

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	25/09/2006
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	19/09/2006
<b>Officer</b>		<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Cassie Plumridge		(1) 2006/2994/P (2) 2006/3483/C		
<b>Application Address</b>		<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
148 Fellows Road London NW3 3JH				
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
<p>(1) Construction of a new part 1, part 2 storey plus basement extension adjacent to the existing building to provide a single dwellinghouse, rear two storey extension to provide additional accommdoation to ground floor flat and associated car parking, following demolition of existing garages.</p> <p>(2) Demolition of existing garages</p>				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse (1) and (2)		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission and Conservation Area Consent		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>66</b>	No. of responses	<b>28</b>	No. of objections	<b>26</b>
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Objections have been received from the following parties including Councillor Graves: <b>1 Belsize Park; 19A Belsize Crescent; Flat 2, 148 Fellows Road X2; Flat 4, 148 Fellows Road; 33C Downside Crescent; 22 Winchester Road; Flat B, 22 Winchester Road; Flat C, 22 Winchester Road X2; 24 Winchester Road X2; 26 Winchester Road X2; Flat A, 30 Winchester Road X2; 32 Winchester Road; 59E Eton Avenue; Flat 1, Maxwell Court, 67 Eton Avenue; Flat 7, Maxwell Court, 67 Eton Avenue; Flat 1, 73 Eton Avenue; Flat 3, 73 Eton Avenue.</b> In summary the following concerns were raised, these issues have been address in the assessment section of the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The size of the basement is an overdevelopment of the site.</li> <li>• Impact on trees.</li> <li>• Subsidence of the surrounding land.</li> <li>• The design in unsympathetic to the historic context.</li> <li>• Amenity impacts on the surrounding neighbours.</li> <li>• This is further back land development.</li> <li>• Impact on parking through loss of existing on site spaces.</li> </ul>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>	<p><b>English Heritage</b> - have no comments on the application</p> <p><b>The Heath and Hampstead Society, Belsize Residents Association and Belsize CAAC</b> all objected to the proposal and in summary raised the following concerns, it is noted that these issues are discussed in full in the assessment section of the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The full basement is an over development of the site – has been created by backland development</i></li> <li>• <i>The side extension is unsuitable and has a poor relationship to the existing building.</i></li> <li>• <i>The development would harm the surrounding trees.</i></li> <li>• <i>Amenity impacts to neighbours, including noise and light pollution.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Thames Water</b> have no objections in principle but have provided comments relating to surface water drainage, the proposed basement (+ sewerage) and water. This is covered by an informative for the applicant's information.</p>					
<b>Site Description</b>						
<p>The subject site falls within the Belsize Conservation Area and is identified in the Conservation Area Statement as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. The appeal property forms the end terrace of imposing five storey buildings. It lies in a prominent exposed location, close to the junction between Fellows Road and Winchester Road and to its west is an open area, containing trees and mature planting, which aligns with the back gardens of houses further north along Winchester Road. It is understood that this area originally formed part back gardens of the adjacent houses on Winchester Road. The existing layout of the site maintains the established street pattern of long gardens and leafy spaces between buildings. The open area contributes to the spacious, leafy character of the area around the site and provides an important break in development in this corner location.</p>						

## Relevant History

- An application for planning permission (ref: 9500874) for the erection of a single storey 3 bedroom dwelling house was refused on 16/02/1996.
- An application for planning permission (ref: P96015950) for the erection of 5 new garages, was refused on 12/07/1996.
- An application for conservation area consent (ref: CE9800300) for the demolition of garage building was approved on 18/03/1999.
- An application for planning permission (ref: PE9800078R1) for the erection of a single storey extension and a four storey extension at the rear, the erection of a five storey extension at the side, and conversion of the property to accommodate five self contained flats and two self contained maisonettes, was refused on 18/03/1999. Appeal dismissed 11/10/99
- An application for planning permission (ref: PEX0100267) for the erection of a two storey side extension to the existing building to create a self contained dwelling; the erection of a part two storey rear addition and the conversion of the rear garages to a gym, including the replacement of the flat roof with a pitch roof, was approved by Council on 08/11/2001, and will expire five years after the permission was granted, 8/11/2006.

