

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		02/09/2011	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		25/07/2011	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Adrian Malcolm				2011/2624/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
100 West End Lane London NW6 2LU				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>							
Renewal of planning permission granted on 7th July 2008 for "Change of use of accommodation ancillary to the public house (Class A4) over part basement, part first, second and third floors to 14 self-contained flats (Class C3) comprising 9 x studios, 2 x 1 bed, 2 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed; together with alterations at roof level including new fenestration to provide additional accommodation at roof level, a second floor extension onto Broadhurst Gardens, and creation of new disabled access ramp onto Broadhurst Gardens."							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Renewal of Full Planning Permission					
<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>44</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
				No. electronic	<b>01</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Site notice expiry- 15/7/11 Press notice expiry- 21/7/11  No representations received					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>		West Hampstead Amenity and Transport- OBJECT as there is acute pressure on parking in the area, thus the new flats should be car free. Also there is a shortage of reasonably priced meeting rooms in the area and it should be conditioned that such a room should be provided within the scheme.					

## Site Description

The corner site at 100 West End Lane is located on the intersection of West End Lane and Broadhurst Gardens. Access from the rear of the site is also possible from Exeter Mews. The property was last used as a public house (Class A4), with ancillary accommodation on the upper levels as well as storage and associated service areas. The site is located within the West End Lane Town Centre.

The existing 4-storey Victorian building marks this corner site with a chamfered corner and pleasing proportions. The corner building is flanked by a group of 3-storey (plus mansard roof) terraces to its south between nos. 90-98 West End Lane. This continues the use of yellow stock brick, strong horizontal lines, cornice lines and its window proportions and alignment. To its eastern boundary, the site sits adjacent to the Lilian Baylis House at no. 165 Broadhurst Gardens. Constructed in red brick, the 2-storey building is mounted by a central pediment and its columns are decorated with Corinthian capitals.

The building is not listed; however it is located within the South Hampstead Conservation Area. The Conservation Area is characterised by its homogenous scale and character; laid out in a traditional Victorian gridiron street pattern. The buildings along Broadhurst Gardens are mostly 3-4 storeys in height and constructed in red or gault brick with slate roofs. The uniformity of the roof line, interrupted by original turrets and gables, provides a pleasing architectural rhythm and helps to give these streets their distinctive character.

## Relevant History

2008/0975/P- Planning permission was **granted** on 7 July 2008 for change of use of accommodation ancillary to the public house (Class A4) over part basement, part first, second and third floors to 14 self-contained flats (Class C3) comprising 9x studios, 2x 1 bed, 2x 2 bed and 1x 3 bed; together with alterations at roof level including new fenestration to provide additional accommodation at roof level, a second floor extension onto Broadhurst Gardens, and creation of new disabled access ramp onto Broadhurst Gardens. The current application seeks to renew this application and was registered on 21 June 2011, shortly before the validity of the application was due to lapse.

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

#### Core Strategy

- CS1 (Distribution of growth)
- CS3 (Other Highly Accessible Areas)
- CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)
- CS6 (Providing Quality Homes)
- CS10(Supporting Community Facilities and Services)
- CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)
- CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards)
- CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)
- CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity)
- CS16 (Improving Camden's health and well-being)
- CS17 (Making Camden a Safer Place)
- CS18 (Dealing with Our Waste and Encouraging Recycling)
- CS19 (Delivering and Monitoring the Core Strategy)

#### Development Policies

- DP1 (Mixed Use Development)
- DP2 (Making Use of Camden's Capacity for Housing)
- DP3 (Contributions to the Supply of Affordable Housing)
- DP5 (Homes of Different Sizes)
- DP6 (Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Homes)

DP15 (Community and Leisure Uses)  
DP16 (The Transport Implications of Development)  
DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport)  
DP18 (Parking Standards and Limiting the Availability of Car Parking)  
DP19 (Managing the impact of parking)  
DP21 (Development Connecting to the Highway Network)  
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)  
DP28 (Noise and vibration)  
DP29 (Improving Access)

**Camden Planning Guidance (parts 1-4 adopted, parts 5-9 proposed for adoption on 7<sup>th</sup> Sept 2011)**

**South Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy  
London Plan**

## **Assessment**

### **Proposal**

The application seeks permission for a change of use of accommodation ancillary to the public house (Class A4) over part basement, part first, second and third floors to 14 self-contained flats (Class C3) comprising 9x studios, 2x 1-bedroom, 2x 2-bedroom and 1x 3-bedroom. The application includes alterations at roof level including new fenestration to provide additional accommodation at roof level, a second floor extension onto Broadhurst Gardens, and creation of new disabled access ramp onto Broadhurst Gardens.

