

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		17/08/2015	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:			
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Carlos Martin				2015/3516/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
10 Rossllyn Hill London NW3 1PH				Refer to draft decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Widen existing opening on the front boundary wall to create a vehicular entrance with new timber sliding gate and associated dropped kerb.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	42	No. of responses	09	No. of objections	08
				No. electronic	09		
Summary of consultation responses:		Press notice published from 30/07/2015 to 20/08/2015 Site notice displayed from 24/07/2015 to 14/08/2015 9x objections and 1 comment received.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		The Heath & Hampstead Society: objects Hampstead CAAC: No response.					

Site Description

The application site is a five storey dwelling house comprising lower ground, ground, first, second and third floors. It forms part of a semi-detached pair of villas together with no. 8 Rossllyn Hill. The pair form a single architectural composition that are notable for their grand appearance, design merit and symmetry. The plot is characterised by mature planting to both the front and rear.

Similar semi-detached residential properties adjoin the site on all sides, with the exception of the grade II listed No. 12 Rossllyn Hill (on the junction of Rossllyn Hill and Hampstead Hill Gardens) immediately to the north-west of the application site.

The site is located within the Hampstead Conservation Area and the building is considered to make a positive contribution to its character and appearance.

Relevant History

2012/4902/P – Planning permission was **granted on 15/11/2012** for the the enlargement of front basement lightwell, installation of new York Stone steps to side elevation and hard and soft landscaping to the front of existing residential dwelling (Class C3).

2010/6339/P – Planning permission was **granted on 24/01/2011** for the erection of a 2 storey side extension at lower ground and ground level with external staircase to rear elevation following demolition of existing extension;, and various fenestration alterations including installation of sash windows to rear and side elevations (Class C3).

2010/4543/P – Planning permission was **granted on 19/10/2010** for a change of use from two self-contained residential units into a single dwelling house (Class C3) and associated alterations to rear elevation lower ground floor bay window.

2007/6411/P – Planning permission was **refused on 03/07/2008** for the formation of a new vehicular entrance with metal gates and associated hard standing for one car space.

Reasons for refusal:

- 1. The proposed forecourt hardstanding and associated vehicular entrance, by reason of the introduction of a new gated opening and of the partial loss of landscaped garden space and of historical front wall (both characteristic of the streetscene), would erode the character of the streetscape and would harm the setting of the row of properties at nos. 4 - 10 and the character and appearance of the conservation area, contrary to policies S1, S2, B1, B3, B7 and T9 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and advice contained in the Camden Planning Guidance 2006.*
- 2. The proposed vehicular entrance would effectively remove two onstreet parking bays and therefore reduce the capacity of the Hampstead Controlled Parking Zone which would be detrimental to local parking conditions, contrary to policy T9 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and advice contained in the Camden Planning Guidance 2006.*

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan 2015 consolidated with alterations since 2011– Policy 6.13

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy (2010)

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS11 Promoting sustainable and efficient travel

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

Development Policies (2010)

DP18 Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking

DP19 Managing the impact of parking
DP21 Development connecting to the highway network
DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

Supplementary Planning Policies

Camden Planning Guidance 1 Design (2015)
Camden Planning Guidance 3 Sustainability (2015)
Camden Planning Guidance 7 Transport

Hampstead Conservation Area Statement (2001)

Assessment

Proposal

1. Planning permission is sought for to widen the existing opening on the front boundary wall to create a vehicular entrance with new timber sliding gate and associated dropped kerb.
2. The application is a resubmission of a similar proposal refused in 2007 (see history section above).

Main planning considerations

3. The main planning considerations are the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and the conservation area generally and its impact on parking.

Design and conservation

4. The Hampstead conservation area statement identifies nos. 4-10 Rosslyn Hill as buildings which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Furthermore, no. 12 Rosslyn Hill which directly adjoins the application site to the north west is a Grade II Listed Building. Accordingly, any works need to have regard to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the special architectural interest of the Listed Building.
5. In general, alterations to the front boundary treatment and provision of hard standing are considered to be contrary to DP25 which seeks to preserve the character and appearance of conservation areas. The character of the front gardens along Rosslyn Hill are well maintained semi-detached properties setback from the street with well-established front gardens, several of these properties have hard standings. No. 10 Rosslyn Hill is part of a row of matching semi-detached properties at nos. 4-10 that remain largely unaltered. The established gardens and historic front garden wall, which runs the full length of the row, remains completely intact. The current proposal is an improvement from the previous submission, as the hard standing area has been significantly reduced along with the proposed alterations to the front boundary wall, which now involve widening an existing gate rather than creating an entirely new one, as previously proposed. However, it is considered that the principle of allowing parking at the forecourt would establish an undesirably precedent that may undermine the ability of the Council to resist similar proposals in the future, which may compromise the pattern and visual integrity of this part of the conservation area, and hence be detrimental to the character and appearance of the row of matching properties, and thus the conservation area and streetscene.

