

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	14/11/2007
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	25/10/2007
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Alex Bushell			1) 2007/4410/P; and 2) 2007/4412/C		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
151 Broadhurst Gardens London NW6 3BE			Refer to draft decision notice.		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
1. Erection of part one/part two-storey single-family dwellinghouse to rear of 151 Broadhurst Gardens following demolition of car repair workshop (Class B1). 2. Demolition of the existing car repair workshop (Class B1).					
Recommendation(s):		1) Refuse Permission; and 2) Grant Conditional Conservation Area Consent.			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	27	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. electronic	01		
Summary of consultation responses:	Site notice displayed 04/10/07 to 25/10/07. One letter of representation from a neighbour (153 Broadhurst Gardens) objecting on grounds of loss of light, view and privacy to Flat 1. The occupant of Flat 1 works nights and construction works will be disruptive.					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	No CAAC in the Swiss Cottage Conservation Area. English Heritage Grant 'flexible authorisation' for the matter to be determined in accordance with national policy and guidance.					

Site Description

The site comprises a single storey workshop/garage on the east side of West Hampstead Mews to the immediate rear of 151 Broadhurst Gardens. The site is located within the Swiss Cottage Conservation Area.

Relevant History

31/07/1986 – refusal of outline permission for erection of two additional storeys over the existing single-storey garage (car radio fitters) for residential purposes (two self-contained flats). Reasons for refusal are: 1. exceeds plot ratio standards, 2. loss of daylight, 3. loss of outlook, 4. no on-site parking, 5. out of scale and character with the Mews, and 6. substandard in size.

08/01/2002 – refusal of planning permission for the demolition of the existing car workshop and the redevelopment of the site by the erection of a two and a half storey single family dwelling house. Reasons for refusal are: 1. out of character with Mews; and 2. loss of outlook. Appeal dismissed on outlook grounds only.

08/01/2002 – conservation area consent granted for the demolition of the existing car workshop.

05/06/2003 – planning permission for the demolition of a car workshop and the erection of a two storey single family dwelling house – scheme modified from 2002 to address appeal inspector's views in respect of outlook. Recent applications have been submitted to discharge the conditions; however no works have commenced. Permission will expire in June 2008.

Relevant policies

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against. However, it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

UDP: S1/S2, SD2, SD3, SD6, H1, H7, H8, B1, B7, T1, T2, T3, T7, T8, T9, and E2.

CPG: Internal space standards.

Assessment

Proposed is the demolition of the existing single storey garage/workshop building and its replacement with a part single storey part two storey building for use as a separate dwelling. As permission has already been granted for both the demolition and removal of the existing building/use and the redevelopment with a single residential unit of similar bulk and footprint (see relevant history above), the principle has been established and main issues to assess in this case is the design particulars of this proposal, how it addresses the outlook issue and whether any of the policies in the recently adopted 2006 UDP introduce any new issues.

Design and Impact on Conservation Area

Context and precedent

Single-storey garage on the east side of West Hampstead Mews. Although the application site is to the rear of 151 Broadhurst Gardens the building forms part of West Hampstead Mews. The site is located within the Swiss Cottage conservation area. The principle of development within this plot has already been established in extant permissions.

West Hampstead Mews has a typical mews character. The side of the mews where the site lies has an especially distinctive and homogenous mews character. This character consists of small scale 2-storey brick built terraced buildings with slate pitched roofs; a consistent eaves and ridge line as well as front building line, which fronts straight onto the cobbled street; entablatures with coach doors or structural openings below and entrance doors with lights and small scale first floor timber windows with arches and stone cills. The attractive appearance of the mews as well as its mix of uses - with the ground floor primarily consisting of business and light industrial uses whilst the first floor is dominated by residential accommodation - enhances its overall character which adds particular value to the Conservation Area.

The proposed development, albeit having the basic appearance of a mews building is not considered to respect the distinctive elements that define its character such as the consistent eaves line, elevational design and proportions.

