

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>19/06/2014</b>
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>29/05/2014</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Tania Skelli-Yaoz			2014/2651/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
86 West End Lane London NW6 2LX			See decision notice	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
Enlargement of mansard roof extension at 2nd floor level to create additional space to existing studio flats.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Refuse planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Full Planning Permission			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>
<b>Informatives:</b>	

### Consultations

<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>27</b>	No. of responses	<b>06</b>	No. of objections	<b>06</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		

<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>In addition to the above, a site notice was displayed outside the site between 2/5/14-23/5/14 and a press notice was advertised on 8/5/14.</p> <p><u>6 adjoining residents have raised objections to the proposal, on the following grounds:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development is out of keeping with area and harmful to CA, contrary to policy DP25.</li> <li>- Loss of privacy to gardens of 84 West End Lane (WEL) and adjoining nursery children.</li> <li>- Similar objections were made to previous proposal which are not addressed in this proposal.</li> <li>- This proposal should be viewed/considered together with that for the elevated terrace (2013/8232/P)</li> <li>- Numerous previous extensions at this site</li> <li>- Loss of amenity including loss of privacy, loss of daylight &amp; sunlight and overshadowing</li> <li>- Disturbance during construction from increase of noise &amp; vibration, odour, dust &amp; fumes and highway obstruction</li> <li>- small successive planning application must be cumulatively assessed</li> <li>- overdevelopment</li> <li>- party wall disputes between site and no. 84</li> <li>-</li> </ul>
---	---

<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify	None received.
--	----------------

### Site Description

Substantial 3-storey plus basement detached Victorian property on the east side of WEL close to the junction with West Hampstead Mews. The building is used as a bridge club (Class D2) with flats above. The site is within the South Hampstead Conservation Area (CA).

### Relevant History

**2014/0645/P** proposal for rear extension at roof level to provide two additional residential flats. WITHDRAWN April 2014 following advice by officer that proposal is unacceptable.

**2013/8232/P** pp granted on 21/02/2014 for the erection of a single storey rear extension at basement level with terrace and associated balustrade above.

**2003/0731/P** pp was granted on 24/11/2003 for the excavation of front lightwells to be covered with flat metal grills, the excavation and erection of a basement rear extension with pea gravel roof with timber framed rooflight and a sunken rear terrace with railings, the formation of a disabled access on the flank elevation, together with associated landscaping all as an extension and improvement to the existing Bridge Club (Class D2) [part implemented. The basement extension was built at a shallower level with no terrace]

**1998** – refusal of pp for a ground floor rear extension and flat in basement – refused as the extension was over dominant – an appeal was dismissed.

**1992** – pp for a 2-storey rear extension – implemented

### **Relevant policies**

#### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2013:

CPG1 (Design) – section 5

CPG6 (Amenity) – Sections 6 and 7

South Hampstead Conservation Area character appraisal and management strategy (2011)

## Assessment

The main issues for consideration are a) design and the impact on the surrounding South Hampstead conservation area and b) impact on neighbouring amenity.

### Land use:

Whilst new residential accommodation in the borough is normally welcome, this has to be balanced against other policies and guidance. In this case the studio units are not considered a high priority within the private sector, in accordance with policy DP5 of the Camden LDF. Also, this policy together with Camden Policy Guidance (CPG) no. 1 recommends that 1-person units are no smaller than 32sqm in area. The proposed extension to flats 9 and 10 will bring the total floor area of each flat to the minimum 1-person floor area standard of 32sqm as per CPG1.

### Design and conservation:

The site is not listed but lies within the South-Hampstead Conservation Area (CA). As such, new developments require high quality design that is in keeping with the building and its surroundings as well as designed so to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the CA. Whilst the development is proposed to the rear and is not visible from the front elevation of the building, the rear elevation is easily visible from its two sides; Compayne Gardens and West Hampstead Mews. Moreover, as the host building has been extended in the past to its rear the proposed further extension will result in over-development, to an extent that will be harmful to the appearance of the host building and the CA. Paragraph 7.16 of the South Hampstead Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy states that roof alterations should not result in increased visual bulk. The proposed roof addition to the rear elevation will appear bulky and top-heavy and protrude beyond the adjoining building in a harmful manner to the detriment of the CA. As such, the proposal fails policies DP24 and DP25.

Amenity: the proposal is not considered to result in loss of daylight or sunlight to the adjoining properties. Loss of privacy to gardens cannot be supported as such views are part of the established views from the existing openings in the building and the extension is unlikely to increase this. Accordingly, the proposal would not fail policy DP26.

Transport: the rear area of the site is large and can provide sufficient space for construction. However, as West End Lane is heavy with vehicle and pedestrian movements it is recommended to add a condition for details of a Construction Management Statement (CMS) in the event of the proposal considered acceptable. As no new units are proposed there is no requirement for the securing of the studios to be car-free.

In summary, the proposal for the roof extension is considered harmful to the building and views from adjoining streets and thereby the South Hampstead CA at large. The enlargement of the existing studio flats would be beneficial to future occupiers, however it cannot outweigh the harm to the building and CA as discussed above.

**Recommendation:** Refuse planning permission.