### **Assessment**

As a renewal application, consideration centres upon any matters that have changed (such as policy, developments in planning issues that impact on government policy, changes in the local area that affect the site etc) since the proposal was last considered.

Changes of particular note are the adoption of the Core Strategy and Development Plan DPD's as part of Camden's Local Development Framework, plus adoption of new parts of the Camden Planning Guidance, the adoption of a new London Plan, the adoption of the new South Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, plus various updates in government policy. The Council also has an emerging Placeshaping agenda for West Hampstead.

Note that issues below that discuss terms of a potential legal agreement could only be secured in the event of planning permission being granted. In the situation of a recommendation for a refusal of planning permission, these issues could not be assured and thus cause additional reasons for refusal in accordance with normal Council practices. It is quite possible that in the event of an appeal, agreement may be reached on these issues, as such some - if not all - of these issues would not be in dispute.

The principal consideration material to the determination of this application remain as follows:

1. Design;
2. Change of use in principle
3. Affordable housing
4. Mix of units
5. Standard of accommodation
6. Accessibility
7. Refuse and recycling
8. Residential amenity

9. Density
10. Sustainability
11. Financial contributions
12. Transport issues
13. Community Safety

### **1. Design**

The scheme involves alterations at roof level to provide additional accommodation, with the addition of dormers to the West End Lane and Broadhurst Gardens frontages, and extension of the roof form towards Exeter Mews; a second floor extension onto Broadhurst Gardens; and creation of new disabled access ramp onto Broadhurst Gardens. The South Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy has been adopted since consideration of the last application, however this guidance does not fundamentally alter the considerations of design for this proposal.

#### *-Alterations at roof level*

The roof maintains its original pitched profile and form, suitable for the host building and setting of the conservation area. Whilst the addition extends the roof form over the existing flat roof area, this is a modest addition which is not considered to overwhelm the host building.

The scheme includes the addition of round headed styled dormer windows which will match the existing fenestration treatment at roof level. The dormers have been sited to reflect the layout of the openings on the lower levels, maintaining the hierarchy and rhythm of openings on the two principle elevations. The dormers are consistent with the CPG guidelines for dormer extensions.

#### *-Side extension*

The existing building has an existing 2-storey side wing as viewed from Broadhurst Gardens. The proposal involves the introduction of an additional floor over this existing side wing. The second floor extension over the side wing on Broadhurst Gardens has been sufficiently set back from the building frontage, minimising its visibility from street level. Its outer wall adopts a similar pitch and profile to the existing building. This will read as a modest addition in the street scene.

#### *-Access ramp*

The scheme includes the addition of a disabled access ramp on the Broadhurst Gardens elevation. This is a modest addition that will integrate well with the host building.

A condition could be placed on any permission requiring new materials to match existing, to ensure the development integrates well with the host building.

The alterations and additions are considered acceptable in design terms, as they would be subservient to the parent building, would respect the original design of the building and are considered to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

### **2. Change of use in principle**

The building comprises basement, ground and three upper floors with a lawful use as a public house (Class A4) and ancillary accommodation. Permission is sought to convert part of the basement, part of the first floor and upper floors of the building to 14 self-contained flats, with the retention of the public house on the ground floor, part basement and part first floors. There are no specific policies that protect A4 uses; however the commercial use at ground floor level would be retained and would thus contribute to maintaining the vitality of the shopping frontages in the locality. Policy DP2 supports the provision of new housing; the provision of residential floor space is considered acceptable and is welcomed in principle.

### **3. Affordable housing**

The Council expects residential developments providing 10 or more units to make a contribution to the supply of affordable housing, in accordance with Policy DP3.