Parking

6. The site is located in the Belsize controlled parking zone (CA-B) which operates between 0900 and 1830 hours on Monday to Friday and 0930 to 1330 on Saturday. Our records indicate that the CPZ suffers from parking stress with a ratio of parking permits to parking spaces of 1.10 (i.e. 110 parking permits issued per 100 parking spaces). In addition, the site has a PTAL rating of 5 (excellent) which means it is highly accessible by public transport. Residents parking bays are located on Rosslyn Hill directly adjacent to the property. The proposal would require the loss of at least 1 on-street parking space.
7. The Council assesses planning applications against the Local Development Framework. This includes our Core Strategies, Development Policies, and Planning Guidance. The transport implications of the

proposal have been assessed against the following:

- Core Strategy CS11 - Promoting sustainable and efficient travel
 - Development Policy DP18 - Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking
 - Development Policy DP19 – Managing the impact of parking
 - Development Policy DP21 - Development connecting to the highway network
8. We have also assessed the proposal against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
9. The NPPF states that at its heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the Development Plan without delay. The proposal would not constitute sustainable development as it would involve the loss of on-street parking spaces. It would also promote private car ownership and use in an area which is easily accessible by public transport.
10. Core Strategy CS11 amongst other things seeks to make private transport more sustainable, which includes minimising provision for private parking in new developments. This is reinforced by CS11 paragraph 11.17 of the supporting text which states that the Council will continue to limit the amount of parking available for private cars, which represents a key part of its approach to addressing congestion and promoting sustainable transport choices. CS11 paragraph 11.21 states that demand for movement, deliveries and car parking on Camden’s roads already exceeds the space available, meaning that effective management of Camden’s road network is essential.
11. Development Policy DP18 supports CS11 and states that the Council will seek to ensure that developments provide the minimum necessary car parking provision and will expect development to be car-free in, amongst other things, areas within Controlled Parking Zones that are easily accessible by public transport. Again, this sentiment is reinforced by the supporting text of DP18, particularly paragraphs 18.2 to 18.4.
12. Development Policy DP19 builds on the approach set out in DP18 by addressing the potential impacts of parking associated with development in terms of on-street parking conditions and wider environmental considerations. DP19 states that the Council will resist development that would:
- add to on-street parking demand where on-street parking spaces cannot meet existing demand, or otherwise harm existing on-street parking conditions;
 - require detrimental amendment to existing or proposed Controlled Parking Zones;
 - create a shortfall of public car parking, operational business parking or residents’ parking.
13. The above points are reinforced by the supporting text of DP19, particularly paragraphs 19.3 to 19.9.
14. Paragraph 19.3 of DP19 states that on-street car parking spaces are a limited resource, and demand exceeds supply in much of the borough. They cater for residents who do not have off-street spaces at home as well as for people visiting businesses and services. The Council manages on-street parking on the basis of designated Controlled Parking Zones, in which regulations control how parking may be used on different sections of the street and at different times. There is a particularly high demand for on-street parking by residents in areas with a low availability of drives or garages.
15. Paragraph 19.4 of DP19 states that development that will reduce the amount of on-street parking or add to on-street parking demand will be resisted where it would cause unacceptable parking pressure, particularly in areas of identified parking stress. Our records indicate that the site is located in a controlled parking zone which suffers from parking stress. The proposal would exacerbate this problem.
16. Development Policy DP21 builds on CS11 which states that the Council will ensure that growth and development has regard to Camden’s road hierarchy and does not cause harm to the management of the road network. DP21 states that the Council will expect works affecting highways to:
- avoid disruption to the highway network and its function (this includes the provision of on-street car

parking facilities);

- avoid harm to on-street parking conditions or require detrimental amendment to Controlled Parking Zones.

17. Paragraph 21.9 of DP21 states that given the high level of parking stress experienced in much of Camden, the creation of new links to access development should not involve overall loss of one or more on-street parking spaces, particularly in areas of parking stress.
18. The proposal would clearly be unacceptable in transport terms based on the above points as it would be contrary to the NPPF, CS11, DP18, DP19 and DP21. The planning application involves the provision of off-street car parking facilities and should therefore be refused.
19. The results of the parking survey, while helpful, do not overcome the fact that the proposal is not sustainable.
20. It is worth noting that the Council has recently refused similar planning applications at 3 Fellows Road and 36 Hemstal Road. Both applicants subsequently appealed these decisions. However, the Planning Inspectorate found in the Council's favour and dismissed both appeals on the grounds that the proposals did not constitute sustainable development.

Recommendation

21. It is considered that the proposed development would heighten demand for on-street parking in an area of existing parking stress which would require a detrimental amendment to an existing CPZ and be harmful to on-street parking conditions. In addition, the formation of private parking spaces would encourage unsustainable forms of transport detrimental to sustainable travel. The development would therefore be contrary to policies Local Development Framework policies CS11, DP18, DP19, DP21, London Plan policy 6.13 and the NPPF.
22. Refuse