

Address:	Lynne Court 200 Goldhurst Terrace London NW6 3HL	
Application Number:	2009/1620/P	Officer: Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin
Ward:	Swiss Cottage	
Date Received:	24/03/2009	
Proposal: Refurbishment and remodelling of existing block of flats including the erection of 2x 4-storey extensions to rear of block and an additional floor at roof level with terraces on east and west elevations, green roof and solar panels, alterations to all elevations including juliet balconies, rendering, green wall and new canopy over front entrance, with associated landscaping works.		
Drawing Numbers:		
Site Location Plan; A01-02; A01-03; A01-04; A01-05; A02-01; A03-01; A1-01; A1-02; A1-03; A1-04; A1-05; A1-06; A2-01 A; A3-01 B; A3-02 B; A5-01; 1006-01; Sketch drawing of proposed fenestration; Areas Schedule 01, 'Sustainability Statement' by Scott Wilson dated 23 th March 2009; 'Daylight & Sunlight Report' by Waterslade dated 18 th February 2009; and 'Arboricultural Assessment of Proposed Removal and replacement of a Cherry Tree' by Tim Laddiman from Broad Oak Tree Consultants Ltd dated 6 th January 2009.		
RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant permission		
Applicant:	Agent:	
Mr David Lazarus c/o Agent	The London Planning Practice LLp 61 Chandos Place LONDON WC2N 4HG	

ANALYSIS INFORMATION

Land Use Details:			
	Use Class	Use Description	Floorspace
Existing	C3	<i>Dwelling House</i>	710.6m ²
Proposed	C3	<i>Dwelling House</i>	884.3m ²

Residential Use Details:										
	Residential Type	No. of Bedrooms per Unit								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+
Existing	<i>Flat/Maisonette</i>	4	8							
Proposed	<i>Flat/Maisonette</i>	2	9	1						

OFFICERS' REPORT

Reason for Referral to Committee: Clause 3 (ix), where the Director of Culture and Environment has referred the application for consideration after briefing Members.

1. SITE

- 1.1 The application site is on the north side of Goldhurst Terrace on the corner of Goldhurst Terrace and Priory Road, within the Swiss Cottage Conservation area. The site is occupied by a 4-storey block of 12x flats (3 flats per floor). The block of flats, known as Lynne Court, is an unlisted 1960s building.
- 1.2 The building has a flat roof with a stair core / lift over-run above. It is of red brick with small windows and sparse detailing in the form of contrasting horizontal brick bands between floor levels.
- 1.3 Although the Swiss Cottage conservation area is mainly characterised by homogenous large semi-detached and terraced late Victorian properties laid out in a regular Victorian street pattern, the application property is one of a number of post-war infill developments in the area (1960s). There are 5- and 6-storey blocks of flats of the same period on the opposite corners of the junction. The application property is of no intrinsic architectural merit in itself, but its main facing materials and its scale are generally sympathetic to its context.

2. THE PROPOSAL

2.1 Original

The proposal is for the refurbishment and remodelling of the existing block of flats, which would include erection of 2 x 4-storey rear extensions and an additional floor at the roof level with terraces on the east and west elevations, green roof and solar panels, and alterations to all elevations including juliet balconies, rendering, green wall and new canopy over the front (main) entrance, with associated landscaping works. *It should be noted that the overall number of flats within the building will not change.*

2.2 Revision

The proposal has been amended since it was originally submitted. The proposed fenestration has been revised to add visual interest to the building, including better quality of materials and soldier course detailing above the 4th floor level windows.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

3.1 200 Goldhurst Terrace

- 3.1.1 **8804281**- Planning permission was **refused** on 17/11/1988 for the erection of an additional storey (4th floor) to provide a 3-bedroom self-contained flat, together with

the formation of three roof terrace areas and two additional parking spaces. An appeal against the refusal of this application was dismissed in July 1989.

3.2 **200 & 200A Goldhurst Terrace**

3.2.1 **2005/3896/P** - Planning permission was **refused** on 23/11/2005 for 'demolition of 2x single-storey garage buildings, erection of a part 1-storey part 3-storey block of 4x 2-bedroom flats and 3 studio flats, plus a basement car park for 7x parking spaces and forecourt for 3x parking spaces, and erection of a roof extension on the existing block of flats to provide 2x 2-bedroom flats, one with a roof terrace'. An appeal was dismissed on 12/10/06. The proposed roof extension by reason of its location, size and design was considered to be an overdevelopment which would have harmed the residential amenities of the flats at no. 62 Priory Road and the appearance and character of the parent building and the wider conservation area. The proposed housing mix by reason of lack of family sized units was also considered not to provide a suitable range of accommodation.

