

Delegated Report		Expiry Date:	06/06/2014	Officer:	David Peres Da Costa
Application Address		Application Number(s)	1st Signature	2nd Signature	
14 Daleham Mews London NW3 5DB		2014/1909/P			
Proposal(s)					
Change of use of part of ground floor vehicle repair garage (Class B2) to utility / storage room ancillary to first floor flat (Class C3) and erection of first floor rear extension to flat.					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission			
Application Type:		Full planning permission			
Consultations	Date advertised	21 days elapsed	Date posted	21 days elapsed	
Press notice	24/4/14	15/5/14	Site notice	23/4/14	14/5/14
	Date sent	21 days elapsed	# Notified	# Responses	# Objections
Adjoining Occupier letters	16/4/14	7/5/14	5	0	0
Consultation responses (including CAACs):	Belsize CAAC: No objection provided uPVC is not used.				
Site Description					
The site is a top floor flat located on the western side of Daleham Mews. The building is not listed but is located within the Belsize Park Conservation Area. The ground floor has historically been used as an motor vehicle repair business (class B2) and dates back to the 1970s. It is noted that Daleham Mews has a history of many mixed use developments, with business at the ground floor and residential use above.					
Relevant History					
2011/5035/P: Erection of timber screen fence to rear boundary of existing flat (Class C3). <u>Granted</u> 08/12/2011					
2013/5859/P: Rear extension at first floor level, in connection with the change of use from existing garage for motor vehicle repairs (Class B2) with residential flat above, to a single dwelling house (class C3). <u>Refused</u> 11/11/2013					
Reasons for refusal:					
1. The proposed development would result in the loss of employment floorspace in the form of a vehicle repair garage, which it has not been adequately demonstrated is not suitable for use, and in the loss of employment opportunities within the Borough.					
2. The proposed rear extension, by reason of its height, bulk, mass and detailed design, would be					

an incongruous and dominant addition to the building, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding conservation area.

3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing car-free housing, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area and would fail to promote use of sustainable modes of transport.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 – Distribution of growth

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS8 – Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP2 – Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing

DP13 – Employment premises and sites

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance – CPG 1 Design – chapter 4

Belsize Park Conservation Area Statement

London Plan 2011

NPPF 2012

Assessment

Proposal: This application is a resubmission of the application (ref: 2013/5859/P) for rear extension at first floor level, in connection with the change of use from existing garage for motor vehicle repairs (Class B2) with residential flat above, to a single dwelling house that was refused 11/11/2013.

The application differs in the following ways:

- The vehicle repair garage would be retained with only 12.74sqm of existing garage floorspace on the ground floor converted to a utility / storage room which would be ancillary to the existing 1st floor flat
- The proposed first floor extension has been lowered in height so that it does not project above the eaves level of the existing building.

Assessment

Land use:

The loss of 12.74sqm of garage floorspace is not considered significant and would be unlikely to harm the viability of the existing vehicle repair garage. There is therefore no objection to this element of the proposal.

Design:

Policy DP24 requires new development to meet a high standard of design which respects the setting, context, and the proportions and character of the existing building. The Council provides specific guidance on extensions in Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 Design. Rear extensions should be designed to respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style. In order for new extensions to be subordinate to the original building, their heights should respect the existing pattern of rear extensions, where they exist. Ground floor extensions are generally considered preferable to those at higher levels. In most cases, extensions

that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, will be strongly discouraged.

Whilst the proposed extension would be lower than the previously refused proposal (extending only to eaves level), the extension would still have an uncomfortable relationship with the rear elevation of the host property and would appear incongruous and clumsy. It is acknowledged that the extension would not be readily visible as it would be located behind an existing timber privacy screen. Nevertheless, as the screen may be removed or may rot (and not be replaced in its entirety), it is important that the extension has an acceptable relationship with the host property. Furthermore, the extension would not be one full storey below eaves level and therefore would be contrary to policy as set out in CPG 1 Design.

It is acknowledged that there is a first floor extension at no. 12 Daleham Mews. This extension is approximately the same height as the eaves at Daleham Mews, and was granted permission in 1970 (Council reference G7/7/3/7724), long prior to the establishment of the Council's current policies, and the conservation area that the site is within. This development should therefore not be considered as a type of development which should be replicated. The proposal is therefore considered to be of an incongruous design, which would not accord with the high standards of design expected by policy DP24, and would fail to preserve and enhance the Belsize Park Conservation Area, making it contrary to policy DP25.

Amenity:

The extension would not harm neighbouring amenity as there is an existing party wall which extends up to eaves level on the boundary with No. 12 and there is an existing high level timber privacy screen between the host property and the properties on Daleham Gardens.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission