

<b>Delegated Report</b> (Member's Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	17/08/2012
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	A) 24/08/2012 B) 02/11/2012
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Angela Ryan			2012/3271/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
9 & 11 Mansfield Road London NW3 2JD			Refer to decision notice		
PO <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>  Erection of 2 three storey dwellinghouses following the demolition of existing dwelling house (Class C3).					
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission subject to a S106 Agreement			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	A) & B)- 18	No. of responses  No. electronic	A)-13 B)-7  A) & B)-5	No. of objections	A)-13  B)- 7
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 03/08/12 (expiring on the 24/08/12). The application was also subject to two periods of consultation, outlined above and below as consultation A) and B).</p> <p><b>Consultation A):</b> A total of 18 letters were sent to neighbouring occupiers on 11/07/12 expiring on 01/08/12. A total of 13 letters of objection were received from the occupiers of 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13B, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21 Oak Village, and the owner of no. 7 and 79A Mansfield Road.</p> <p><b>Consultation B):</b> After the submission of an amended scheme re-consultation letters were sent to all 18 neighbouring occupiers on 19/10/2012 expiring on 02/11/2012. A total 7 letters of objections/comments were received the occupiers of nos. 7 and flat B-13 Mansfield Road and nos. 6, 15, 16 Oak Village and a joint letter from the occupiers of nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, and 20 Oak Village, and Councillor Theo Blackwell.</p> <p>All the responses are summarised below:</p> <p><b>Consultation A)</b></p> <p><b>Objections:</b> <u>Design:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Huge dominating and complex double pitched roof (<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 1.3 and section 3 of this report)</li><li>-Proposed mass and bulk of the development (overdevelopment) (<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 1.3 and section 3 of this report)</li><li>-Proposed depth of building over original building footprint(<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 1.3 and section 3 of this report)</li><li>- increase in the projection of the building at first and second floor levels(<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 1.3 and section 4 of this report)</li><li>- inappropriate design features, such as proposed balconies on the rear elevation,</li><li>- Balconies and terraces proposed at first and second floor levels(<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 1.3 and section 3 of this report)</li><li>- Proposal prejudicing future development at no. 7 Mansfield Road(<b>Officer's response:</b> See paras. 1.3 and 4.3 of this report)</li><li>- Front of the buildings appear to be 0.5m forward of the historic building line(<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 1.3 and section 3 of this report)</li></ul> <p><u>Amenity:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Overlooking (<b>Officer's response:</b> See paras. 1.3 and 1.4 in this report)</li><li>- Loss of privacy (<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 1.4 in this report)</li><li>- Loss of outlook (<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 4.5 in this report)</li><li>- Lack of ground floor garden space (<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 3.8 in this report)</li><li>- Loss of natural light (<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 4.4 in this report)</li><li>- Loss of amenity (<b>Officer's response:</b> See section 4 of this report)</li><li>-Visual intrusiveness (<b>Officer's response:</b> (See para 1.3 and section 3 of this report)</li><li>-Sightlines from balconies are extremely selective and disingenuous(<b>Officer's response:</b> see paragraph 1.3 and 4.1 of this report)</li><li>- Proposed roof extending into the boundary of no. 7 Mansfield Road (<b>Officer's response:</b> Plans revised -see para. 4.5 of this report)</li><li>- Lack of parking provision and the limited car parking space in the area(<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 5.1 in this report)</li><li>- Proposed parking will be hazardous to road users and pedestrians(<b>Officer's response:</b> See para. 5.1 in this report)</li></ul>					

Other matters:

- Drawing no 100-BA-120 is inaccurate. The garden of no. 7 Oak Village overlaps half the rear of the existing property and the rear extension should therefore be shown on the south elevation. (**Officer's response:** The scheme has since been amended. See para 1.3 of this report)
- Although the application form (Section 10) indicates 2 proposed car parking spaces these are not shown on plan (**Officer's response:** See section 5.1 of this report)
- The application form (Section 17) indicates that two flats/maisonettes are proposed; however the plans indicate 2 houses (**Officer's response:** The application is for two houses which are clearly shown on the proposed plans and this is the scheme that the Council has considered.)