Plot width

Each building on this side of the mews has a consistent plot width of approx. 5m. The front façade of the proposed dwelling house is divided in two to give the impression of 2 buildings however each frontage is 4.3m wide. This alters the rhythm of the terrace and weakens the ability of the contemporary building to unite with the adjoining terrace.

Roofline

The front part of the roof will breach the existing consistent line of the pitched slate roofs and line of the party wall (as shown on the photomontages) of the adjoining terrace. This would over dominate the terrace at roof level and create an awkward junction between the rooftop and party wall up stand.

Proportions

The first floor looks out of proportion for a typical mews building. This maybe best corrected by reducing the height of the first floor windows, moving them closer to the eaves and reinforcing and extending the ground floor bressumer. Realigning the width of the building will also help proportion the buildings height

Detailed design and Materials

The success of the development is considered to depend on the appropriate use of high quality materials, detailed design and finished appearance. The drawings do not give a sufficient level of detail to be convinced that the design will sit comfortably within its setting. The window reveals, eaves detail, ground floor windows, side wing with porthole as well as proposed brick bond would have been the subject of a condition had permission been forthcoming. The Juliet balcony railings are considered overly fussy. Vertical rather than horizontal boarding is generally found within a mews. The design of the first floor windows, front section of roof and are considered elements which will be detrimental the character and appearance of the mews.

Demolition

The principle of the demolition of the existing building has already been established. The CAC has expired (granted in 2002) and a new Conservation Area consent is required. Having regard to the fact that there is an extant permission for redevelopment, it is recommended that consent be granted for the demolition, subject to the usual condition that no works be undertaken until a contract for redevelopment has been entered into.

Conclusion

Mews buildings are generally small, simple buildings whose character relies on well proportioned and detailed elements. The proposed design is not correctly proportioned, breaks the consistent elements which make up the adjoining terrace and does not show a sufficient level of detail to assess.

Residential Amenity

The 2003 scheme was allowed following negotiations to address the appeal scheme refusal (2002 – see history), which related to a loss of outlook to the windows of the separate flats in 151 Broadhurst Gardens itself looking directly to the rear over the application site. The extant permission included angled cutbacks to allow oblique views and improved outlook. It also has a 'green' sedum wall that would soften the visual impact.

151 Broadhurst Gardens

In this case, the scheme has been designed with additional setback for the main two storey component (5m instead of 3m in the refused scheme from the rear window of 151 Broadhurst Gardens) and the bulk of the flank elevation has been split into different sloping components. No objection is raised in terms of outlook or overbearing physical impact of the proposed structure. The otherwise open aspect and the narrow width of the end/flank elevation of the higher component would be such that there would be no material loss of light. No windows proposed would face or provide direct views into private habitable rooms.

149 Broadhurst Gardens

In respect of the objector's property at 149 Broadhurst Gardens, the matter was assessed in detail for a scheme of greater bulk in closer relationship to the flat windows as part of the 2002 appeal. The appeal inspector concluded that there would be no material loss of amenity to the flat concerned. As this scheme incorporates greater setback with an otherwise similar bulk and no windows facing the neighbour, the same conclusion can be applied in this case and the development is considered to be acceptable in light and privacy and outlook terms. The concern expressed in respect of nuisance during construction is a matter that should be managed in association with Environmental Health and is not a basis for a refusal of planning permission.

Highways and Parking

The extant permission was not the subject of a car-free planning obligation on the basis that vehicle movements associated with a car repair workshop would be far greater than would result from a single residential house; however the previous decision was made under a different policy context and the recently adopted UDP now includes much stronger policies in this regard. The site falls within a CPZ with existing parking stress and has good public transport accessibility. It is therefore recommended that permission be refused on the basis that the development does not address additional on street parking pressure and would be more likely that the previous use to introduce overnight parking. An informative is included to advise that a car-free S106 would overcome the reason for refusal.

Accessibility

The scheme has been designed for with a highly accessible ground floor and is capable of being modified to incorporate a lift to first floor level and is considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Recommendation

That planning permission be refused on design and vehicle parking grounds and conservation area consent be granted subject to conditions.

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613