

<b>Delegated Report (Refusal)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	08/07/2019
				<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	29/07/2019
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Ewan Campbell			2019/2496/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
21 Belsize Square London NW3 4HT			Please refer to draft 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>					
Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Full Planning Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
<b>Informatives:</b>					
<b>Consultations</b>					
		No. of responses	<b>03</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		<p>The application was advertised in the local press on 13/06/2019 and a site notice was displayed on 05/07/2019.</p> <p>Two objections were received from residents at 22 Belsize Square on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Out of keeping with Conservation Area</li> <li>- Loss of garden space</li> <li>- Increased amount of glazing and increased light pollution</li> <li>- Existing character would be lost.</li> <li>- Yet more loss of green when front gardens are already being concreted over. Possibility of flooding which could affect us too. A disaster for flora and fauna.</li> <li>- Original features at ground level (e.g. a lovely bow window) will be destroyed.</li> <li>- Will leave a very small footprint for such a large building. There is no need when there is single family occupancy in an already enormous space.</li> <li>- Will the roots of nearby trees be affected?</li> </ul>			

<b>Belsize Society</b>	<p>One objection from Belsize society. Concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No Design and Access statement</li> <li>- Rights of light and privacy are impossible to assess</li> <li>- Extension would set a precedent</li> <li>- Not in context within Conservation area</li> </ul>
<b>Belsize CAAC</b>	<p>One objection from Belsize CAAC. Concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strongly object to full width, very deep extension</li> <li>- Object to loss of original bow window</li> </ul>

## Site Description

The site is a large four storey property with a converted loft and three dormer windows at roof level. The site is located on the south side of Belsize Square in a predominantly residential area characterized by similarly scaled large dwellinghouses. The site is located within sub area 1 of the Belsize Conservation Area and is identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

## Relevant History

Relevant planning records at the application site:

N/A

## National Planning Policy Framework 2021

### The London Plan 2021

### Camden Local Plan 2017

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

Policy D1 Design

Policy D2 Heritage

### Camden Planning Guidance (CPG)

Design (January 2021)

Amenity (January 2021)

Home Improvements (2021)

### Belsize Conservation Area Statement (2003)

## Assessment

## 1 PROPOSAL

1.1 Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level measuring 4.1m in depth to one side and 4.7m to the other, 8.3m in width (full width) and 3.3m in height with a flat roof design. The proposal would include a bay window design and alter the rear staircase

## 2 ASSESSMENT

2.1 The material considerations for this application are as follows:

- Design
- Amenity

### 2.2 Design and Amenity

#### Statutory Framework and Implications

2.2.1 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (“the Listed Buildings Act”) is relevant, and requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area when considering applications relating to land or buildings within that Area.

2.2.2 The effect of this section of the Listed Buildings Act is that there is a statutory presumption in favour of the preservation of the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. Considerable importance and weight should be attached to their preservation. A proposal which would cause harm should only be permitted where there are strong countervailing planning considerations which are sufficiently powerful to outweigh the presumption. The NPPF provides guidance on the weight that should be accorded to harm to heritage assets and in what circumstances such harm might be justified (section 16).

#### Policy review

2.2.3 Local Plan policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy D1 requires development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, which improves the function, appearance and character of the area; and Policy D2 states that the Council will preserve, and where appropriate, enhance Camden’s rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas and listed buildings.

2.2.4 Within the Heritage section of the Design CPG it is noted that ‘The Council will only permit development within Conservation Areas that preserves and where possible enhances the character and appearance of the area’. This is also echoed within the Belsize CA management appraisal

#### Assessment

2.2.5 The application site is located within Belsize Park Conservation area and is identified as a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the Conservation area. It is also labelled as a dominant character area. The property is an attractive period property, dating from the late 19th century. The properties in the street are listed as Queen Anne Style but with Arts and Crafts influences. Belsize Park has a coherent and mostly uniform architectural character – a residential area populated with well-composed, muscular, mid-19th century semi-detached and terraced villas with classical and Italianate detailing. The closely spaced villas maintain a continuous building line and their repeated forms with narrow gaps between give a uniform rhythm to the streets and provide important, glimpsed views. Belsize Square was part of the earliest development within the Belsize area.