The two-storey side extension to create the new residential unit, allowed as part of this permission, was set behind the front façade of the host building (1.5 metres from the front southwest corner), had a width of 5.5 metres, and depth of 8.5 metres, being set in marginally from the rear wall of the host building. The two-storey rear extension to the existing flats extended 3.6 metres to the rear, aligning with the rear projecting section of the No. 144 Fellows Road, and had a limited width of 3.8 metres, and as such did not extend the full width of the existing building.

The scheme adopted a traditional design idiom, using face brick work to match the host building, a pitched slate roof with exposed eaves lines to match existing, and a traditional window pattern on the front and rear elevations and blank flank elevation. It is noted that the façade was all on the same plane, where as the subsequent applications PEX0200217, as noted below was refused, utilised a bay feature on the front façade.

- An application for planning permission (ref: PEX0200216) for a side extension to the existing building and alterations to the existing garage block to create a new residential unit was refused by Council on 7/05/2002, however this decision was over turned by the Inspectorate, decision dated 14/05/2003, who granted planning permission. This permission is still valid, expiring five years after the decision was issued, 14/05/2008.

An application for planning permission (ref: PEX0200217) for a side extension to the existing building and alterations to the existing garage block to create a new residential unit was refused by Council on 7/05/2002, and this decision was upheld by the Inspectorate, decision dated 14/05/2003.

Both applications were considered together by the Inspectorate. The applications are described below:

- The scheme shown in application PEX0200216 maintained the width of the side extension, 5.5 metres, approved by the previous permission (ref: PEX0100267), and was also set behind the façade of the existing host building (again 1.5 metres from the southwest front corner of the host building). This scheme included a two-storey rear extension, which extended beyond the rear building line of the existing building to have an overall depth of 12.2 metres, aligning with the rear projecting section of the adjoining building, No. 144 Fellows Road. The extension behind the existing building indenting the rear elevation by having a depth of 3 metres.

The scheme adopted a traditional design idiom, using facing brick work to match the host building, a raised parapet was provided around the perimeter of the roof with pitched slate roof behind, the pitched roof extended over the side extension and a flat roof for the rear extension; and on the side elevation a chimney breast was provided and (as approved in PEX0100267) openings were excluded from the flank elevation. Like the façade in PEX0100267 this scheme also used an unarticulated front elevation.

- The scheme shown in application PEX0200217 was wider than previously approved (ref: PEX0100267, which allowed 5.5 metres) having a width of 6.8 metres, however maintained the depth of the previous approval, 8.5 metres.

This scheme had a two storey projecting bay on the front elevation, having a horizontal emphasis,

which the Inspector considered to conflict with the established vertical rhythms along the front of the existing terrace.

This scheme also adopted a traditional design idiom, using face brick work to match the host building, a raised parapet was provided around the perimeter of the roof, with pitched slate roof sitting behind, and a traditional window pattern for the rear elevation and blank flank elevation.

## **Relevant policies**

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. 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.

### **Replacement UDP 2006**

- S1 & S2 – Strategic Policy on Sustainable Development
- SD1 – Quality of Life
- SD4 – Density of development
- SD6 – Amenity for Occupiers & Neighbours
- SD 7 + 8 – Light, noise + vibration pollution and disturbance
- SD9 - Resources and energy
- H7 – Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing
- B1 – General Design Principles
- B3 –Alterations and Additions
- B7 – Conservation Areas
- N5 - Biodiversity
- N8 – Ancient woodlands + Trees
- T1 – Sustainable transport
- T3 – Pedestrians and Cycling
- T8 – Car Free Housing and Car Capped Housing
- T7 – Off street parking, city car clubs + city bike schemes
- T9 – Impact of parking
- + relevant appendices

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

- Section 2.3 – Internal Arrangements
- Section 2.7 – Alterations and Additions
- Section 2.4.11 – Visibility splays
- Section 5.7 – Layout and design of highways

### **Belsize Conservation Area Statement**

## Assessment

### PROPOSAL:

The application seeks planning permission and conservation area consent for the construction of a new part 1, part 2 storey plus basement single dwellinghouse adjacent to the existing building and associated car parking, following demolition of existing garages.

