

H5 | 2/13

8804430

[2555]

E38/1339 (Rec)

DISMISSED

FILE COPY

REF: NW



Planning Inspectorate

Department of the Environment

Room 1404 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct Line 0272-218927

Switchboard 0272-218811

GTN 1374

Keith Dalton & Associates
19-20 Garlick Hill
LONDON EC4V 2AH

Your Reference

NMF.AJD.620

Our Reference

T/APP/X5210/A/88/111550/P5

Date

2 MAY 89

Gentlemen

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9
APPEAL BY EVERGREEN PROPERTIES (LONDON) LTD
APPLICATION NO:- PL 8804430

1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine this appeal following the failure of the Council of the London Borough of Camden to determine an application for conversion of the first, second and third floors of 68 Compayne Gardens, London NW6 to form 5 self contained flats within the prescribed time limit. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the council. I inspected the site on 17 April 1989.

2. On the basis of the material before me and of my site visit I consider that the main issues in this case are the effects of subdivision of the existing property into 6 separate dwelling units on the Swiss Cottage Conservation Area and on the amenities of the surrounding residential area, in particular the implications for on-street parking.

3. 68 Compayne Gardens is a substantial property which has long been in use as flats. Much of Compayne Gardens was originally built to the same pattern of large semi-detached houses and has similarly been converted to flats, with, judging by the number of doorbells, a widely varying number of flats in each. The ground floor flat of No 68 which has exclusive use of the rear garden does not form part of the application before me but in assessing the implications of your proposals for providing 2 flats on the first and second floors and a new flat within the roof space, I consider it necessary to take into account the existence of this ground floor unit. Your proposal would then provide 6 separate dwelling units at 68 Compayne Gardens.

4. Your proposals would not involve any changes to the exterior of 68 Compayne Gardens apart from rooflights, skylights and rear dormer windows already approved as part of a separate application to provide a four bedroom maisonette from the top floor and the roof space. I therefore do not consider that your proposal would have any significant direct consequences on the conservation area. Additionally occupation of the property by 6 households would not in my view in itself be likely to directly affect neighbours' amenities to a significantly greater extent than occupation by some lesser number of households, especially in comparison with the benefits I recognise would follow from providing a greater number of dwelling units more closely suited to the needs of one or two person households.



5. However, the occupation of the building by a greater number of small households can reasonably be expected to result in a demand for more car parking spaces. The Council has produced Design Guidance on roof alterations in this particular locality and I note that one of the concerns behind the principles it has adopted is that excessive sub-division would be likely to lead to an unreasonable increase in demand for on-street parking. In the circumstances of this proposal, in which no off-street parking is proposed and a roof conversion is involved, I consider that the consequences of increased on-street parking are properly regarded as material considerations in the evaluation of your proposal for additional dwelling units.

6. The width of the appeal site, and the standard width of neighbouring properties on both sides of Compayne Gardens, is some 12 m, which provides kerbside parking for about 3 cars. I consider it reasonable to assume that each household of the size you propose would give rise to demand for parking of at least one car. On this assumption your proposals would result in a demand for at least 3 parking spaces more than could be parked in front of No 68. Existing residents of the neighbourhood already report experiencing difficulty in finding on-street parking and on my site inspection, I saw not only a high level of on-street parking during the day but formed the view that the limited parking provision compared with the number of separate households in Compayne Gardens would result in much competition for overnight on-street parking. In my judgement, the extra parking demands from the additional dwelling units you propose would add significantly to local residents' problems in finding parking spaces close to their homes, especially in the evenings. I consider that this would have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of this residential area.

7. I have considered all the other matters raised. I recognise that comparable properties in the neighbourhood have been converted to as many as 7 flats but the harmful effects of on-street parking in a residential street are cumulative and my concern is about adding to an existing high level of demand. I acknowledge that your proposal would bring benefits through providing an increased number of small residential units but this does not in my view outweigh the disadvantages for local residents from adding to competition for on-street parking. None of the other matters raised affect my conclusion that your proposals should not be permitted because they would lead to increased demand for on-street parking and thereby have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of existing local residents.

8. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss this appeal.

I am Gentlemen
Your obedient servant

Simon E. Gibbs.

Simon E Gibbs MA MSocSc MRTPI
Inspector