**Consultation B)**

Objections:

Design:

- Proposed chimneys are unnecessary and should be omitted from the scheme (**Officer's response:** See para 3.5 in this report)
- Rear of the development is 'culturally alien and contractually incongruous' (**Officer's response:** See section 3 of this report)
- Rear balconies at first floor level (**Officer's response:** See para 4.1 of this report)
- Privacy screens need to be higher (**Officer's response:** See para 4.1 of this report)

Amenity:

- First floor parapet wall needs to be reduced in height to alleviate the loss of light to no. 7 Mansfield Road (**Officer's response:** See para 4.4 of this report)
- Overlooking (**Officer's response:** See para 4.1 of this report)

Other matters:

- The plans (1004-BA-124 G & 126 Rev F) are inaccurate as there is no step down from nos. 15 to 16 Oak Village so sight lines are incorrect. Views to the rear garden are much greater than the plan portrays (**Officer's response:** The plan is incorrect as the levels between nos. 15 & 16 Oak Village are the same. See para 4.1 in this report)

Comments:

- Need to ensure that the privacy of the rear gardens of properties in Oak Village is maintained and that residents do not suffer a loss of amenity by occupiers of the proposal using the flat roofs as roof terraces or neglecting/removing the proposed planters (**Officer's response:** See para 4.1 & 4.2 in this report)
- The trellis on the rear garden fence needs to be at least 1m high (**Officer's response:** See para 4.1 in this report)
- Second floor flat roof should not accommodate any conservatories (**Officer's response:** See para 4.3 of this report)
- Permitted development rights should be removed from the new properties proposed (**Officer's response:** See para 4.3 of this report)
- Would prefer it if there were no first floor balconies. The above should be controlled via conditions. (**Officer's response:** See para 4.1 in this report)
- Developers should revise the scheme to ensure that the rear of the buildings aligns with the rear building lines at nos. 7 & 13 Mansfield Road (**Officer's response:** See para. 1.3 and section 3 of this report)
- Expect a distance of about 2m from first floor boundary wall of no.13 Mansfield Road to ensure that the sense of enclosure is reduced and that no loss of outlook and light occurs to the living room and terraced area at first floor level (**Officer's response:** See paras 1.3, 3.6 and 4.5 in this report)
- Occupier at no. 7 Mansfield Road wants the side boundary wall to remain separate at first floor level and does not wish the boundary wall to be disturbed during construction (**Officer's response:** This would be subject to a party wall agreement)
- Concern raised about the eaves jutting out approximately 1m over the alley way at no. 7 Mansfield Road and above the roof and the impact of water overflowing onto the butterfly roof (**Officer's response:** The scheme has since been revised to set the roof back from the boundary with no. 7 Mansfield Road. See section 1.3 in this report)
- Concerned about the impact of construction, therefore a construction management plan is essential (**Officer's response:** See para 5.3 of this report)
- Aesthetic quality not in keeping with existing development, and the chimneys and crude proportions of the windows should be reconsidered (**Officer's response:** See para 3.5 of this report)
- There is potential for the proposed first floor to accommodate a conservatory and the proposed second floor to be used as outdoor space or accommodate a conservatory

