

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>11/11/2019</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>24/11/2019</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Mark Chan				1. 2019/4709/P 2. 2019/5406/L			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
5 A Greville Place London NW6 5JP				Please refer to decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>				
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
1. Erection of a roof extension, alteration to front elevation and enlargement of the front entrance door opening to fit a transom window. 2. Erection of a roof extension, alteration to front elevation, enlargement of the front entrance door opening to fit a transom window and internal alterations.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		1. Refuse planning permission 2. Refuse listed building consent					
<b>Application Type:</b>		1. Full Planning Permission 2. Listed Building Consent					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>	
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	The application was advertised in the local press from 31/10/2019 until 24/11/2019. Site notices were displayed from 25/10/2019 until 18/11/2019.  1 objection from an adjoining occupier was received concerning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Amenity</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposed extension will block light and overshadow the skylights at adjoining property; and</li> <li>○ The proposed windows along the side elevation can see directly into the adjoining property, resulting in a loss of privacy.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>	<b>St John's Wood CAAC</b> – There is no local representative body for the conservation area at the present time, therefore no response to the consultation.						



## Site Description

The application site is a Grade II listed detached house, dating from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. The building consists of two distinct parts, the main villa to the north, and a subordinate two-storey structure to the south. The OS map of 1871 shows a building of the same footprint as the southern structure linked to the main house – this is likely to have been an ancillary service building to the main villa.

Although the site has now been divided, and the ancillary service building has become a separate dwellinghouse, the southern building remains subservient to the host villa. The hierarchy between these two buildings is of significance to the listed building, providing architectural and historic interest to the heritage asset.

The site is located within the St John's Wood Conservation Area.

## Relevant History

**2015/2858/P & 2015/3542/L** – The erection of a single storey rear extension at lower ground level. Granted 13/08/2015.

**2011/4860/P & 2011/4864/L** – Enlargement of existing lower ground floor beneath front garden and to rear and creation of terrace on roof of rear lower ground floor extension, erection of roof extension, re-landscaping of front garden and installation of new gate piers and railings, and alterations to fenestration all in connection with existing dwelling house (Class C3). Granted 03/01/2012.

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

### London Plan (2016)

#### London Plan – Intended to publish (2019)

### Camden Local Plan (2017)

Policy A1 – Managing the impact of development

Policy C6 – Access for all

Policy D1 – Design

Policy D2 – Heritage

### Supplementary Guidance

CPG Design (2019)

- Chapter 2: Design excellence

- Chapter 3: Heritage

CPG Amenity (2018)

### St John's Wood Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2009)

## Assessment

### 1 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission and listed building consent are sought for the erection of a mansard style roof extension with a pitched gable front and a bullseye window, rooflights and dormers to the southern building on the application site which was once ancillary to the main villa. The applicant is also seeking to widen the entrance door and fit a transom window.

## **2 Assessment**

- 2.1 The main considerations in the determination of these applications are as following:
- Design and Heritage (Impact of the proposal on the listed building of special architectural or historic interest, and the character and appearance of the conservation area).
  - Amenity (Impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents in terms of daylight, outlook and privacy).

## **3 Heritage and Design**

- 3.1 The Council's Policy D2 Heritage states that the Council will preserve, and where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their setting, including listed buildings. The same policy states the Council will resist proposals for alterations and extensions to a listed building where this would cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the building. Policy D2 Heritage also states the Council will require the development within conservation areas preserves, or where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area.
- 3.2 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions are proposed. Policy D1 requires extensions to consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; and the character and proportions of the existing building.
- 3.3 CPG Design clearly states that the Council will only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and where possible enhances the character and appearance of the area.
- 3.4 Section 16, and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("the Listed Buildings Act") are also relevant. These sections impose a statutory duty on the planning authority to consider the impact of proposals upon listed buildings and their setting. In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possess.
- 3.5 Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is also relevant. This section places a general duty on the planning authority that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.
- 3.6 The effect of these sections of the Act is that there is a statutory presumption in favour of the preservation of listed buildings, their setting and conservation areas. Considerable importance and weight should be attached to their preservation.
- 3.7 The proposed extension is considered too tall and bulky, does not act as a subservient element to the main villa and would harm the hierarchy and proportions of the buildings at the application site. The relationship between the main villa and the subject building would be changed to such an extent that the structure to the south would visually challenge the dominance of the host villa, thereby causing harm to its significance. Furthermore, the proposed windows to the side elevation of the roof extension are considered too large and would dominate the roof plan, and clearly does not respect the hierarchy of windows in the building, contrary to the Council's design policy. A further impact on the significance of the listed building occurs as the proposed pitched gable feature of the design means the listed building may stylistically relate more to its listed neighbour No. 3 Greville Place, and would erode the visual relationship between Nos. 5 and 5a. The significance of its listed neighbour would be harmed through the implementation of this development.