The applicant has failed to provide an updated affordable viability assessment and instead has relied upon the 'GLA Toolkit' assessment provided in 2008. This is unacceptable as it does not provide a satisfactory basis to demonstrate the current viability of the scheme. Assertions made in the applicant's Policy Review Statement regarding the financial viability of the scheme are therefore unsubstantiated, as they refer to an outdated assessment made in 2008 rather than current market conditions.

The applicant refers to the physical restrictions of the site by essentially converting an existing building and the lack of potential to increase the financial yield. The applicant thus refers to previous acceptance of a commuted payment in lieu of on site provision, as it would not have been practical to provide one or two affordable housing units on site. They point out that when RSL's were approached before the 2008 application, they were not willing to take one or two small studio units, for which Housing Corporation would not have been available to the time. The same payment as previously (for the Council's Affordable Housing Fund) agreed of £65,000 is now offered as a payment in lieu. This is asserted by the applicant as being reasonable, given the relatively limited difference between the existing use value and residual land value (though no 2011 figures are provided to substantiate this). It is further asserted that a higher contribution would be unreasonable requirement as it would diminish the incentive of the land owner in conjunction with the developer to develop the site.

Without a fresh viability assessment and an update regarding the reaction of RSLs (in the context of the altered and emerging affordable housing regime) and any other means of providing affordable housing, the Council is not in a position to accept the applicants' arguments. It is appreciated that there may be constraints that impact upon the ability to provide affordable housing on site, but without a comprehensive demonstration that it is not viable or feasible to provide affordable housing units as part of an acceptable scheme, the Council can not reasonably draw this conclusion on the basis of the information provided. Even if the Council were to accept (for the sake of argument) that a payment in lieu were to be acceptable, the target that would be sought would be in excess of £300,000. This is reached using the formula set out in CPG that has been adopted since the time of the last application. Again, without a demonstration of the current viability of the scheme, the Council would not be in a position to accept the £65,000 payment in lieu offered, even if it were to be inclined that the principle of a payment in lieu were to be an appropriate reaction to the Council's affordable housing policies.

It is therefore concluded that the case for the appropriate contribution to affordable housing by the scheme currently under consideration has not been made and that the Council can not accept with this application the previous offer, on the basis of circumstances in 2008.

#### **4. Mix of units**

At the time of the previous application, attention was drawn to UDP Policy H8, which stated that new residential schemes should provide a mix of unit sizes, large and small but was not prescriptive on the percentage of accommodation that should provide family sized accommodation. It stated that, when assessing the appropriate mix for units within a housing scheme, the Council would have regard to Camden's Housing Needs Survey (2004), the site conditions and general locality. The Survey showed that a shortage of all sizes of homes within the Borough and consequently, given the central location with good public transport accessibility, within a mixed use building with a public house on the ground floor and the limited ability to provide amenity space on site on balance the mix was considered to be satisfactory at the time (these are the arguments now set out by the applicant to justify the proposed mix).

Current adopted policy retains a commitment to securing a range of self-contained homes of different sizes to contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities. However it also provides clearer evidence of housing need in the form of the Dwelling Size Priority table. The policy sets out that the Council will seek to ensure that all residential development contributes to meeting the priorities set out in the Dwelling Size Priorities table, including conversion of existing residential and

non-residential floorspace and expect a range of large and small homes in **all** residential developments.

If it were to be accepted that a development comprised only market units, (the arguments for which have yet to be made to the Council's satisfaction - see affordable housing considerations above), the proposed mix is unsatisfactory. 11 of the proposed 14 units fall in the lower priority group of studios or 1 bedrooms, only 2 within the very high priority group (the aim for this category would be 5-6 units) and only a single unit that would qualify as a large home of 3 bedrooms- representing a mix of 13 small homes (mostly low priority) and only 1 large home. The policy sets out a range of factors that will be taken into account. It also points out in the supporting paragraphs (such as in 5.11) that there are relatively few opportunities in this borough to provide housing that well matches the features sought for larger family homes (for example where ground floor uses prevent direct access to the street, which are on major roads or where provision of lifts are not feasible. However, it states that even the total absence of such features is not considered to justify the absence of large homes from a development.

