

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT FORM

ADDRESS GOLDHURST MANSIONS, 7-19 GOLDHURST TERR., NW6
 NAME AND ADDRESS PARBRIGHT INVESTMENTS LTD.,
 OF DEVELOPER 7 HOLMFIELD AVENUE
 LONDON NW4

CASE OFFICER: M. SCOTT
 DATE OF APPLICATION: 17 OCT 85
 REVISIONS: —
 REFERENCE: 96/16/A

PROPOSAL Extension at 5th floor level, to provide a three bedroom flat and a two-bedroom flat, including works of conversion.

EXISTING USES/AREAS

PROPOSED USES/AREAS

RESIDENTIAL MIX

1st fl.: Storage → Residential
 1st fl.: Retail — Retail
 4th fl.: Res. — Res.

EXISTING
 3 flats

PROPOSED
 10 flats

Nett site = 730m²
 Gross site = 910m²
 Proposed density = 138/hpa
 Plot ratio = 2.4:1

CONSULTATIONS 154 A.O.s. 5 letters + 1 petition objecting loss of storage space, unsympathetic external appearance, noise, loss of value, car parking, overdevelopment.
 EXPIRY DATE: 27. NOV. 85 Impede fire escape, overload lift + sewers, security

KEY POLICIES

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Ground floor (shops) + four floor over (residential - 2 flats per floor) in mansion block on eastside of Goldhurst Terrace, close to Fitchley Road

2. Proposal, see above.

3. REFUSAL 1. OCT. 84. Extension at 5th floor level to provide 3-bed, + 2-bed flats. reasons for refusal: - ① exceeds plot ratio: considered overdevelopment. ② put excessive additional demands on existing services to detriment of existing residents.

Previous application was acceptable to officers, committee members requested "green sheet refusal".

Current application is identical in form to previous refusal. It is considered acceptable to officer in terms of ① a sympathetic design - minor elevational alterations at front + rear by insertion of dormers + recladding of roof, no increase in existing height, ② there are no daylight or sunlighting problems, ③ no loss of privacy or overlooking, ④ the mix of accommodation is acceptable, whilst layout + room sizes are reasonable, ⑤ front area balconies provide some amenity space.

There is no scope for off-street parking provision. The plot ratio is higher than standard at 2.4:1 (The standard here is considered to be 2:1). So even if the developers could implement the proposal without disruption to tenants the development is as before unacceptable to members.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

REFUSE PERMISSION

Michael Scott 9th December 85