	<p><b>(Officer's response:</b> See para 4.3 in this report)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposed first floor level would mimic the footprint of nos. 13-15 Mansfield Road and the bulk should be reduced through setting it in from the sides (<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 1.3 and section 3 of this report)</li> <li>- Bulk and visual brutality of the rear elevation and inevitable privacy issues do not alleviate the anxiety that the ultimate intention is to deliver a multi-apartment building (<b>Officer's response:</b> This is not a material planning consideration)</li> </ul>
<p>CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify</p>	<p><b><u>Consultation (A)</u></b>  <b><u>Elaine Grove and Oak Village Resident's Association:</u></b> Objected on the following grounds:</p> <p><b><u>Design:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposed design at the rear is overbearing and intrusive with no design coherence</li> <li>- Mass and bulk (overdevelopment) (<b>Officer's response:</b> See para. 1.3 and section 3 of this report)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Amenity:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of privacy (<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 4.1 of this report)</li> <li>- Loss of amenity (<b>Officer's response:</b> See section 4 of this report)</li> <li>- Loss of outlook (<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 4.5 of this report)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Other matters:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site location, ground floor plans and any documents showing the ground level of nos. 5 &amp; 7 Mansfield Road and 7 Oak Village are incorrect (<b>Officer's response:</b> The plans have since been revised)</li> <li>- The rear projection at no. 7 Mansfield Place has no south facing window in the rear (<b>Officer's response:</b> The plans have since been revised to omit the south facing window)</li> <li>- The sightlines from the proposed balconies are inaccurate (<b>Officer's response:</b> The plans have since been revised)</li> <li>- The plans indicate that only the gardens of nos. 15 &amp; 16 Oak Village will be overlooked which is incorrect. The proposed second floor balconies will overlook all the rear gardens in 1-21 Oak Village. (<b>Officer's response:</b> The plans have since been revised to omit the second floor balconies)</li> <li>- Inaccurate assumptions/information contained in the design and access statement submitted for the previous application relating to the site. (<b>Officer's response:</b> The statement has since been revised)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Consultation B)</u></b>  <b><u>Elaine Grove and Oak Village Resident's Association:</u></b> Raised objections to the proposed first floor balconies as they are only 6m away from the rear gardens of properties in oak Village and result in the loss of privacy and amenity (<b>Officer's response:</b> see para 4.1 of this report)</p> <p><b><u>Comments:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed houses are large and to ensure that they are not made larger the Council should remove permitted development rights (<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 4.3 of this report)</li> <li>- Flat roof at first and second floor levels should be controlled via condition to ensure that they are used for maintenance purposes only as future owners will see this roof as a potential for a roof terrace, conservatory or additional room(s) (<b>Officer's response:</b> the first floor areas are to be used for balconies providing an element of amenity space. The proposed use of the second floor flat roof for maintenance purposes will be controlled via an appropriate condition)</li> <li>- If first floor balconies are approved then a planning condition should be attached to ensure that the 1m deep planters are integrated into the construction and the glass screens are at least 1.5m high and retained permanently (<b>Officer's response:</b> This element will be controlled via an appropriate condition)</li> <li>- Details of the proposed planting is needed to ensure that it is hardy evergreen planting to avoid losing the planting screen for 7 months of the year (<b>Officer's response:</b> This will be sought via an appropriate condition)</li> <li>- The proposed chimneys are unnecessary and should be omitted from the scheme (<b>Officer's response:</b> See para 3.5 in this report)</li> </ul>

## Site Description

The site comprises a two-storey detached building that was formerly used for a single family dwelling house and is currently vacant. To the east lies a two-storey building (7 Mansfield Road) that is current in use as a retail shop with storage above. To the west lies a three-storey property (13-15 Mansfield Road) that is in residential use. To the south and north-east at the rear lie two-storey residential cottages in Oak Village. To the rear of the application site the area is predominantly residential in character where to the front on Mansfield Road the area is of a mixed commercial/residential character.

The site is not listed and does not lie in a conservation area, although the Mansfield conservation area lies on the northern side of Mansfield Road opposite the site.

## Relevant History

### 9 Mansfield Road:

**29/10/1969-** Permission **granted** for the formation of a means of vehicular access to the highway at 9 Mansfield Road (Ref: CTP/E10/7/A/7722).

**07/02/1984-** Permission **granted** for the erection of a single storey conservatory at the rear (Ref: 8400014)

### 9-11 Mansfield Road:

**08/05/12-** Permission **refused** for the erection of 2x three storey dwellings following the demolition of existing dwelling house (Class C3). (Ref: 2011/6317/P). The application was refused by reason of the buildings height, bulk, massing and detailed design and by reason the height of the rear projections and large amenity areas proposed at the rear. A further four reasons for refusal were based on the absence of a S106 agreement to secure car-free housing, a sustainability plan, a construction management plan, and a financial contribution for highway works. The applicant appealed the Council's decision (Ref: APP/X5210/1/12/2177666/NWF); the appeal has been subsequently withdrawn.

**17/05/12-** Certificate of lawfulness **refused** for proposed development for excavation of basement in connection with existing dwelling (Ref: 2012/1663/P).

