

Delegated Report		Expiry Date:	08/04/2015	Officer:	David Peres Da Costa
Application Address		Application Number(s)	1st Signature	2nd Signature	
351 West End Lane London NW6 1LT		2015/0871/P			
Proposal(s)					
Erection of front extension to existing restaurant					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission			
Application Type:		Full planning permission			
Consultations	Date advertised	21 days elapsed	Date posted	21 days elapsed	
Press notice	12/3/15	2/4/15	Site notice	6/3/15	27/3/15
	Date sent	21 days elapsed	# Notified	# Responses	# Objections
Adjoining Occupier letters	3/3/15	24/3/15	56	2	1
Consultation responses (including CAACs):	I have concerns about the extension eating into pavement space. The pavement narrows significantly at that corner, and the extension, by blocking vision and also by pushing people to the outer edge of the pavement could prove dangerous. One letter of support received.				
Site Description					
The site is 3 storey semi-detached property at the corner of West End Lane and Cannon Hill. The site falls within the West End Green Conservation Area and the building is identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area. The site also falls within the West Hampstead Town Centre (but is not in a core or secondary frontage) and the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan area.					
Relevant History					
2009/0756/P: Use of part of the ground floor and the basement as restaurant and cafe (Use Class A3). <u>Certificate of lawfulness (existing) Granted 07/05/2009</u>					
2014/1304/P: Change of use of rear of ground floor from class C3 (residential flat) to class A3 (restaurant). Granted 02/04/2014					

Relevant policies

NPPF 2012

The London Plan March 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 (Distribution of Growth)

CS5 (Managing the Impact of Growth and Development)

CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)

CS14 (Promoting High Quality Places and Conserving Our Heritage)

DP16 (The transport implications of development)

DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport)

DP24 (Securing High Quality Design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the Impact of Development on Occupiers and Neighbours)

Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan

Policy 2 (Design & Character)

Policy 3 (Safeguarding and enhancing Conservation Areas and heritage sites)

Policy 9 (Pavements & Pedestrians)

West End Green Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (Feb 2011) Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 9

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design chapter 7

CPG7 Transport chapter 8

Assessment

Proposal: Permission is sought for a front extension to the existing restaurant. The front extension would not extend the full width of the shopfront and the front entrance would be maintained in the existing position. The extension would measure 1.3m by 3.54m and would have pitched glazed roof. The extension would be 3m high at the rear (where it adjoins the rear elevation) and 2.64m at the front. These measurements would be from external pavement level. The proposed shopfront would be subdivided with 4 panels of glazing above a subdivided stallriser. The extension would be built above the existing wooden deck (0.27m high) and would replace the existing external seating area with timber enclosure (0.75m high).

Assessment:

Design

The building is one half of a semi-detached period property with a uniform frontage and traditional shopfront elements including pilasters with corbels which clearly delineate the existing shopfront.

Policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) states that development should consider the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape and should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street or ignore patterns or groupings of buildings. The West End Green conservation area statement stresses the harm that can be caused by poor quality shopfronts to the uniformity of the area. *The almost uniform pattern of shop fronts defined by scroll dividers, a canopy, cornice and subdivided window with door or doors, is now overlaid by large signs, plate glass windows and many poorly designed shop fronts* (paragraph 5.4). *Shop front details were traditionally in timber with large awnings and street displays. This pattern has now been eroded by many alterations* (paragraph 5.6).

The conservation area concludes that 'West End Lane is absolutely central to the character, vitality and history of the conservation area' and 'the decline of the shop fronts is detrimental to the area' (paragraph 9). It also concludes 'shopfront design is a particular cause for concern' (paragraph 6.3). The conservation area further emphasizes guidance on shopfront design in paragraph 7.3. *It is important that shopfronts maintain the visual character and appearance of the street through respect for the proportions, rhythm and form of the original frontages* (paragraph 7.3).

The proposed front extension to the restaurant shopfront would be an incongruous addition in an otherwise uniform building line. It would not be in keeping with the character of the period property and would harm the uniformity of the semi-detached pair. The proposed extension would not respect the rhythm of the original frontages and would represent a further erosion of the shopfronts within the conservation area.

Whilst the detailed design of the proposed extension would reflect the appearance of the existing shopfront, the protrusion of a front extension with glazed pitch roof would be harmful to the appearance of the semi-detached pair and the wider conservation area.

Amenity

The 1.3m deep and 2.64m high extension (3m high at the rear) would have limited impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of daylight or sunlight and would not result in any loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

Pedestrian Movement

The width of the pavement is approximately 2.4m on the corner with Cannon Hill and then widens so it would be 4.2m in front of other side of the shopfront (to the east). Whilst the extension is not the full width of the shopfront, an extension in this location would result in a narrowing of the footway. Whilst the extension would occupy an existing timber decked seating area, this seating area appears to be unauthorised and is likely to be an ad hoc addition. Camden Streetscape Design Manual indicates that a minimum 1.8m of clear footway is required for two adults passing. Camden Planning Guidance CPG7 Transport states the Council will seek to maximise the width of footways wherever possible (paragraph 8.9) and any minimum standards for footway widths should not be used to justify the provision of unnecessary street clutter or reduction in footway width. The extension would project 1.3m beyond the existing shopfront and would narrow the width of the footway to approximately 1.65m (close to the corner with Cannon Hill), harming the ease of pedestrian movement.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission