

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

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

Gentet, Matthias

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 October 2016 22:44
To: Planning
Subject: 2016/5676/P 18/20 Lancaster Grove
Attachments: 18 Lancaster Grove Inspector decision 1.jpg; 18 Lancaster Grove Inspector decision 2.jpg

Planning Application 2016/5676/P

18/20 Lancaster Grove NW3

1. I object to this planning application. Planning permission was achieved at No 18/20 for a house with a floor area of 840 sq m (9,053 square feet) after an Appeal at Public Enquiry. The Inspector, importantly, removed development rights.

2. Louise Crosby, the Planning Inspector for the Planning Appeal at No 18/20 stated in her **Conclusions...(App 1)**

32. I have also removed permitted development rights. Whilst I am aware that this should only 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.

3. As the Inspector found that 9,053 ft² should not be increased at No 18/20 and removed the Development Rights, it would be totally wrong to grant this consent. The impact particularly on the adjoining neighbour, Genie Lee, at No 16 could be enormous.

4. We ask that this application be refused.

Regards
Barrie Tankel FRICS

[REDACTED]