### ASSESSMENT:

The principal considerations material to the determination of this scheme are summarised as follows:

- The acceptability of the proposed development in this location, including the design, bulk, height and footprint.
- Trees and landscaping.
- Traffic and car parking.
- Internal amenity for future residents of the site.
- Impacts on the amenity of the surrounding neighbours
- Sustainability.
- Lifetime home and wheelchair housing.
- Appropriateness of demolition of the garages.

#### **The acceptability of the extension in this location, including the design, bulk, height and footprint:**

- As discussed previously, there are two permissions still valid on the site:
  - Planning permission (ref: PEX0100267) for the erection of a two storey side extension to the existing building to create a self contained dwelling; the erection of a part two storey rear addition and the conversion of the rear garages to a gym, including the replacement of the flat roof with a pitch roof, was approved by the Council on 08/11/2001, which will expire five years from the date of the decision, 8/11/2006.
  - Planning permission (ref: PEX0200216) for a side extension to the existing building and alterations to the existing garage block to create a new residential unit was refused by Council on 7/05/2002, however this decision was over turned by the Inspectorate, decision dated 14/05/2003, who granted planning permission. This permission is still valid, expiring five years from the date of the decision, 14/05/2008.
- The application site is located on the north side of Fellows Road close to the junction with Winchester Road. The site contains a red brick, five storey end of terrace Victorian Villa with small lower ground and ground floor side extension. To the west of the house is a large area of undeveloped land bound by trees and vehicular access from Fellows Road servicing a row of single storey garages at the rear of the site. Due to the leafy gap and attractive Victorian Villa the site is considered to make a positive contribution to the Belsize Conservation Area of which it forms a part.
- Planning permission and Conservation Area consent is sought for the demolition of the existing garages and erection of a part 1, part 2 storey plus basement single dwelling house attached to the flank elevation (also reads as a side extension) of the existing dwelling.
- The issues to consider are the potential impact the development would have on the character and appearance of this area (sub area three: The Eton Avenue Area) of Belsize Conservation Area having particular regard for the gap in development and established vertical rhythms along the front elevation. The principle of extending 148 Fellows Road has already been established by earlier planning permission approved in November 2001 and on appeal in May 2003 (ref: PEX0100267 and PEX0200216). Both schemes were for the erection of a two-storey side extension to create a self-contained dwelling; the erection of a part two storey rear addition and the conversion of the rear four garages.
- The undeveloped land between 148 Fellows Road and the rear of properties fronting Winchester Road is considered to be an important gap in the Conservation Area, separating the terraces. The proposed development would excavate this area to provide 'underground' accommodation with a green roof. It is considered that this would retain the significant gap, maintaining the spacious, leafy character of the area around the site. The development is considered to accord with Basement BE2 guidelines set out in Belsize Conservation Area Statement which states that works should contribute to the established character of the street scene.
- The proposed dwelling house which effectively comprises a two storey side extension to the existing house

would be set back 2m from the existing front building line, have a frontage of around 5.5m (relative to previous approvals) and line through with the top of the porch of the existing building. This is considered to be subservient in relation to height and bulk of the existing building and not encroach on the openness of the gap site. The design of the extension relates satisfactorily to the main building in terms of proportions – taking cues from the bay windows on the existing building. The materials palette uses brick and concrete. The brick would match the existing dwelling whilst the grey concrete would be used to emphasise the modern extension. The limited colours are considered to correspond to the simple facades that already exist on the street. The scheme respects the New Development guidelines BE19 and B20 set out in Belsize Conservation Area Statement which requests new development respects the building lines, design, height and scale of existing development. Detailed drawings and samples would be required to ensure the detailed design is suitable should these applications be recommended for approval.