3.2.2 **2008/1109/P** - Planning permission was **granted** subject to a S.106 agreement on 13/01/2009 by the Development Control Committee for erection of a new 2-storey over basement detached house. There is ongoing construction work on the site.

4. **CONSULTATIONS**

4.1 **Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC)**

There is no CAAC for Swiss Cottage Conservation Area

4.2 **Local Groups**

Combined Residents Association of South Hampstead (CRASH) objects to the proposed development. In summary, the grounds of their objections are:

- The proposed roof extension and the external alterations by reason of their bulk and height would not respect the surrounding houses on Aberdare Gardens and Goldhurst Terrace and would be out of character with the wider Conservation Area.
- The proposal would result in additional living spaces to the existing flats and would change the mix of units. Most of the flats in the block would be suitable for families.
- The proposed rear extension would reduce the amenity space for the occupiers of the residential block.
- The proposed rendered low boundary wall with hedge above would be preferable.
- No on-site car parking will be provided.

- Windows with obscure glass should be put in the north side to avoid overlooking to 62 Priory Road.
- It is difficult to understand the full detailing of the proposed cladding from the submitted drawings.

4.3 **Adjoining Occupiers**

<i>Number of letters sent</i>	80
<i>Total number of responses received</i>	29
<i>Number of electronic responses</i>	08
<i>Number in support</i>	0
<i>Number of objections</i>	23

4.4 Objections received from 196, Flat 7, 200, 231, Flat 1, Flat 3, Flat 5, and Flat 6 269 Goldhurst Terrace, 2, and Flat 4, 4 Acol Road, 60 Compayne Gardens, 5, 8, 9, and 11 Cecil Court, 1, 7, and 75 Aberdare Gardens, 5 Priory Close, 58, 62A, 62B, 62C, and 62D Priory Road and 67 Sidney Boyd Court. The following concerns were raised:

4.4.1 **Design:**

- The proposed elevational details would be out of character with the conservation area.
- The application site is already over-developed. The proposal would exceed the existing footprint of the building and would worsen the impact of the existing building on the appearance of the conservation area.
- The proposed roof extension, by reason of its bulk, it would be prominent in the streetscene.
- The design of the proposed roof extension would be inappropriate to the existing development pattern in the conservation area. There are no 5-storey blocks in the immediate locality with the exception of Cecil Court (opposite). However, the ground floor level of Cecil Court is below the road level.
- The materials to be used in the proposed development would be out of character with the conservation area.
- The proposed roof addition would be only 5.5m from no.62 Priory Road and would be contrary to the guidance given in the Camden UDP which states that a minimum distance between new buildings of 18 metres needs to be maintained.

4.4.2 **Amenity:**

- The proposed extensions are too high and wide therefore they would create sense of enclosure and result in loss of privacy and daylight to the nearby properties.

- The proposed roof extension would adversely affect the neighbouring properties on Priory Road, Goldhurst Terrace and Acol Road and would reduce the living standards.
- The proposal would result in loss of out look for the residents of the flats at no. 62 Priory Road.
- The proposed roof addition, balconies, terraces and Juliet balconies would overlook to the neighbours.
- The proposed layout would create noise nuisance.
- The proposed two roof terraces to the west and north east of the Lynne Court would create noise problems.
- The proposal would create a claustrophobic atmosphere and reduce views from no. 62 Priory Road.

4.4.3 **Density:**

- The proposal will increase the density in an area which is already over populated. That would be put a strain on services including schools and shops, transport conditions and off-street parking.

4.4.4 **Landscape and trees:**

- The proposal would result in the loss of cheery tree with amenity value. Its replacement birch tree could grow much larger and taller than the existing cherry tree and would be inappropriate.
- The loss of garden space and the additional hard surfacing could limit the space for the water run off.

