



To: [planning@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planning@camden.gov.uk)

**Re 22 Lancaster Grove NW3**

Dear Sirs

I live at 39 Lancaster Grove NW3 4HB and I wish to object to the planning application for 22 Lancaster Grove NW3 which seems to fail to take into account the existing architecture and the conclusions of the Inspectorate already made in this regard and other factors.

I hope that the Planners will seek to refuse the application and ask the owners to go back and make an application taking into account the Inspectorates conclusions.

It is important to maintain the feel and architecture of the existing houses in the street.

Yours faithfully

Jonathan Levy

the attractiveness of an area and not harm its appearance or amenity. In addition, I consider that the proposal would accord with UDP Policy B7(A) which seeks to ensure that new development in a conservation area preserves or enhances the special character or appearance of the area. Similarly, the proposal would I consider accord with the advice set out in paragraphs 4.17 and 4.27 of PPG15.

#### Other Matters

26. With regards to the matter of living conditions, the new dwelling would be slightly closer to the side of 16 Lancaster Grove. However, this elevation of No 16 contains only secondary windows. The proposed dwelling would project beyond No 16 at the rear but there would be a gap between the two properties and there is also mature planting in place along the boundary.
27. I consider that a condition requiring frosted glass in the first and second floor windows on the western elevation of the proposed dwelling, and that their lower sections be fixed to prevent them being opened, would protect the occupiers of No 16 from overlooking. Whilst the rear bay window nearest to No 16 would have a small window in the side, I consider that given the size of the window and the distance to No 16 no harmful overlooking would occur from this.
28. I am aware that the windows at the rear of the proposed dwelling would project further into the garden than the existing but I consider that given the mature planting along the boundary and the distance between the dwellings that overlooking would not occur to a harmful degree.
29. Turning to the matter of dominance and loss of light to the windows at No 16, again I consider that there is sufficient distance between the two properties to prevent any oppressive feeling within the garden or rooms at the rear of No 16. Finally, in terms of the loss of light, I consider that this would be minimal given the distance apart and the fact that the rear of No 16 faces south.
30. I conclude on this point, that subject to the conditions that I have imposed, the proposed dwelling would not have an adverse effect on living conditions at No 16.
31. In terms of car parking, provision has been made for the off street parking of at least two cars in front of the dwelling. I note there are no objections from the Council's Highway Department. I am also mindful of the guidance set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: *Transport*, which advocates the use of maximum parking standards and encourages the use of sustainable modes of transport. The site is within walking distance of a range of public transport facilities and therefore I consider that the parking provision proposed within the site is sufficient.

#### Conclusions

32. I have imposed a condition that will give the Council control over the brick and stone bonding. I have also removed permitted development rights. Whilst I am aware that this should only be done in exceptional circumstances, I consider that given the sensitivity of the site, the size of the proposed dwelling

and the fact that the dwelling has been so cohesively designed that it is warranted in this case.

33. In order to deal with concerns regarding the potential damage to trees shown as retained on the proposed plans, whilst building works are being carried out, I have attached a condition which requires them to be protected during any works. Additionally, I have attached a condition that requires a detailed landscaping scheme to be submitted and implemented.
34. Finally, in terms of the demolition of the existing dwelling, I have imposed a condition that prevents its demolition until a contract has been let for the new dwelling. This will prevent the site becoming an unsightly, vacant site within the Conservation Area.
35. To conclude, I find that the existing dwelling makes no more than a little contribution to the Belsize Conservation Area. The proposed dwelling, which in my opinion has been well designed, would enhance the character and appearance of Belsize Conservation Area in accordance with relevant local and national policy guidance, subject to the conditions that I have set out below.
36. I have had regard to all other matters before me but for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Louise Crosby*

Inspector