The existing layout of the upper floors (across a relatively large floorplate) would not appear to preclude potential for conversion that could closer meet the Council's housing mix priorities. There would also be ample potential for units with more than one aspect. It is not uncommon for limited outdoor amenity space to be provided in central locations (only limited outdoor amenity space is proposed to one proposed studio unit), but this would not justify providing mainly studio units within the scheme.

The arguments regarding the location, position above a ground floor use with potential for nuisance and lack of amenity space are recognised, but measures to mitigate the impact of the retained use on future occupiers, including those in family sized units, such as sound insulation could be provided. These arguments apply to many sites in the borough and are not considered to justify failing to achieve a better mix that better meets the Council's housing size priorities and failing to contribute to adequately to contributing to mixed and inclusive communities.

The proposed unit mix is considered to be contrary to policy DP5 and is unacceptable.

### **5. Standard of accommodation**

Assessment of this issue remains similar to that before. The sizes of the proposed residential units are all in excess of the space standards in the Camden Planning Guidance. In addition, all rooms meet or exceed the minimum 11m<sup>2</sup> for first and double bedrooms and the 6.5m<sup>2</sup> for single bedrooms. The floor area of each flat is shown below:

<b>Flat</b>	<b>No. of Bedrooms</b>	<b>Floor Area</b>
1	Studio	51
2	1-bed	54
3	2-bed	69
4	Studio	32.5
5	3-bed	91
6	2-bed	71
7	1-bed	57 (wheelchair accessible)
8	Studio	35
9	Studio	32
10	Studio	38
11	Studio	35
12	Studio	33.5
13	Studio	35
14	Studio	45

The proposed units will all receive adequate natural light and ventilation. The proposed new flats,

with the exception of Flat 10, would not be provided with an outdoor space as part of the proposal (surprisingly the only outdoor amenity space would be provided to a studio flat, rather than a larger sized flat); however this is not considered to be unreasonable in principle given the location of the site and the limited options presented by the building's conversion combined with the need to make optimum use of the site to meet the borough's housing needs.

The applicant advised that measures would be undertaken to protect the new units from noise pollution from the existing public house use, which is to be retained on part of the lower ground and first floors and most of the ground floor. It is noted that, given that the public house is an existing lawful use, planning conditions cannot be used to restrict opening times or to control noise to protect the amenity of future occupiers (although this would be a matter for control under the licensing regime). The applicant has advised that triple air cavities will be employed to deliver a sound proof separation system to block out noise from the commercial premises to the surrounding residential. The change of use will be required to comply with Building Regulations Approved Document E (resistance to the passage of sound). This document sets out requirements for both the passage of noise and the impact of noise (i.e. vibration) through both walls and floors. Notwithstanding this, it would be both relevant and necessary to impose a condition on any planning permission requiring the submission of details for sound insulation to be submitted and provided, in order to ensure that appropriate measures are undertaken to ensure that the amenity of future occupiers is protected against noise nuisance from the public house and traffic noise.

#### **6. Lifetime Homes/Wheelchair accessible housing**

Flat 7 has been designed in such a way that it can be easily adapted to accommodate wheelchair users, which would meet the requirement for 10% dwellings suitable for wheelchair units. However, the applicant has not confirmed that the proposal would comply with the Wheelchair Housing Design Guide and there are some issues that have been raised by the Council's access officer in respect of disabled access that would require clarification, if this scheme were to proceed.

The applicants have failed to provide an updated assessment of the proposals against Lifetime Homes standards (the standards were updated in July 2010) and this would be needed prior to any positive recommendation.

The applicants have indicated they would agree to appropriate planning control measures to secure the necessary adaption to meet the requirements of the Wheelchair Housing Design Guide and the Lifetime Homes measures in the event of a recommendation for planning permission. It is considered that these measures could be secured by condition.

#### **7. Refuse/Recycling**

The scheme includes a refuse and recycling store adjacent to the eastern boundary. This can be accessed externally from the street. A condition would be required on any planning permission requiring details of the design and method of waste storage and removal (including recycled materials) be submitted to and approved by the Council prior to construction and that the approved facility shall therefore be provided prior to the first occupation of any of the new units and permanently maintained. Subject to this condition, the application would be acceptable in terms of its provision of refuse and recycling storage.

