Delegated Report			Analysis sheet			Expiry	Date:	15/01/20	)14
			N/A			Consultation Expiry Date:		02/01/20	)14
Officer				Application Nu					
Aysegul Olcar-	lin	2013/7482/P							
<b>Application A</b>				Drawing Numbers					
37 Heath Stree									
London			See decision i			otion			
NW3 6TR			See decision r			otice			
PO 3/4 Area Tea		am Signature   C&UD			Authorised Officer Signature				
		<u>_</u>							
Dropool									
Proposal									
Replacement of extract duct and fan to rear elevation and roof.									
Recommenda	tion:	Grant conditional permission							
rtoooniiiionaationi									
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission							
for Refusal:									
Information -		Refer to Draft Decision Notice							
Informatives:									
Consultations	5								
A all a lasta as O a seco		No. notified	05	No	. of responses	00	No. of ob	ojections	00
Adjoining Occup	oiers:				·			•	
				No	. electronic	00			
		A site notice	was displa	ayed	from 11/12/2013	to 01/	01/2014.	A press no	tice
Summary of cor	sultation	was advertised on 12/12/2013.							
responses:									
		No response has been received.							
CAAC/Local groups		None							
comments:									

# **Site Description**

The application site is a four storey end of terrace property located on the west side of Heath Drive close to its junction with Holly Bush Vale in the Hampstead Conservation Area. The property has a two storey rear extension and existing ducting in association with the ground floor A3 restaurant unit which is the subject of this application. There are residential flats above the restaurant.

The site is within the designated Hampstead Town Centre. The surrounding area is characterised by mainly properties with commercial uses at ground floor and residential above.

# **Relevant History**

None

### Relevant policies

# **National Planning Policy Framework 2012**

The London Plan 2011

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS7 – Promoting Camden's centres and shops

CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP12 – Supporting strong centres and managing impact of food, drink, entertainment and other town centre uses

DP24 - Securing high quality design

DP25 - Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

DP28- Noise and vibration

#### **Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

CPG 1 – Design

CPG 6 – Amenity

# **Hampstead Conservation Area Statement 2001**

#### Assessment

#### Proposal

It is proposed to replace the existing ducting with more efficient ducting with acoustic attenuation at the rear. The proposal would also include a new kitchen extract fan (Helios GBD 560/4/4 T120).

### **Design and Impact on Conservation Area**

Policy DP24 requires all development to consider the character, setting, context, scale and proportions of the existing and neighbouring buildings. Policy DP25 also states that the Council will grant planning permission for development in Camden's Conservation Areas that preserves and enhances the special character or appearance of the area. Section 11 of CPG1 suggests that building service equipment where, because of its nature, it cannot be integrated within the building should not be a dominant feature of the building and cause visual blight.

The existing duck runs through the roof of the existing rear extension and is against the rear elevation of the building. The proposed duct would be sited in the same location as the existing and it would be slightly chunkier than the existing ducting but it would not be readily visible from the public views.

The fact an existing duct is in situ is a strong material consideration to justify a replacement on this particular building, moreover the applicant demonstrates that a slightly larger duct is required in order to mitigate any environmental nuisance. On balance the protection of neighbouring amenity

outweighs any visual harm that the larger duct may create.

The rear of the terrace which the application property forms part has a utilitarian appearance with pipe works and another ducting which is similar in appearance to the existing ducting. The proposed ducting would be very similar to the existing ducting in appearance and would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The fact an existing duct is in situ is a strong material consideration to justify a replacement on this particular building, moreover the applicant demonstrates that a slightly larger duct is required in order to mitigate any environmental nuisance. On balance the protection of neighbouring amenity outweighs any visual harm that the larger duct may create. On balance, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in design terms.

# **Neighbouring Amenity**

Policy DP28 seeks to ensure that noise and vibration is controlled and managed and will not grant planning permission for development likely to generate noise pollution; or development sensitive to noise in locations with noise pollution, unless appropriate attenuation measures are provided. The Noise and Vibration Thresholds set out in Table E of this policy need to be complied in this case.

The applicants submitted an acoustic assessment report dated November 2013 to demonstrate that noise from the new equipment would be 10dBA below the prevailing background noise level at 1m outside windows of the nearest affected noise-sensitive property. According to the report the closest windows of the adjoining flats would be 5m from the location of the new fan and the lowest background noise measured as 43dB. The noise level from the proposed equipment subject to installation of a silencer is expected to be 32dBA.

The Council's environmental health officer was concerned that the distance to the nearest affected window was less than 5m and required further information. In order to address this, the applicants submitted another drawing illustrating the noise levels to the existing rear windows of the residential properties in the building. In the light of the submitted information the officer was satisfied that the proposed equipment could meet Camden noise criteria and recommended a condition for a time clock.

Subject to a recommended condition the proposal is considered not to harm the amenities of the nearby properties.

**Recommendation:** Grant conditional planning permission.