- The replacement garage building matches the footprint and form as previously approved. The building now contains a green roof and is considered acceptable.
- The scheme proposes a full width two storey extension at the rear of the main house to be built to match existing. The cumulative affect of the side and rear extension, although used for different function is considered to over dominate the existing building, however consent was granted by the Inspectorate for a similar scheme in May 2003 and the Council are bound by the decision.
- The proposed front boundary includes steel gates with cedar cladding. Concerns are raised about the size and style of this type of boundary treatment proposed as it is considered that this may harm the character of this part of the Conservation Area which is attractive tree lined road with leafy suburban appearance with prevailing pattern of low brick built boundary walls. Further detailed drawings and samples would be requested as a condition if the application is minded to be approved. Community safety issues also need to be taken into consideration here given the adjoining boundary treatments.
- In conclusion the proposed development would retain the important leafy gap between Fellows Road terrace and Winchester terrace preserving the character of this part of the Conservation Area. The proposed extension would relate to the existing pattern of development and appear modest in scale from the street scene, and as such the provision of the extensive basement is not considered to adversely impact on the Conservation Area. In my view it would not harm the appearance of the existing building or the terrace as a whole subject to the appropriate detailing and materials. The scheme complies with policies B1, B3 and B7 of the replacement UDP, BE2, 19 and 20 Conservation Area Statement guidelines would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and is therefore considered acceptable.

#### **Trees and landscaping:**

- The site is bordered with 2 trees which are the subject of a TPO. Both are Lime trees (T10 & T11 see below) situated in the rear garden of 30 Winchester Road. The remaining trees which border the site identified on the drawings and the accompanying arboricultural report by ACS dated 24/11/05 are considered to make a positive contribution to the character of the Belsize Park Conservation Area. These are T1 Ash r/o 22 Winchester Rd, T2 Plane & T3 Plane front of 146 Fellows Rd, T4 Ash, T5 Red Chestnut, T6 Lime, T7 Red Chestnut r/o 126 Fellows Rd, T8 Sycamore & T9 Sycamore r/o 69 Eton Rd. , T10 Lime & T11 Lime r/o 30 Winchester Rd, T12 Ash r/o 28 Winchester Rd.
- Of these trees T1 an Ash, on the frontage of the site overhanging Fellows Rd, has significant dieback in the crown indicating that the tree has a very limited safe useful life expectancy. It is proposed to fell this tree for this reason. This proposal is considered to be acceptable.
- The proposals show a root protection zone to the surrounding trees within the site where no excavations are to take place. These distances are T8 1.2m ( BS:6.6m), T9 1.2m (BS:8.4m), T10 2m (BS:4.5m), T11 1.9m (BS:7.2m), T12 1.7m (BS:6.2m). These distances fall short of the recommended distances within the arboricultural report according to the prescriptions of BS 5837: 2005 Trees in Relation to construction (see BS:X above).
- No justification has been given for the reduction of these distances. There are possible reasons for this - the existing tarmac surface is less conducive to root growth than the surrounding garden area or trees T8 and T9 both grow at a slightly raised level to the proposals site and a retaining wall and foundations to the garage prevent extensive root growth into the site. However without trial holes to investigate the extent of root growth into the site these assertions would be speculative only. Therefore unless evidence is presented to the contrary, any excavations for a building on the site should be outside the recommended root protection zones for the trees surrounding the site outlined in BS 5837.
- It is considered that in the absence of such details, that the scheme would harm the Conservation Area. This would result in potential damage and loss of trees around the boundary, given that the proposed scheme utilises reduced distances which fall short of the recommended distances within the arboricultural

report according to BS 5837: 2005 Trees in Relation to construction. It is considered that the proposed development, in the absence of further information which details the extent of root growth into the site from the surrounding trees, would harm the Conservation Area resulting from the potential damage and loss of trees around the boundary, contrary to Policies B1 (General Design Principles), B7 (Conservation Areas), N5 (Biodiversity), N8 (Ancient Woodlands and Trees) of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.