#### **8. Residential amenity**

##### *-Overlooking*

The scheme utilises existing openings on the rear elevation on the lower levels. The scheme includes the addition of three dormers on the rear roof slope; the new dormers are sufficiently recessed from the rear boundary and sited to only allow for oblique views along the rear elevation of the properties located to the south along West End Lane. The possible views are considered to be no more intensive than the views from the lower levels. The new dormers are not considered to raise

issues of overlooking.

#### *-Daylight / Sunlight*

The proposed extensions to the building are appropriately located to not adversely impact on the adjoining properties access to daylight and sunlight. The extensions at roof level are restricted to the existing footprint of the building extending the roof form over the flat roof towards Exeter Mews and the second floor extension onto Broadhurst Gardens elevation. Therefore the scheme is considered to be acceptable in terms of impact upon daylight and sunlight levels to nearby properties.

### **9. Density**

Density *per se*, is considered to be less relevant in this case than ensuring that the development is acceptable in terms of its impact upon the character and appearance and character of the area (primarily see design section above), does not harm local amenities and makes the appropriate contribution to meeting the Council's housing needs. These issues are considered in more detail in other parts of this assessment.

The proposed density would be around 350 dwellings per hectare or 575 habitable rooms per hectare, which is rather high for this location in terms of dwellings in terms of the range set out in the London Plan (70-260 dwellings per hectare), which is not surprising given the concerns raised above regarding the dominance of small units within the scheme residential mix. It would, however, fall within the preferred range of habitable rooms of 200-700 habitable rooms which could be argued to be more of an indication of the building's proposed capacity rather than the mix.

The Council's housing policies in the Core Strategy and Development Policies seek to maximise the supply of homes in a manner that meets the breadth of housing need, and the general strategy is make optimum use of limited urban land. Therefore, while the very high number of *dwellings* on the site is indicative of the poor housing mix (against which concerns have been raised above), the actual physical impact of the high density does not in itself raise concern in this case.

### **10 Sustainability**

#### *-BREEAM assessment.*

An early stage BREAAAM (EcoHomes) assessment has been provided which gives an overall score of 64, which comfortably falls within the 'very good' category sought under CPG. The relevant threshold scores would be met in the energy and materials category (the latter with an impressive 90% score), though the score in the water category would not meet the guideline threshold of 60% score of available credits, which in practice represents a failure by only 0.6 of a credit. This is not in itself considered sufficient to be a cause for objection as it may be possible to explore enhancement of this score at subsequent stages. Any successful recommendation for planning permission would require that detailed pre-implementation and post-completion assessments be secured to demonstrate that the policy targets are met. This would likely include a contribution towards the Council's engagement of the independent assessment of the submitted details and would be secured by S106.

#### *-Renewable Energy*

The Energy Report submitted with the application considered the viability of biomass heating, biomass CHP, small scale wind turbines, solar photovoltaic and solar thermal collectors. For various technical viability reasons and on-site constraints, the most viable option for on-site renewable technologies was considered to be solar thermal collectors.

The scheme proposes 45m<sup>2</sup> of solar thermal collectors at roof level; this would have an output of approximately 550 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/annum. This would result in carbon dioxide emission reduction in the region of 4.23 tonnes per annum, exceeding the policy targets for 20% CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction and 20% energy generation. The sustainability plan, secured by the appropriate planning means, would require at least 20% of the development's energy requirements to be derived from on-site renewables, in the event of a recommendation for planning permission. As with the rest of the sustainability plan,



this will be subject to a post construction review. It is considered that the development is capable of meeting this requirement as detailed above.

#### *-Landscaping / Green roof*

The scheme includes a green roof above the flat roof of the side extension on Broadhurst Gardens. In order to ensure that the green roof is designed to allow for long-term viability a condition could be placed on any planning permission requiring details of the green roof, including species, planting density, substrate and depth to ensure it is adequate to allow for the long-term viability of the green roof. Such a condition could also require that the green roof is permanently retained and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme of maintenance.