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

#### Core Strategy:

**CS1** (Distribution of growth)

**CS5** (Managing the impact of growth and development)

**CS6** (Providing quality homes)

**CS11**(Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)

**CS13**(Tackling climate change though promoting higher environmental standards)

**CS14** (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

**CS15** (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces & encouraging biodiversity)

#### Development policies:

**DP2** (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing)

**DP5** (Housing size mix)

**DP6** (Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes)

**DP17** (Walking, cycling and public transport)

**DP18** (Parking standards and the availability of car parking)

**DP19** (Managing the impact of parking)

**DP20** (Movement of goods and materials)

**DP22** (Promoting sustainable design and construction)

**DP23** (Water)

**DP24** (Securing high quality design)

**DP25** (Conserving Camden's heritage)

**DP26** (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

### Camden Planning Guidance 2011

**CPG 1- Design: Chapters 1, 2,**

**CPG2- Housing: Chapter 4 & 5**

**CPG3- Sustainability: Chapters 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9**

**CPG6- Amenity: Chapters 1, 6, 7 & 8**

**CPG7- Transport: Chapters 5, 6, 7**

**CPG8- Planning Obligations: Chapters 1, 3, 5, 7 & 10**

### London Plan 2011

### National Planning Policy Framework 2012

## Assessment

### 1.0 Proposal:

1.1 The applicant proposes to erect one 3 storey building containing two semi-detached houses at the site following demolition of the existing two-storey detached dwelling house. The existing building appears to be postwar origin and is of no special architectural or historic merit. Historic maps show that originally there was a pair of houses on the site which had a similar footprint to the adjacent stuccoed properties located at nos 13-15 Mansfield Road. This application seeks to reinstate the pair of houses that formally stood on the site. The proposal would result in the provision of a 2x 4 bed houses, one for 6 persons and one for 8 persons.

1.2 A similar application was submitted earlier on in the year for the erection of 2 three storey houses comprising a 5 bed house and a 4 bed house. This application was refused on the basis of its mass and bulk and detailed design, the proposed height, projection into the rear garden and inclusion of large amenity terraces at a high level and the proposed absence of a S106 agreement to secure car-free housing, sustainability plan, construction management plan, and repaving works to the highway (See relevant planning history). The current scheme has now been revised and it is considered that this scheme addresses the reasons for refusal of the previous scheme.

### 1.3 Revisions-

During the course of the application the scheme has been amended to:

- Reduction of the bulk and massing at the rear
- Re-design of the windows/doors located at rear 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors
- redesign of first floor roof balconies
- Removal of the wall separating the two properties on the flat roof at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor level
- Removal of balconies at second floor levels
- More lightweight screening at first floor level
- Bringing the building line forward at the front building at north-east corner
- Reduction in height of the proposed side extension and setting it back from the front building lines (North-west)
- Reduction in the width of the first floor balconies (insetting them 1m away from no. 13 Mansfield Road and 4.5m away from rear addition at no 7 Mansfield Road
- Introduction of chimneys
- The overhanging roof of the house set back from the boundary with no. 7 Mansfield Road and eaves replaced by a parapet wall (*no reconsultation*)

1.4 The key issues to consider are: -

- The principle of the development
- The impact on the character and appearance of the area and setting of the Mansfield conservation area
- The impact on amenity

#### **Other matters:**

- Transport
- Sustainability
- Lifetime homes

### 2.0 Principle of the development:

2.1 Policies CS1, CS6 and DP2 seek to make full use of Camden's capacity for housing and the proposal for two houses replacing one house is considered to conform to this objective. Houses of 4 or more bedrooms are considered to be a medium priority as identified in the dwelling size priority table in policy DP5 para.5.4, but they do provide family sized

accommodation which reflects the character of the area. Camden's policies also seek to ensure that all new homes are built to a high standard and provide well-designed accommodation that meets the needs of a range of occupiers, without adversely affecting occupiers or neighbouring properties. The accommodation is well laid out with rooms of an adequate size and shape, well lit and ventilated. Satisfactory amenity space has been provided by virtue of the proposed first floor balcony areas and rear gardens proposed at ground floor levels.

### **3.0 The impact on the character and appearance of the area and setting of the Mansfield conservation area**

3.1 The site does not lie within a designated conservation area although the Mansfield Conservation Area is located nearby on the northern side of Mansfield Road. Therefore the impact on the setting of the conservation area needs to be taken into consideration.

3.2 The existing building is a non-descript detached house which appears to date from after World War II. Architecturally, it is unremarkable and has undergone a series of alterations such as replacement windows, erection of a side garage and a large conservatory at the rear of the application site. Historic maps show that originally there was a pair of houses on the site which had a similar footprint to the adjacent stuccoed properties at 13-15 Mansfield Road. The existing house is a non-designated heritage asset and therefore its demolition and loss is considered to be acceptable in principle.