#### **Traffic and car parking:**

- With regard to assessing the application against traffic considerations, the following concerns are raised: cycle parking; the safety of the proposed parking arrangement including visibility; and the impact on the new scheme on parking capacity.
- The Council requires the provision of secure cycle parking, with Appendix 6 of the UDP requiring 1 cycle storage space per unit for C3 development. The development does not nominate a cycle storage space. However, it is noted that this could be addressed through condition if planning permission were to be granted.
- Relevant guidance for visibility requirements for parked vehicles leaving a site is contained within section 2.4.11 of SPG, which further refers to sightline guidelines in section 5.7.23. These explain that visibility for a driver leaving the parking space must be: in the 'x' dimension (2.4m from back edge of footway) a driver must have clear visibility between 0.6m and 1.0m above the level of the footway for a distance of 2.4m in the 'y' dimension (either side of the driver). This is a triangular shaped area, known as a visibility splay. Any objects higher than 0.6m in this triangular area compromise the visibility splay of the driver in terms of what they can see on the footway approaching the crossover.

The scheme is unable to meet the above SPG policy, as the existing brick wall within the visibility splay triangle reduces the area of visibility significantly (by at least 50 percent), and as such creates an unacceptable potential for pedestrian-vehicle conflict at the crossover. Vehicles would also have to reverse out onto the highway, which could also compromise pedestrian and traffic safety.

The scheme as proposed is considered to compromise pedestrian and traffic safety, however it is noted that given the size of the site it may be capable of accommodating a reconfigured parking arrangement to meet these requirements of the SPG, and that it is expected that in meeting these requirements it would be necessary to reduce the number of car parking spaces from two to one.

- Appendix 6 of the revised UDP contains the relevant parking standards for all use classes, and specifies a maximum of 1 car parking space per residential dwelling. As such, the parking scheme proposes two car parking spaces for the new residential unit and is therefore contrary to this standard.
- With regard to the impact of on street car parking of the development it is noted that the subject section of Fellows Road is not identified as being heavily parked. While the subject site currently provides for four on-site car parking spaces, it is considered that the existing flats on the site would also be eligible for on-street parking permits and thus it would not be reasonable, given the immediately surrounding network is not identified as being heavily parked, as part of this application to impose parking restrictions on the existing flats on the site as part of a Section 106 agreement. However, if Council were to grant planning permission for the scheme it would be considered suitable to impose a car-capped arrangement on the new residential unit, in that this unit would not be eligible for any on-street car parking permits, and in the absence of such an agreement, the proposal is considered to unreasonably impact on the on street parking network. .
- Based on the discussion above the scheme is not considered acceptable. It is noted that reasons for refusal related to the issues discussed above will be accompanied by an informative outlining how these concerns can potentially be addressed.

#### **Internal amenity for future residents of the site:**

- The application proposes to provide a basement level covering the full extent of the existing garden, and a two-storey side and rear extension to the existing end terrace building and a single storey building in the general location of the existing garages.
- The basement level is proposed to accommodate four bedrooms all with en-suites, an open plan dining, kitchen and family area, a utility room including a bathroom, a steam room, gym, and a swimming pool with bathroom attached. A light well runs along the length of the western side boundary of the site (adjacent to the rear boundaries of properties facing Winchester Road). Internal light wells are also provided; to the rear, a light well is flanked by the swimming pool and family area and two light wells are provided to the side and front of the dining room, the light well to the front + also for servicing of the bedrooms. A large void area, extending the two storey height above is provided above the dining area.
- At ground floor level a single storey level is proposed at the rear of the site to accommodate a cinema room

and play room. The building is set in from the side boundaries, and is provided with glazing only on the internal elevation, facing the rear of the existing building. This building has a curved roof with the planted / turf finish.

