Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry	y Date: 30/05/2014			
		N/A / attached		Consu Expiry	Date:	74/11/21/2111/2		
Carlos Martin			Application Nu 2014/2073/P	Application Number(s) 2014/2073/P				
Application Address			Drawing Numb	Drawing Numbers				
3 West End Lane London NW6 1RL			Refer to draft de	Refer to draft decision notice				
PO 3/4 Area Tea	m Signature	C&UD	Authorised Of	ficer Si	gnature			
Proposal(s)								
Installation of glass roof over rear lightwell at ground floor level.								
Recommendation(s):								
Application Type: Full Planni		ing Permission						
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft	Refer to Draft Decision Notice						
Informatives:								
Consultations								
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	22	No. of responses	00	No. of o	bjections	00	
			No. electronic	00				
Summary of consultation responses:	No response							
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	None; not in	CA.						

#### **Site Description**

The application site relates to a three-storey modern mews house located within a development of mews houses. The site is not listed and does not form part of any conservation area.

## **Relevant History**

2013/6866/P: Installation of glass roof over rear lightwell at ground floor level. Granted

### **Relevant policies**

**NPPF 2012** 

The London Plan 2011

#### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2011

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 Securing high quality design

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 2013 (design)

# **Assessment**

Planning permission is sought for the installation of a glass roof to cover the existing rear lightwell. The cover would be mechanically operable to give the benefit of being indoors and outdoors.

Although the loss of outdoor amenity space is not encouraged in the LDF, in this case the acceptability of enclosing the rear lightwell has already been established with the granting of planning permission for a similar proposal in 2013, on the basis that is a space of little amenity value and the proposal to cover it with an openable glass roof was not considered to be detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers. The current proposal is similar to the previous one. The only difference being that the glazed enclosure is subdivided with transoms and mullions.

The new roof would not be visible from the public realm and so no objections are raised with regards to its impact on the character of the building or the area.

The proposal does not raise any neighbouring amenity concerns.

Recommendation: Grant