4.4.5 **Transport conditions:**

- The proposal would intensify the use in an already congested area

4.4.6 **Others:**

- The occupiers of 9 Cecil Court have not been notified (*according to the Council's records the occupiers of Flat 9 Cecil Court were sent a notification letter of this application on 13/05/09*).
- The proposal by reason of its scale would reduce the value of nearby properties.
- The submitted drawings and information does not clarify how the proposed green roof would be accessed and maintained safely.
- No information for access for disabled people is submitted with this application.
- The excavation work at 200A Goldhurst Terrace could cause damage to the damp-course and drainage and could increase flooding risk.

- 2m wall along the path from the rear of Lynne Court to the street would create sense of enclosure and would be unsafe. The path to the back door would also be unsafe.
- The construction works that have been carried out by the same developer in this area is causing noise, dust and traffic problems.

4.5 **Cllr Andrew Marshall** objects to the proposal on the grounds of bulk, loss of light, overlooking and overall impact on the neighbours.

5. **POLICIES**

5.1 **Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006**

SD1 – Quality of life
 SD4 – Density of development
 SD6 – Amenity for Occupiers & Neighbours
 SD9 - Resources and energy
 B1 – General Design Principles
 B3 - Alterations and Extensions
 B7 – Conservation Areas
 H8- Mix of units
 N5 – Biodiversity
 N8- Ancient Woodland Trees

5.2 **Camden Planning Guidance 2006**

Access for all
 Conservation areas
 Daylight and sunlight
 Design
 Designing safer environments
 Energy and onsite renewable facilities
 Landscaping and trees
 Materials and resources
 Overlooking and privacy
 Residential development standards
 Sustainable design and construction
 Transport assessment

5.3 **Other Relevant Planning Policies**

Swiss Cottage Conservation Area Statement

6. **ASSESSMENT**

6.1 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application and summarised as follows:

- Impact of the proposed development on the appearance and character of the application building and conservation area;
- Impact on neighbouring amenity;

- Sustainability;
- Impact on the mix and size of the units;
- Impact on trees and landscaping; and
- Other issues (e.g. density, transport conditions and lifetime homes)

6.2 Design and Appearance

It is proposed to extend the existing building at roof level and at the rear, to re-face it in brick slips and render, and amend the fenestration detail. A previous application for an extension at roof level was refused due to the unacceptable impact of the additional height and bulk of the proposed roof storey and building up of the parapet, which was considered to give the building a top-heavy appearance (ref: 2005/3896/P).

6.2.1 Rear Extensions:

- 6.2.1.1 The proposed rear extensions would extend the rear of the residential block on all floor levels between the shared boundary with no. 62 Priory Road and rear access route to the existing building. The proposed rear extension facing the shared boundary would infill the gap between the projecting rear wall of the building and the north side wall of the building and would have a depth of 3.1m. The proposed rear extension to the projecting rear wall of the building would have a depth of 2.9m. The proposed rear extensions would take up approximately 23sqm of the existing rear (communal) garden space.
- 6.2.1.2 Swiss Cottage Conservation Area Statement advises that rear extensions should generally be as unobtrusive as possible and no more than one storey in height, so that long views across open spaces at the rear of properties would be protected. Furthermore, the conservation area statement states that any development of rear garden spaces should not detract from the general feeling of openness, and should ensure that the majority of existing garden space is retained. Although the proposed rear extensions would be 4-storeys high, they would be subordinate to the existing building in terms of their location, form, scale and dimensions and would respect the existing architectural features of the building. The extensions are also considered not to detract from the ratio of built and unbuilt space, as they would take up a small proportion of the garden space. Given that the proposed extensions would take up a part of the communal garden space which is not ideal for private use and they would not project beyond the Goldhurst Terrace frontage of the building, the proposal is considered not to harm the open character of the area.
- 6.2.1.3 The existing building is a corner property and has two primary frontages. The widest frontage of the building, which is the Goldhurst Terrace frontage, screens the rear elevation of the building. The Goldhurst frontage of the building would also significantly screen the proposed rear extensions. The proposed rear extensions would add to the north elevation and would not be readily visible from the public realm therefore they are considered not to be harmful to the character or appearance of the conservation area.