3.3 This scheme has been designed on the assumption that the previous building matched (or was similar) to 13-15 Mansfield Road. Such a design approach in principle is considered to be acceptable; however in following this course the design needs to be more appropriately executed otherwise the design will appear as a pastiche. The design details, with sash windows, slate hipped roof, rendered walls and traditional boundary treatment, are considered appropriate in the context of neighbouring buildings of similar design and materials.

3.4 The applicant has now reverted to a scheme similar to the previously refused scheme (ref: 2011/6317/P- see relevant planning history). The bulk and massing is acceptable with the building reading as a detached villa symmetrically designed with a subservient western side wing. The general detailing, proportions and design has been resolved in a convincing manner which results in a building which will sit comfortably with its neighbours. Although the building is somewhat higher than the pair of houses at nos 13-15 and higher than the neighbours on the other side at nos 5-7, the building is still considered appropriate without excessive bulk or height and its 3 storeys reflect the prevailing style of neighbouring 3 storey buildings.

3.5 Objections have been raised in respect of the proposed chimneys and them being positioned on the outer edge of the roof slopes. The applicant's intention is to mimic historic features of the Victorian building adjacent to the site at nos. 13-15 Mansfield Road. Whilst these chimneys appear to have no particular function, their siting is not considered to be out of keeping with the character of historic features located on other Victorian buildings.

3.6 The bulk and massing at the rear has been reduced to an acceptable level. The ground floor building line matches that of no 13 and indeed less than that of no 7. The first floor projections now have a scale of a traditional rear wing, being set in from both sides, matching the projection of the rear wing at no.13 and in a form which is akin to that found on other Victorian properties with rear wings. The building line at rear second floor level has been set back so that it almost matches that of both neighbours on either side at this floor.

3.7 The privacy screens proposed at first floor levels will be of obscured glazing which is considered to be appropriate as it reduces the perception of bulk by using lightweight materials.

### **4.0 The impact on amenity**

4.1 The proposed balconies at first floor level would be approx 4m wide and 1.5m deep with additional planter troughs on the edges. The addition at first floor level at no. 9 Mansfield Road will be approximately 4.5m away from the existing rear addition at no. 7 Mansfield Road and the addition at first floor level at no.11 Mansfield Road 1m away from the existing boundary at no. 13 Mansfield Road which currently provides screening to a terraced area. The balconies will be approximately 7.9m away from the rear boundaries of the properties located in Oak Village, whilst the proposed planter will be approximately 6.2m away. 1.4m opaque glass screens (1.5m high from finished floor level) are proposed to be erected on the rear of the proposed balconies and 1.8m high privacy screens on the sides. The latter will prevent any views sideways to adjoining neighbours. The 1.5m high screens, although allowing views outwards, will not cause any serious overlooking as there are no direct views visible of windows at the rear in Oak Village within a 18m distance. Planters are placed in front of the privacy screens in order to prevent views from people at the outer edge of the balconies directly downwards into adjoining gardens so as to alleviate perception of overlooking into surrounding gardens. Moreover a 0.5m high trellis is proposed to be erected on the rear boundary wall of the application site which would result in raising the rear boundary treatment to approximately 2.8m high. As such the height of the proposed screens at 1.5m high is considered appropriate in this instance. Given the above it is considered that the creation of additional overlooking into surrounding properties would not be significant and therefore existing privacy will be protected.

4.2 It is recommended that an appropriate condition is added to the decision notice to secure the retention of the privacy screens and associated planting and to prevent the flat roof at second floor level and side roofs at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level being used

as amenity terraces.

4.3 Concerns have also been raised in respect of the proposed houses having large footprints and the fact that once implemented they can be made larger by virtue of permitted development rights. Given the constraints at the site, it is considered that, should the buildings were to become bulkier, this may result in having an adverse impact on existing residential amenity and as such an appropriate condition will be attached to the decision notice removing permitted development rights for both properties.

4.4 There will be no loss of light to no.13 as the proposed house does not project beyond its rear building line. With regard to no.7, it has windows at 1<sup>st</sup> floor in the main rear elevation and the side elevation of the rear wing which both serve workshop/storage space for the business here. The proposed first floor rear wing is now designed so that it respects the recommended 45 degree daylight angle from the rear 1<sup>st</sup> floor window so as to maintain daylight levels. The rear wing is located 4.5m away from the adjoining side window. Although this would result in some loss of outlook and daylight, this is not considered serious or unreasonable, as a 25 degree daylight angle would be approximately maintained to this window and in any case does not affect a habitable room but ancillary business space. Therefore it is considered that there would be no significant loss of light to the occupier of no. 7 Mansfield Road.

