

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		20/12/2021	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		26/12/2021	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Obote Hope				2021/5201/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
83 Lawn Road London NW3 2XB				See 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>							
Erection of single storey rear extension.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>				No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>A site notice was displayed on 01/12/2021 expiring 25/12/2021.</p> <p>The application was also publicised in the local press from 02/12/2021 to 26/12/2021.</p> <p>No comments have been received.</p>					
<b>CAAC</b>		<p>The Belsize CAAC have objected on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The floor area of the proposed extension is excessive and unjustified</li> <li>existing bay window should be retained and the garden room enlarged no more than the neighbours extension.</li> </ul>					

## Site Description

The application site relates to a two storey (plus loft accommodation) semi-detached property located towards the southern end of Lawn Road. The surrounding area is predominately residential in character with similar semi-detached properties. The application site is within the Belsize Conservation Area and is noted as a positive contributor in the Parkhill Conservation Area Statement (CAS).

The west side of Lawn Road was started by 1914 and completed in the inter-war years in the Garden Suburb style. The houses are built in a rich red stock brick, with a homely, picturesque character. The properties face those of an earlier Italianate urban style on the other side of the street. The narrow gaps between these pairs lead to a uniform rhythm with glimpsed views between them. It should be noted that the designation of the conservation is to prevent the loss of important and prominent features which positively contribute to the character or appearance of a conservation area.

## Relevant History

**2021/1177/P** - Erection of a full-width extension to the rear elevation at ground floor level following the demolition of the existing bay window and single storey extension. **Refused** on 24/08/2021

**29598** - Change of use from hostel to single family dwelling house. **Granted** on 19/02/1980.

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2021

### The London Plan 2021

### The Camden Local Plan 2017

Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development)

Policy D1 (Design)

Policy D2 (Heritage)

### Camden Planning Guidance 2021

CPG Home Improvement

CPG Design

CPG Amenity

### Parkhill and Upper Park conservation area appraisal and management strategy 2011

## Assessment

### 1. Proposed Development

- 1.1. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey full-width rear extension at ground floor level which would measure approximately 3.3m in depth, 7.8m in width and 3.4m in height. The proposed single storey rear extension would be constructed with matching red brick with clay tiles and French windows and glazed panels painted white painted timber doors. The proposed roof would be flat with sedum roof and consist of rooflights.

### 2. Assessment

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

- Design and Heritage
- Residential amenity

### 3. Design and Heritage

- 3.1. Camden Local Plan Policy D1 (Design) seeks to secure high quality design in development which respects local context and character. Policy D2 (Heritage) states that the Council will preserve and enhance Camden's heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas. The Council will not permit development that results in harm that is less than substantial to the significance of the heritage asset unless the public benefits of the proposal significantly outweigh that harm. The Council will also require that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible enhances the character or appearance of the area.
- 3.1. CPG Home improvements (2021) paragraph 2.1.1 states that "*there are times when the rear of a building may be architecturally distinguished, either forming a harmonious composition, or visually contributing to the townscape*". It advises that the pattern of development of neighbouring buildings is an important consideration in the preparation of plans. Notwithstanding this, the policy document requires rear extension to be designed to: respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style; respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies or chimney stacks;
- 3.2. In this instance, the rear of the host building forms a relatively harmonious pair with no 84 and the distinctive ground floor bay window which is retained on both properties, contributes to the harmony. The demolition of the existing bay window and erection of a full width rear extension would disrupt the pattern of development, including the proportion of built to unbuilt space, which is relatively uniform across the pair. Along the southern end of Lawn Road, these two properties are the only pair to retain their bay windows and the distinctive rear bays are fully appreciated.



- 3.4 The Parkhill and Upper Parkhill Conservation Area Appraisal states (paragraph 6.2) that details and features tend to have a distinctive character in buildings originally developed in groups. The individual group and the details should be retained and enhanced on a project by project basis. In this instance there is architectural merit to retain the existing bay window, especially as the extension being proposed here would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the host building. Moreover, it is considered that the height and scale of the proposed full-width extension would be an unsympathetic addition to the design and appearance of the semi-detached pair. Whilst paragraph 7.54 stipulates that the character and appearance of a conservation area can be eroded through the loss of traditional architectural details such as historic windows and doors, characteristic rooftops, garden settings and boundary treatments.
- 3.5 Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states 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. *“Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification”* (paragraph 200). In this case, there is no justification for the loss of the bay window and there is no associated public benefit to outweigh the identified harm.
- 3.6 The proposal has failed to take under consideration the group value, context and the setting of buildings, as well as their quality as individual structures and any contribution to the setting of the semi-detached pair. The proposed design would compromise the architectural character of the host building. Its detailing would not respect the character of the rest of the property and the height increase of 1m along the full-width of the rear elevation would further detract from the

uniformity of the semi-detached pair. Whilst the revision changes the fenestration treatment to include three timber framed French doors this would not compensate for the loss of the bay window.

- 3.7 it is claimed that the proposal would not be visible from within the public realm and that there would be no impact whatsoever on the Conservation Area. A proposal can be considered to neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of a conservation area when it has limited or no visibility from the public realm. The proposal is considered to cause harm to the significance of the Conservation Area and this would impact on the appearance of the building itself, the attached building it forms a pair with (no. 84) and the prevailing pattern of development. Private views of the development would be possible from within the Conservation Area, from within the property itself as well as neighbouring properties. Moreover, the existence of these extensions is not a compelling reason to allow development that would undermine the character and integrity of the building.
- 3.8 Rightly the Heritage Statement (Page 9 paragraph 3) states that the houses in the area are of different design and recognised the uniqueness of the property as a pair and whilst no 84 has a modern extension, the bay window was indeed retained. Reference is made to the fact the property benefits from permitted development rights. However, This is assessed as an householder application and Permitted Development or PD rights are legislation pass through Parliament, the legislation does NOT need any filtering through the relevant Local and National Planning Policy which is mainly impact based. No details of a fallback position have been put forward and it is noted that single family dwellinghouses within conservation areas have limitations under the GPDO.
- 3.9. Thus, the relevant statutory and policy tests require development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area (including under s.72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013). The NPPF (chapter 16) requires an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The Council considers that the rear elevation of the site, including the intact and visible bay feature, to contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area. Paragraph 199 of the NPPF requires great weight to be given to an asset's conservation. The loss of the bay window being replaced with a full width rear addition with no architectural merit that would extend across the majority of the rear elevation would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance the building and neither preserve nor enhance the area's character.
- 3.9.1 In conclusion, the proposed extension, owing to its width and the loss of the ground floor bay window feature, as well as its detailed design, is considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and its relationship with its neighbour No. 84 to which it forms a part of.
- 3.9.3 Considerable importance and weight has been attached to the harm and special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance conservation area, under s. 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013.

#### **4.0 Impact on the amenity of surrounding residential occupiers**

- 4.1 Owing to its depth, single storey height and the relationship the host building has with its neighbours, it is not considered that the proposed rear extension would result in any significant loss of amenity for neighbours in terms of loss of daylight/sunlight, overlooking or sense of enclosure, sufficient to warrant a refusal of the application.

## **5.0 Recommendation**

### 5.1 Refuse Planning Consent