### **11. Financial contributions**

In accordance with planning guidance, all residential development proposals resulting in a net increase of 5 or more dwelling units will be expected to provide a contribution towards education provision for the children that may be housed in these new dwellings, plus a contribution towards open space provision (given that only a single 10sqm balcony would be provided to a single flat within the scheme). Such contributions would be calculated in accordance with the formula established in the CPG and would be required to be secured via heads of terms on any S106 attached to any planning permission. The failure to provide such contributions would be a reason for refusal.

### **12. Transport issues**

The site is located on the corner of Broadhurst Gardens in the West Hampstead Town Centre. Restricted vehicular access can be gained from the private road Exeter Mews and access to public transport is excellent (PTAL 6b). There is an existing public house use on the site and it is proposed to convert the ancillary accommodation to 14x residential units with alterations at roof level.

#### *-Cycling Storage*

The proposed plans show 14 spaces provided in the basement. In the event of planning permission being granted, a condition would be added requiring details of the cycle parking to be submitted to and approved by the Council prior to construction and requiring the approved cycle parking to be implemented prior to occupation of the residential units and permanently retained.

#### *-Car free housing*

The site is located in an area of high public transport accessibility with a Public Transport Accessibility Level of (PTAL) of 6a (excellent) and is within a Controlled Parking Zone. In compliance with development plan policy it would be appropriate for this development to be 'car free' (i.e. that residents would not be entitled to apply for residents' streetside parking permits, in the event of a recommendation for planning permission. The applicants previously agreed to enter into a Legal Agreement to secure the new units on the site as car free. The failure to secure the development as car-free would lead to further unacceptable demand pressures for on-street parking in this Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and would be contrary to policy DP18.

#### *-Construction Management Plan (CMP)*

The site is located in West Hampstead Town Centre which is very busy and is tightly constrained. Construction vehicles will have to stop in the highway as there is limited vehicular access to the site, and given the scale of the development, there will be a significant impact on the local road network. A Construction Management Plan outlines how construction work will be carried out and how this work will be serviced (e.g. delivery of materials, set down and collection of skips), with the objective of minimising traffic disruption and avoiding dangerous situations for pedestrians and other road users.

The applicants previously provided a Construction Management Statement, which did not satisfy all of Camden's requirements, as it provided inadequate information regarding how this development will be constructed or serviced during construction. This has not been updated. Therefore, A Construction Management Plan would therefore need to be submitted and approved before any works start on site, and approval would be secured via a Section 106 planning obligation on any permission. It should be noted that any agreed CMP would not prejudice further agreement that may be required for matters

such as road closures or hoarding licences (N.B. It is noted that Exeter Mews is a private road, and that if it is proposed to be used for access during construction then the developers would need the consent of the owner/s of that land).

*-Work to the highway*

The construction of the development will be likely to cause damage to the footway. Therefore a financial contribution would be required to repave the footway adjacent to the site on Broadhurst Gardens. This work and any other work that needs to be undertaken within the highway reservation would be secured through a Section 106 (Town and Country Planning Act 1990) Agreement with the Council in the event of planning permission being granted. The Council will undertake all works within the highway reservation, at the cost to the developer.

**13. Community safety**

Lighting surrounding the main residential entrance would be a sufficient standard to ensure a secure environment. A good level of passive surveillance is available along Broadhurst Gardens. Access to each residential unit would be via the main entrance only and a video entry phone system will be installed at the front entrance. The proposed development does not raise any community safety concerns either for the residents/people working within the development and the general public and is considered acceptable. An informative could be placed on planning permission encouraging the applicants to incorporate Secure by Design techniques.

**Other considerations**

An objection has been received relating to the local need for provision of meeting rooms. CPG8 on planning obligations sets out that *“New residential or commercial development which generates or attracts significant numbers of people to an area may require new provision or lead to an increased demand on existing community facilities near to a site.”*

It goes on to state that *“Obligations and contributions will not generally be sought for developments of less than 10 residential units or 1,000sq m of floor space.”* It is considered that the proposal, which would result in the creation of residential units across approx 680sqm of floorspace would be unlikely to generate sufficient additional demand for such facilities locally as to justify the need for a contribution to local community facilities, either in kind by way of provision of a meeting room, or by financial contribution.

**Summary**

The failure of the proposals to provide a contribution

**Recommendation:** Refuse Planning Permission

**Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444***