG Trees (2019)

Chapter 2: How the Council will protect trees

Chapter 3: New & replacement planting and management

CPG Amenity (2018)

Chapter 2: Overlooking, privacy and outlook

Chapter 3: Daylight and Sunlight

Chapter 4: Artificial Light

Chapter 6: Noise and vibration

Belsize Conservation Area Statement (2003)

1. The Proposal

1.1. This application seeks planning permission for the following:

- Single storey rear extension

1.2. The proposed extension would extend out from the host building by 3.4 metres and would measure 6.3 metres wide. It would measure 3.6 metres tall.

1.3. The proposed extension would be constructed with bricks to match the existing building. The rear elevation would feature 3 sash windows, to align with the windows on the upper floors of the host building. The side (southern) elevation would feature glazed pocket sliding doors.

1.4. The extension would have a flat roof with 3 skylights which protrude above the roof by 0.2 metres. Two of the skylights would measure 0.5 by 1.1 metres and the third would measure 1.5 by 2.5 metres.

2. Revisions

2.1. The following revisions were made during the course of the application:

- The extension would be constructed with bricks to match the host building rather than being fully glazed with aluminium sliding doors on the rear and side elevations
- 3x skylights instead of 1

3. Assessment

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

- The impact on the character and appearance of the wider area (including the Belsize Conservation Area)
- The impact on nearby and neighbouring properties
- The impact on trees

4. The impact on the character and appearance of the wider area (including the Belsize Conservation Area)

4.1. The application site is located within the Belsize 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, in accordance with Section 72 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (as amended).

4.2. The Belsize Conservation Area Statement (BCAS) (2003) notes that: "*Sussex House is an overbearing flat block significantly larger than the other buildings in the street*". The building is then listed as being a negative feature of the conservation area.

4.3. Policy D1 of the Local Plan seeks to secure high quality design which respects local context and character; preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with Policy D2; comprises details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character; and preserves strategic and local views. Policy D2 seeks to preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and

their settings, including conservation areas and listed buildings.

- 4.4. Although the BCAS identifies Sussex House as being a negative feature of the conservation area, this is considered to be due to its size in the street scene, where it towers above the neighbouring buildings which are predominantly 2 or 3 storeys tall. The building itself, which dates from the 1920s, is considered to represent a striking example of brick modernism, designed to be reminiscent of a fortress, with crenellations and detailed entrance surround; and the rear elevation is as carefully composed as the front. A symmetrical pair of wings flank a central stair tower of offset arched openings.
- 4.5. The proposal to erect a single storey extension at the northern end of the rear elevation of the host building would disturb the symmetry of the building, to the detriment of the design of the whole building. Furthermore, there is no scope for re-balancing the composition because the opposed wing benefits from a lightwell at the rear. Furthermore, the flat within the opposed wing is in different ownership.
- 4.6. Although the rear elevation of the proposed extension has been re-designed to better reflect the host building's fenestration pattern, the fact the extension would partly wrap around the projecting part of the host building further contributes to the harm the extension would cause to the host building. CPG Altering and extending your home specifically notes that: *"Proposals should (a) be secondary to the building being extended; (c) respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style; (d) respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies or chimney stacks."* In this case, it is not considered that the extension would be suitably subservient, by virtue of the wrap-around element, and neither is it considered that it would respect and preserve the original design and proportions and architectural composition of the host building, contrary to the CPG guidance.
- 4.7. The CPG also notes at paragraph 3.5 that: *"Sometimes the rear of a building may be architecturally distinguished, either forming a harmonious composition, or visually contributing to the townscape. Where architectural merit exists, the Council will seek to preserve it where it is considered appropriate"*. In this case, the Council considers that the rear elevation of the host building is of merit and is worthy of preservation. As noted, the proposed extension, by virtue of its siting and design, would detract from the rear elevation.
- 4.8. The side elevation, which would be visible from the communal garden at the rear would feature glazed pocket sliding doors and it is considered that this design feature would detract from the pattern of fenestration across the rest of the building (sash windows with glazing bars). Whilst this would not represent a reason for refusal in itself, it contributes to the overall harm.
- 4.9. The proposed skylights on the roof of the proposed extension would also detract from the character and appearance of the host building, as they would project above the roofline and represent alien features, uncommon to a building of this age and style.
- 4.10. To conclude, it is considered that the proposal would cause harm to the host building and also to the Belsize Conservation Area, which is a designated heritage asset. Paragraph 193 of the NPPF notes that: *"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance"*.
- 4.11. In this case, it is considered that the harm amounts to *"less than substantial harm"* and

paragraph 196 of the NPPF guides that: *“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”*.

- 4.12. In this case, the Council does not consider there to be any public benefits associated with the proposal that would outweigh the harm caused and therefore there is no justification for the proposed development and the application is recommended for refusal on this basis.

5. The impact on nearby and neighbouring properties

- 5.1. Policy A1 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development which does not cause unacceptable harm to amenity.
- 5.2. The main properties that are likely to be affected are other flats within Sussex House (the host building) and the neighbouring property to the north, No. 12 Glenilla Road.
- 5.3. It is considered that the proposal would not cause undue harm in terms of overlooking, as the single storey rear extension would provide views onto the communal garden, which is already overlooked by all the rear-facing flats in Sussex House.
- 5.4. It is considered that the proposed single storey rear extension would not cause any loss of outlook to neighbouring properties, due to its siting at the northern end of the host building, adjacent to a blank brick wall belonging to No. 12 Glenilla Road. Views from the flat above, down into the garden would be altered, but this flat would still benefit from good long-range views across the garden.
- 5.5. It is considered that the proposed single storey rear extension not would cause any loss of sunlight / daylight to neighbouring properties, again due to its siting.
- 5.6. Although concerns have been raised about noise transfer, this should be adequately covered by Building Regulations if the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable.
- 5.7. The proposed extension may cause harm to the residential amenities of the flat above in terms of light pollution from the skylights. The roof of the proposed extension would feature 3x skylights, which protrude above the roof by 0.2 metres. Two of the skylights would measure 0.5 by 1.1 metres and the third would measure 1.5 by 2.5 metres, which represents a significant proportion of the roof. The largest of the skylights is located only 0.3 metres from the building edge, directly underneath a window of the flat above. Given that the skylights are intended to provide light into the ground floor flat, they are likely to be left open rather than screened with any kind of blind and it would be too difficult to condition the skylights to be covered at night. On this basis, it is considered that the skylights would be harmful to the occupiers of the flat above as a result of lightspill in the evenings. The application is recommended for refusal on this basis.

6. The impact on trees

- 6.1. Policy A3 of the Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance sites of nature conservation and biodiversity and the policy notes that the Council will protect and seek to secure additional trees and vegetation. Part (k) requires that trees and vegetation which are to be retained, should be satisfactorily protected during the construction phase of development. Part (l) expects replacement trees or vegetation to be provided where the loss of significant trees or vegetation is justified in the context of the development.
- 6.2. Concerns have been raised about the impact on existing trees in the communal garden. There are some bushes around the edge of the private terrace belonging to Flat 1, and the

application does not make it clear whether or not these bushes would be retained as part of the proposals. However, the bushes are not considered to be so large or substantial so as to require the submission of an Arboricultural impact assessment and if the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable a suitable planning condition could require details of proposed landscaping to be approved prior to the commencement of development, in order to ensure the re-provision of vegetation on site.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.