6.2.2 Roof Extension:

6.2.2.1 The Swiss Cottage Conservation Area Statement states proposals which alter the existing roof profiles will generally be resisted unless to replace inappropriate later alterations with less visually disruptive alternatives. The existing building is not part of a group of buildings which has a uniform architectural style and does not reflect the characteristic features of the Swiss Cottage Conservation area. Therefore, a contemporary roof addition on this location, provided that it would not dominate the appearance of the existing building and this part of the conservation area, is considered to be acceptable in design terms.

6.2.2.2 The amount of rooftop extension has been significantly reduced from the previous application which was refused permission, and is now limited to the area above and around the stair core. The current proposal would comply with the Council's design guidance and policies.

6.2.2 The proposed roof extension would be set back 2.5m from the north side wall of the existing building and 1.8m from the front wall of the building. There would be roof terraces at the rear and front of the building, which would be accessible from the proposed roof extension.

6.2.3 Given the positioning, height and bulk of the proposed roof extension and its significant set back from the building edges, the proposed roof extension is considered to appear acceptably subordinate to the existing building and would not be a prominent addition when viewed from the nearby roads. It should also be noted the proposed roof extension would be largely glazed and would have a light-weight appearance.

6.2.3 New canopy over the front entrance:

6.2.3.1 The proposed canopy would be of glass and steel and would be across the glazed section on the front elevation of the building. It would be mounted to the front wall of the building. The size, design and siting of the proposed canopy would be similar to the existing canopy, but it would have a more contemporary appearance. The contemporary design and materials of the proposed canopy would be suitable to the rest of the design and materials of the proposed external surfaces. The size and location of the proposed canopy is considered to be subservient to the building and would not dominate the front elevation.

6.2.4 Elevational Alterations:

6.2.3.1 The existing building appears to be quite dated, and appropriate restoration works could potentially improve the appearance of the existing building and thus enhance the appearance of the conservation area. The ground floor level of the building would be rendered. The rest of the external surfaces of the building (above ground floor level) would have red brick cladding, which would be sympathetic to the palette of materials that is characteristic of the conservation area. All the windows would be replaced with powder coated aluminium windows. The new Juliet balconies would have a stainless steel brushed balustrade with glass infill each. The existing asphalt roof would be replaced with a sedum green roof. A small section of the wall at the main entrance would have climbers from ground level to soften the hard surfacing on the external fabric.

6.2.3.2 The re-facing of the building and alterations to the fenestration and glazing would improve the appearance of the existing building. This application also seeks to marginally increase the height of the parapet. It is considered that this would not result in an unnecessarily overbearing scale when seen in conjunction with the proposed alterations to the fenestration pattern.

6.2.5 The proposed extensions and alterations are considered to improve the appearance of the existing building and would thus enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and comply with policies B1, B3, B7 and N5 of the UDP.

6.3 **Amenity**

Policy SD6 seeks to ensure that the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties is protected. It states that planning permission will not be granted for development that causes harm to the amenity of occupiers and neighbours in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy.

6.3.1 Light:

6.3.1.1 The Council's planning guidance states the Council will consider the guidelines and methods recommended by the Building Research Establishment (BRE) for daylight and sunlight assessment in new planning applications. The Council's guidance on 'daylight and sunlight' states that if rooms do not achieve 27% vertical sky component (VSC) it is possible to accept a reduction to the existing level of daylight to no less than 0.8 times its former value. Additionally, the guidance recommends the average daylight factor (ADF) should be 2% for kitchens, 1.5% for living rooms and 1% for bedrooms.

6.3.1.2 The proposed rear extensions would project approximately 3.3m beyond the rear wall of no. 62 Priory Road within 3m of that property and 6.2m beyond the rear wall of no. 62 Priory Road within 5.4m of that property. The proposed roof extension would be 5.4m from the south side of no. 62 Priory Road and would be 1.4m higher than the eaves height of that property. Given the height of the proposed roof addition and its proximity to no. 62 Priory Road, the proposed roof addition is considered not to cause significant loss of daylight and outlook to the top floor flat at that property or to worsen the impact of the existing building on the daylight and outlook to the lower floor flats at that building. However, the proposed rear extension close to the shared boundary with no. 62 Priory Road would affect daylight to the bedroom windows of the flats on the south elevation of no. 62 Priory Road and the habitable windows of the flats on the lower ground and upper ground floor levels on the east elevation of no. 62 Priory Road.

