

- **Application Number** 2014/2651/P
- **Application Type** Full Planning Permission
- **Addresses** 86 West End Lane, London, NW6 2LX
- **Development Types** Residential Extension

As a resident of No 84 West End Lane, I object to this Planning Application on the following grounds:

- 1) Development in a Conservation Area that does not preserve or enhance the special character or appearance of the area as set out in Policy DP25.2 – the applicant has submitted a series of applications for this building rather than one application revealing the true extent of the development and intended development.

That series started with the basement, which was excavated far beyond the footprint of the building into the garden (which has been almost completely concreted over as shown in the picture below); both extent and loss of character to the garden area being inconsistent with the South Hampstead Conservation Area Management Strategy. Then a side extension was built with excavation for a staircase to the basement level. A basement level extension and roof terrace has just been approved and the current application is for a further extension to the second floor roof area, which is itself a further story to an older extension.

I understand that the applicant was told by the planning officer that planning permission would not be granted for any further extension to the roof of his property, but he withdrew the last application 2014/0645/P before it could be formally rejected. This was just a week or two before he made the current application. My objection is therefore substantially the same as my objection to 2014/0645/P.

The scale and density of the development over this series of applications is much greater than each individual application and we should ask that the full extent of the development is considered and not only the individual component applications. A series of applications, particularly with the last two being so close together, seems entirely unnecessary if the full extent of the development is considered. During this series of commercial and residential developments, the applicant has shown little understanding of the impact of his ongoing development on the neighbouring properties.

It is notable that the applicant does not mention the series of planning permissions in the community infrastructure levy form submitted. That only deals with the roof extension proposed in this application. It conveniently sits within the 100m2 limit by only referring to the roof extension – there is no mention of the basement extension.

- 2) Overshadowing and impact on outlook, sunlight and daylight as set out in Policy DP26.3 - the current application for a roof extension to accommodate two studio flats would add additional height and bulk to an already extended building which now has permission for a further extension at basement level. As far as we can see from the application, the applicant has again only provided pictures showing the impact of the extension on his own garden. The pictures below are taken from No84 towards No86 and show a different aspect. We believe that the scale of additional height and bulk of the brick wall required will lead to overshadowing and impact on outlook, sunlight and daylight to No84 and we would ask that this is considered in accordance with Policy DP26.3.

- 3) Noise and vibration— Policy DP26 - the applicant has built an extension to the side of No86 using the gable wall of No. 84 which received planning permission retrospectively but has never had any permission from No84, nor any Party Wall Act Agreement. Given the side extension is a likely means of access to the rear of the building during construction, we have a clear concern that there will be further noise and vibration immediately adjacent to that gable wall. We cannot see how the noise and vibration during construction has been addressed in the application, which is inconsistent with Policy DP26.



Left: Typical gardens in the South Hampstead Conservation Area and the concreted garden at No 86 West End Lane

Right: Existing extension. Application 2014/0645/P would be for an extension of the wall above the two drains shown and up to the same level as the highest point shown.



Above: detail of the existing brickwork. It is not clear from application 2014/0645/P how the brickwork will fit in with the existing selections of brick.