- A two storey building is provided adjacent to the side of the existing terrace building, accommodating at ground floor reception area and at first floor, a study for the new residential unit. These floors have limited floor space as approximately half of the two-storey building is dedicated to the void servicing the dining area at basement level. Glazing on the side elevation is limited to the ground floor and is generally aligned with the void area, with the exception of the side window to the front bay which also aligns with the void. The rear elevation is dominated with glazing.
- In terms of layout and room sizes, the development is considered to provide the four bedroom dwelling with a functional layout that provides for good internal amenity.
- The scheme would provide for a good level of internal amenity with regard to access to daylight. The applicants have provided an Internal Daylight Report, prepared by consultants GIA, which demonstrates that application meets the BRE Guidelines. The report concludes *"Our analysis illustrates that the proposed scheme will exceed the BRE Guideline recommendations on all three daylight criteria, and in any areas exceed the ideal daylight recommendations. Consequently rooms will appear well lit and the light will be evenly distributed within the proposed rooms."*
- It is noted that the majority of the accommodation is provided at basement level, with rooms along the western side elevation being serviced by the 1.5 – 2 metre wide light court. As such these rooms are not considered to be provided with a high level of amenity with regard to out look, however it is acknowledged that the UDP and the SPG do not explicitly identify the need to protect or provide a good outlook from windows of habitable rooms. As noted above rooms will be provided with good access to daylight and sunlight, which will assist in provide a good level of amenity to these rooms.
- A two storey rear extension is proposed to the existing building on the site, providing additional accommodation for the existing flats. The ground floor flat's access to a dedicated garden space is also maintained.
- Limited windows are provided on the flank elevation to service the existing flats in the building, these being restricted to a modest two storey side extension which is provides limited amenity with regard to outlook or daylight to the existing flats in the building. The removal of this two storey building and the associated windows was been established as acceptable as part of the previous permissions (see above)
- **Impacts on the amenity of the surrounding neighbours:**
- It is considered that the proposal would not adversely impact on the adjacent properties with regard to privacy and overlooking, sunlight and daylight, adverse artificial light, or sense of enclosure, and thus is considered to be consistent with Policy SD6 of the revised UDP.
- The development would not adversely impact on the surrounding properties with regard to privacy and overlooking. As discussed above, the majority of the new residential unit is provided at basement level, and as such negates issues of potential overlooking into the adjoining properties. The proposed two storey building would be adjacent to the side of the existing terrace building, accommodating at ground floor a reception area and at first floor a study for the new residential unit, these levels have a limited floor space as approximately half of the two-storey building is dedicated to the void servicing the dinning area at basement level.

Glazing on the side elevation is limited to the ground floor and is generally aligned with the void area, with the exception of the side window to the bay, which also aligns with the void. It is noted a landscaping screen is proposed along the western flank elevation further restricting views from the ground floor. Given the glazing on the flank elevation generally services the void to the dining area at the basement level. As such there would be no opportunities for views from the new building to the west.

It is noted that if it were minded to grant planning permission, a condition would be needed to remove permitted development rights [Part 1 (Classes A-H) of Schedule 2 of that Order], in order to protect the amenity of the surrounding properties.

The rear elevation, which services the reception area at ground floor and study at first floor is provided with full length windows on the rear elevation. While the windows would be afforded views of the rear portions of gardens of the surrounding properties, windows are not within 18 metres of habitable rooms, and as such are not considered to result in unreasonable views into these properties. The existing building on the site is provided with windows on the rear elevation, and these are considered to be no more intensive that those currently provided. It is noted that extensive vegetation is along the side boundaries which would screen views to the rear.