6.3.1.3 The rear of both the application property and the adjacent property (no. 62 Priory Road) are east facing. The existing building already affects daylight to the flats at no. 62 Priory Road. The submitted 'daylight and sunlight report', which was prepared in accordance with the guidelines set out by the Building Research Establishment, shows that the proposed extensions would not have a significant impact on the natural light received by the windows of the habitable rooms at no. 62

Priory Road. The report demonstrates that the bedroom on the second floor level would have an ADF (average daylight factor) of 2.1% and the reduction in daylight to the bedroom windows on the upper ground and first floor levels which already receives less than recommended 27% VSC would be less than 0.8 times than its former value. Additionally, the report states the windows on the lower ground floor level on the east elevation of no. 62 Priory Road would achieve approximately 31% of total Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH), which would be in excess of the recommended 25% APSH.

6.3.2 Outlook:

6.3.2.1 The existing building already significantly projects beyond the rear of no. 62 Priory Road and blocks impacts on the view from the rear windows of that property towards Goldhurst Terrace. The proposed rear extensions would not project beyond the furthest projecting point of the existing building at the rear, and therefore would not result in a significant loss of outlook or increased sense of enclosure to that property.

6.3.3 Privacy:

6.3.3.1 In terms of privacy and overlooking, the Council's planning guidance advises a minimum distance of 18m between the windows of the habitable rooms of different units that directly face each other. The BRE guidelines also recommend distances of 18-35m between residential windows which directly face each other, to ensure privacy is maintained. Such distances are generally unachievable in a central urban location such as this. However, policy SD6 of the UDP does seek to ensure that overlooking is not of an unacceptable level.

6.3.3.2 The proposed roof extension would be 5.4m from the south side flank of no. 62 Priory Road and would have a series of high level windows above eye level on the north elevation (facing no. 62 Priory Road). Therefore, it is considered that the proposed roof addition would not be likely to adversely impact on the privacy of the occupiers of that property. New windows which are proposed to be inserted on the north side elevation of the building which would face the bedroom windows on the side elevation of no. 62 Priory Road would be obscurely glazed. A condition requiring those windows to be obscure glazed will be attached to protect the privacy of the occupiers of no. 62 Priory Road.

6.3.3.3 The proposed roof terraces facing the side of no. 62 Priory Road would be screened by 1.8m high obscure glazed panels, which would prevent unacceptable overlooking to the habitable rooms of the flats at no. 62 Priory Road. The proposed roof terraces would be more than 20m from the properties on the opposite site of Goldhurst Terrace (no. 58 Priory Road and no. 269 Goldhurst Terrace); therefore it would accord the recommended distance in the BRE guidelines and would not cause unacceptable overlooking.

6.3.3.4 The proposed rear extension would be approximately 8m from the west flank of the new house at no. 200A Goldhurst Terrace under construction (ref: 2008/1109/P). The openings on the west elevation of the new house which face the rear of the application building would be obscure glazed, as shown on the approved

plans. The proposed extension by reason of its location, orientation and proximity to the new house would be unlikely to cause loss of outlook and daylight to the new house.

- 6.3.4 The proposed roof and rear extensions would not significantly worsen the impact of the existing building on the amenities of the immediately adjacent property (no. 62 Priory Road) in terms of loss of daylight and outlook. Additionally, subject to safeguarding conditions, it is considered that the proposed extensions and alterations would not result in loss of privacy to the nearby residential properties. It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with policy SD6.

6.4 Sustainability

- 6.4.1 The proposed development does not fall under 'major development' category; therefore there is no requirement for the provision of renewable energy sources or compliance with 'Code for Sustainable Homes'. However, the Council has a policy to promote use of renewable energy sources and sustainable development. The applicant has submitted a Pre Assessment Estimator to demonstrate how the proposal would achieve 'very good' Ecohomes Standards.
- 6.4.2 The proposal would include incorporation of green roofs and walls, solar panels to heat water, use of recycled and energy efficient materials (e.g. thermally efficient windows) and re-cladding to improve insulation. Incorporation of element of sustainable design to the proposed scheme is appreciated in this respect.
- 6.4.3 The proposed solar panels would be on the flat roof of the proposed roof extension and would not be visible from the streetscene. The proposed green roofs on the flat roofs of the four storey part of the building are considered to be appropriate to this building and could provide a habitat for the wildlife in the area. The proposed sustainability measures are welcome and in accordance with policy SD9.