2.2.6 The proposal would result in a full width rear extension extending to the side and beyond the rear elevation of the main building by a considerable depth. By way of its size, siting, appearance and design it would detract from the form of the original building and it would be harmful to the architectural character and heritage of the Conservation Area. The bay window element of the extension is not lined up with the original bay that goes up the rear elevation. The result is an awkward addition which does not fit within the context of the building. Furthermore the depth is considerable which is not a common feature of this part of the Conservation area or street. Many of the original rear elevations along Belsize square have been retained, and where the properties have been extended, this is generally in the form of a subordinate half-width extension which doesn’t interfere

with the original bay window detailing. The proposed 4.6m deep extension would significantly alter this character and is considered oversized in this context.

2.2.7 The proposal to further extend the original building to the rear and would result in an excessive addition to the building which would be harmful to the form of the building and the layout and configuration of the group of semi-detached villas to the detriment of the historic and architectural characteristics of the Conservation Area.

2.2.8 The importance of the architectural style and detailing of the villas is referenced clearly in the conservation area appraisal (page 12), and is considered to contribute to the character and significance of this part of the conservation area.

*In Belsize Park, Belsize Park Gardens, Belsize Grove, Buckland Crescent and Belsize Square the predominant type is the paired villa. The villas are symmetrical about their slab chimney stacks, have hipped, slate roofs with overhanging eaves which are supported on brackets, the elevations have large rusticated quoins, recessed sash windows diminishing in size on successive upper floors with classically detailed surrounds, canted three-light bays on the ground floor and steps up to porticoes. Other distinguishing features of Tidey villas are their curved glass bay windows at the rear and front doors with two panels, characteristically of etched glass with rounded heads (apart from Buckland Crescent, south side).*

2.2.9 The proposed extension, even though to the rear of the property, would be highly visible from neighbouring windows and from Lancaster Drive to the south east. It would be out of character with the host building and is considered to cause harm to the architectural composition both of the house and the symmetry of the villa-pair, as well as the wider terrace. For these reasons, it is also considered to cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. Although this harm would be at the lower end of less than substantial, there are no public benefits which would outweigh this harm given the proposals involve the extension of a single family dwellinghouse and are for the benefit of the applicant only.

2.2.10 Therefore the proposal fails to comply with policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan.

### 2.3 Amenity

2.3.1 Policy A1 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. The factors to consider include: visual privacy, outlook; sunlight, daylight and overshadowing; artificial lighting levels; noise and vibration; odour, fumes and dust; and impacts of the construction phase, including the use of Construction Management Plans.

2.3.2 The impact on no.22 would be limited due to the original external staircases in both rear gardens which run along the boundary wall and would limit the impact of the extension in terms of its impact on neighbouring outlook, daylight, and sunlight. Although a new staircase is proposed, it would be in a similar position to the existing, and as such, would not result in greater potential for overlooking than the existing situation. Although the extension would be more visible from no. 20, it would be set away from the boundary wall by 1.1m, and would not impact neighbouring views to such an extent as to warrant refusal on this basis. Given the south west orientation of the rear elevations, the extension is also unlikely to have a significance impact on daylight or sunlight.

2.3.3 In relation to the comments regarding light pollution there are no roof lights proposed, and the proposed glazing to the rear is not considered to result in a significantly greater lightspill than the existing situation.

## 3 **RECOMMENDATION**

3.1 Refuse planning permission for the following reason:

- The proposed extension, by reason of its siting, size and design, would result in an excessive and incongruous addition to the building which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the building, the group of semi-detached villas of which it forms a part, and the Belsize Conservation Area, and would therefore be contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.