- The proposal is not considered to result in adverse artificial light pollution to the surrounding properties, as development is located away from residences on adjoining properties. Glazing on rear elevation is not considered to unreasonably impact on surrounding properties.
- The development would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding properties with regard to access to sunlight and daylight or sense of enclosure. As discussed previously, the side and rear extension follow the footprint of the previously approved schemes, and the majority of the new unit is provided at ground level.
- The proposal would not adversely impact on the outlook of adjoining properties, being appropriately recessed from side boundaries at ground and first floor levels and having appropriate regard for the siting of built form on adjoining properties. As discussed previously, the proposed side extension and ground and first floor level will allow for sufficient open space to the side of the building to not adversely reduce the open character to the side of the existing building or disrupt the established pattern of development. The proposal would not encroach on the views of adjoining properties or adversely harm their outlook.
- The application involves the addition to two external plant items. The applicant has provided correspondence from Bonair Ltd with regard to the units, who commented; *'We expect that we shall require the use of two outdoor condensing units Daikin model RXYSQ6M (1345mm high x 900mm wide x 320mm deep) to be located at basement level within the light well trench between grid lines I and H [see drawing 1148(PRO\_LAY)101]. The wall behind will be lined with acoustic tiles to further reduce any reverberation noise. The sunken location of these units together with their small footprint and ultra low noise levels will ensure that they will neither be visible nor heard from any of the adjoining properties.'*

Notwithstanding previous comments, if planning permission were to be granted it would be considered necessary to put a condition on the permission requiring the submission of an acoustic report demonstrating that the proposed units would meet Councils requirements with regard to Policies SD6, SD7, SD8A and Appendix 1 (Noise and vibration thresholds).

- Policy SD6 also identifies the need for adequate facilities for storage, recycling and disposal of waste. Layout plans identify the provision of three storage facilities for waste collection within the front garden area of the site, adjacent to new boundary with the existing flats on the site. While plans do not nominate an area for storage of waste for the existing flats, the front garden area is considered to be of a sufficient size to accommodate these facilities. If planning permission were to be granted it would be considered necessary request further details of facilities for storage, recycling and disposal of waste.
- It is noted that if planning permission were to be granted, assessment of the application against Building Regulations would ensure that the stability of the surrounding land would be considered in checking the design and construction under the Building Regulations 2000, under which permission would only be granted when deemed acceptable in this regard. If planning permission were granted an informative would be placed the decision indicating the need to comply with the Building Regulations.

#### **Sustainability:**

- While it is not a compulsory requirement for an application of this nature to address Policy SD9, the proposal has adopted sustainable aspects, including a green roof system and turf roof system which would allow for area above the basement to function as a garden area. Windows are also proposed to be double glazed to improve the thermal efficiency of the building.
- It is noted that if planning permission were to be granted, further details would be required to clarify the extent of planting over the basement and that this vegetation could be sustained.

#### **Lifetime home and wheelchair housing:**

- As this is an application for a new dwelling, Approved Document M of the Building Regulations applies in full (covering Standards 1,3,5,6,7,10,12,14, and 15 of Lifetime Homes). In addition planning policy H7 requires that all new dwellings be built to Lifetime Homes Standards.
- In correspondence dated 24 July 2006, the applicant made the following comments regarding Policy H7.

*Disabled people can reach the principle entrance, or a suitable alternative, from the point of access to the site. This would be the case here as surface level access will be available from the main entrance. Pedestrian entrance is separate from vehicular access an additional advantage of the scheme.*

*Disable people will be able to gain access into and within the dwellings principle story and sanitary accommodation at ground floor level will be provided.*

*The layout makes provision for wheel chair turning area at ground floor level and the front entrance and*

*internal doors at ground floor level will be of sufficient width. Sockets and other controls will be located at a convenient height.*

- Lifetime Homes also require, due to the size of a dwelling, a ground floor WC and shower facility. There are a number of other requirements relating to the detailed design, however there is insufficient information on the drawings to assess whether they have been met.
- Further details are considered necessary to make a comprehensive assessment of the scheme's compliance with Lifetime Home standards, as discussed above. As such, the scheme as proposed is not considered suitable on several grounds. It is considered appropriate that an informative be placed on the decision outlining that Council would expect the scheme for the new residential unit on the site to meet Lifetime Home Standards.

**Appropriateness of demolition:**

- Based on the discussion above it is evident that the scheme as proposed is not considered suitable for support, thus the granting of Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the garages in the absence of an approved scheme for its replacement would be likely to result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area contrary to policies B7 (Conservation areas) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Refuse

**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***