4.5 It is also considered that there would be no significant loss of outlook from the rear of properties in Oak Village as the current gap between the buildings at nos. 9-11 and 13-15 Mansfield Road is partially retained and the existing gap between the application site and no. 7 Mansfield Road is to be retained. At present no.13-15 Mansfield Road has a first floor roof terrace, and given that the proposed first floor projection has been set back by 1m and the second floor of the proposed building reduced in depth to respect the rear building lines at no.13-15 Mansfield Road, it is considered that the proposal would not have a significant impact on views to the site or unacceptably add to the sense of enclosure.

## **5.0 Transport**

5.1 The applicant has indicated that it is proposed to create two offstreet parking spaces. However the proposed parking is not shown on the plans submitted. Policies DP17 and DP18 seek to promote the use of more sustainable transport measures, such as walking, cycling and the use of public transport, and allow the Council to resist developments which would add to parking stress. The site also has a PTAL rating of 4 which indicates a good level of accessibility by public transport. Gospel Oak Station is located approximately 60m north-east of the site and bus stops are located on Mansfield Road to the immediate west of the site. The site currently has 1 off-street car parking space which is accessed via Mansfield Road via an existing vehicular crossover. The proposal includes the retention of the vehicular crossover and a forecourt in front of the entrance door for one house which will not be large enough to accommodate a car. The other house will not have any carspace according to the plans. Both gardens will have binstores. It is considered that, notwithstanding the plans' intentions, a condition be imposed to require appropriate landscaping and boundary wall treatment to prevent any possible carparking on these front gardens. In addition, in light of the above, it is considered that both of the units should be subject to car-free housing, which will be secured via a S106 legal agreement.

5.2 Six covered and secure cycle spaces are proposed in two separate cycle stores located at ground floor levels inside the proposed dwellings. The level of cycle parking provision exceeds the Council's minimum standard of 4 cycle spaces and this is considered adequate.

5.3 The application does not provide details to describe how the proposals would be constructed. As the proposal would involve the demolition of the existing property and the construction of 2 new dwellings it is considered that it would impact on the surrounding highway network, especially given the site's location with a pavement barrier railing in front and next to a zebra crossing. As such a Construction Management Plan would be required to enable the Council to consider the construction impacts as well as issues relating to the occupation of the highway, such as parking bay suspensions, hoardings, skips or storage of materials as these are likely to be constrained. The Construction Management Plan will be secured via a S106 legal agreement.

5.4 Where demolition and construction works are proposed, the Council normally seeks a financial contribution to cover the costs associated with repaving the footway and removal of any redundant vehicular crossovers adjacent to the property. Whilst the front yard of the property could be used for the storage of some demolition and construction materials, this area is limited in size and the proposed front yards are smaller than the current yard. This further limits the ability of the applicant to store materials on site. It is thus likely that skips and materials may need to be stored on the public highway, which could lead to further damage to the highway. The financial contribution to cover the costs associated with the highway works described above will be secured via a S106 agreement.

## **6.0 Sustainability**

6.1 The applicant has submitted a Code for Sustainable Homes Assessment, as required by policy DP22 and Camden Planning Guidance 3 on Sustainability. It shows that it would achieve a Very Good (level 4) score of 76.5% for both houses, would also exceed 50% in Materials, Energy and Water and would achieve a 25% improvement on Part L 2010 CO2 emissions. The Council normally requires the submission of a post-construction assessment and ongoing management in strict accordance with the Code for Sustainable Homes will be secured via a S106 legal agreement.

## **7.0 Lifetime homes**

7.1 The proposal would meet 15 of the 16 criteria for lifetime homes. The applicant has explained that disabled on-site parking is not achievable for the site given the existing constraints and there being no area beyond the building's footprint. As such this element of the proposal is considered to be appropriate.

**Recommendation: Grant planning permission subject to a S106 to secure the following:**

- **Car-free Housing**
- **Post-construction review of the CfSH assessment**
- **Construction Management Plan**
- **Financial contribution for repaving the footway**

### **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> December 2012.**  
**For further information please click [here](#).**