6.5 Mix of Units

- 6.5.1 Lynne Court is a mix of 4 x 1-bedroom and 8 x 2-bedroom flats. The Planning Inspectorate's appeal decision dated 12/10/06 states that the location of the site would be suitable for some family homes. The proposal would provide 2 x 1-bedroom, 9 x 2-bedroom and 1 x 3-bedroom flats.
- 6.5.2 Policy H8 (Mix of units) seeks a mix of large and small units and considers larger units of three or more bedrooms to provide flexible use for occupation by a range of household sizes, including families. In addition to this, the Camden Housing Needs Survey has identified a shortfall in the number of larger units suitable for families within the Borough. The proposal would provide 1 x 3-bedroom flat and would improve the size and living standards of the existing flats. Therefore it is considered that the proposed mix unit would be in accordance with policy H8 of the UDP.

6.6 Trees and Landscaping

- 6.6.1 The site has 5 trees which are covered by a TPO; an Oak and a Lime along the frontage with Priory Road and a Lime and two Purple Plum trees on the frontage

with Goldhurst Terrace. There is also a Lime tree at the front of no. 62 Priory Road which would be in proximity to the building works at Lynne Court. None of these trees would directly be affected by the proposals. However, they may be affected by construction activity within the site. Therefore any planning permission should be conditional on the submission and approval of a method statement for the protection of trees to be retained on and around the site.

- 6.6.2 The proposal involves the removal of a Cherry tree towards the rear of the site adjacent to the flank boundary with no. 62 Priory Road. Whilst this tree has some value, its prominence in the landscape is limited. It is notable that this tree has not had a TPO placed on it during previous surveys of the site, mainly because it lacks sufficient prominence to meet the criteria for a TPO. The Cherry has also been heavily pruned in the past due to its proximity to the existing building, and its form would be further compromised by ongoing maintenance work. The proposals include a replacement tree on the site to mitigate the loss of the Cherry, which is considered acceptable.
- 6.6.3 The proposals include new planting around the block and sections of green roof. Any planning permission should be conditional on the submission and approval of hard and soft landscape details including details of the construction, planting and maintenance of the green roofs.
- 6.6.4 The existing communal garden space at the rear is approximately 112sqm. The proposed rear extensions and ground floor rear terrace would take up an area of approximately $\frac{1}{5}$ of the communal garden space. Although the proposal would reduce the rear communal garden space, it would provide terraces for two of the flats in the building which could be used as a private amenity space and which compensate to some extent for the loss of communal amenity space. The proposed green roof would also compensate the loss of green open space.

6.7 **Density**

Policy SD4 of the UDP encourages high density development which makes full use of the potential of a site provided that the following considerations are taken into account:

- a) the character, scale, amenity, and density of the surrounding area;
- b) the nature of the site;
- c) the quality of the design;
- d) the type of development being provided;
- e) the availability of local facilities, services and open space;
- f) accessibility by public transport; and
- g) the potential impact on the local transport network.

As national and local policy seeks to maximize this land use, and the proposal is to extend an existing building without any increase in the overall number of units, it is considered that the refusal of this application on grounds of excessive density could not be justified.

6.8 **Transport Conditions**

- 6.8.1 Given that there are no existing parking spaces on the site and the proposal would not increase the number of units, the proposal would not be likely to worsen the existing transport conditions.
- 6.8.2 The scale of the construction work for the proposed development is considered to be unlikely to cause unacceptable disruption to the operation and safety of the public highway therefore a Construction Management Plan (CMP) is not required. There is space around the site off the public highway for storage of materials and erection of scaffolding etc. However it is likely to be some suspension of residents' parking bays for skips and loading and unloading close the junction between Goldhurst Terrace and Priory Road during the construction. Highways Licences which will be needed for this would ensure the work is carried out in an orderly fashion.

6.9 **Lifetime Homes**

As the building already exists and the proposal will not worsen the existing access arrangements, there is no requirement for the proposed development to comply with all Lifetime Homes standards. However, an informative will be added to the decision letter to encourage compliance where possible.

7. **CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 The proposal would improve the appearance of the existing building and the wider conservation area without compromising the open character and appearance of the conservation area, amenities of the neighbouring properties or existing transport conditions; therefore planning permission should be granted.