- 3.8 The application site is within the St John's Wood West sub area according to the Conservation Area Appraisal. The Appraisal has noted this sub area has retained much of its original character and appearance and the built environment is of high quality. Furthermore, the grade II listed buildings represent important examples of both the early development of the Conservation Area and later development in the Victorian period. Nos. 1, 3 and 5 Greville Place are grade II listed detached stucco villas built in early 1820s and is the oldest section of the Conservation Area. They are characterised by their hipped slate roofs and a smaller ancillary building on the side amongst many other features. Further along the road are more examples of stucco-style buildings and villas. As such, the proposed roof extension and mansard roof form with gable end would harm the character and proportions of the host villa and the ensemble of traditional buildings in this area. The roof extension would add significant bulk and uncharacteristic prominence to an otherwise ancillary-style building and would adversely impact the oldest section of the Conservation Area.
- 3.9 Where harm is caused to a heritage asset, local planning authorities should give 'great weight' to preserving the asset's significance, in accordance with paragraph 193 of Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification and where harm is caused to a heritage asset, the NPPF requires decision makers to determine whether the harm is substantial, or less than substantial, paragraph 196 requires that harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals.
- 3.10 This is further supported in Local Plan Policy D2 Heritage which states 'The Council will not permit development that results in harm that is less than substantial to the significance of a designated heritage asset unless the public benefits of the proposal convincingly outweigh that harm'. The Council's view is that the harm in this case is 'less than substantial'. However, the proposal does not meet the public benefit test. A proposal which would cause harm should only be permitted where public benefits outweigh the heritage interest. There are limited public benefits to outweigh the harm in this instance. Therefore the proposals have not meet the requirements of either the Local Plan Policy D2 Heritage or paragraphs 194 or 196 of the NPPF and thus is unacceptable.
- 3.11 It should be noted that there has been a previous approval (Application ref nos.: 2011/4860/P and 2011/2864/L) for a very shallow hipped roof, set behind the parapet. However, this has not been implemented. It should be also be noted that in the assessment of the previous permissions, the original proposal was for a similar mansard roof but it was also considered unacceptable in design terms for the same reason as it would have challenged the visual primacy of the main villa and the relationship between the listed buildings. Thus, the approved scheme was altered and the mansard roof was ruled out. The current scheme here would introduce a mansard roof type extension which would be even taller than the previous proposal. Whilst the 2011 proposals for a mansard roof extension were unacceptable under a different planning policy and guidance regime, this continues to be the case as the revised national and local planning and guidance have not brought about any material changes to take into consideration.

#### **4 Amenity**

- 5.1 Policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan seeks to ensure that the amenity of neighbours is protected including visual privacy, outlook, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing.
- 5.2 One objection has been received in regards to the proposed extension blocking light and overlooking the neighbouring property. It is not considered the mansard roof extension would reduce the amount of daylight/sunlight into the rooflights at No. 3B Greville Place materially. However, given that the extension would sit higher than the roof of No. 3B, the introduction of windows on the south-western side elevation of the roof extension would give the applicant a direct and unrestricted view into the habitable spaces of the adjoining No. 3B through its

rooflights. This would result in a loss of privacy and overlooking to the occupiers of No. 3B.

## **5 Conclusion**

- 6.1 The proposed mansard roof extension, by virtue of the detailed design, massing, windows and sitting, would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance on Conservation Area and dominate the neighbouring grade II listed host villa. In line with the NPPF, whilst the harm is considered to be 'less than substantial', there are no demonstrable public benefits to outweigh the harm, thus the proposal is unacceptable. The proposal would also result in the loss of privacy and overlooking to the adjoining occupiers of No. 3B Greville Place.
- 6.2 The proposal is therefore contrary to policy A1, D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017. It is also contrary to the provisions of the London Plan 2016 and the NPPF 2019.

## **6 Recommendation**

- 7.1 Refuse Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent.