

Regeneration and Planning Development Management London Borough of Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 9JE

Tel 020 7974 4444

planning@camden.gov.uk www.camden.gov.uk/planning

WEBB ARCHITECTS LIMITED Studio B 7 Wellington Road London NW10 5LJ

> Application Ref: **2017/4366/P** Please ask for: **John Diver** Telephone: 020 7974 **6368**

15 November 2017

Dear Sir/Madam

DECISION

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Full Planning Permission Refused

Address: 66 Fitzjohn's Avenue London NW3 5LT

Proposal:

Erection of pair of semi-detached, three storey (plus basement) 3-bed dwellings following demolition of existing pair of semi-detached dwellings.

Drawing Nos: 1169.01.01(-), 1169.01.02(A), 1169.01.03(-), 1169.01.04(A), 1169.01.05(-), 1169.01.06(-), 1169.03.01(-), 1169.03.02(-), 1169.03.03(-), 1169.03.04(-), 1169.01.10(F), 1169.01.11(H), 1169.01.12(G), 1169.01.13(H), 1169.01.14(B), 1169.01.15(B), 1169.01.16(C), 1169.02.11(G), 1169.03.11(G), 1169.03.12(E), 1169.03.13(E), 1169.03.14(E),

Supporting:

Daylight and Sunlight Report produced by Waldrams dated 11th July 2017; Design and access statement produced by Webb Architects Ltd; Planning statement produced by SBW Planning; BIA Structural addendum letter from consultant structural engineer (Michael Chester & Partners) ref. 15094 dated 26th July 2017; Tree Survey and Arboricultural Method Statement produced by Tretec dated July 2017; BIA report (produced by Michael Chester & Partners) ref. 15094 dated 16th October 2015; Hydrological BIA Report (produced by SLR) ref. 401-04869-00001 dated 16th October 2015; Response to queries raised in Campbell Reith's BIA Audit, Michael Chester and Partners dated July 2016; BIA



Memorandum produced by SLR dated 29 April 2016; MCP response to CR tunnel query (dated 16.10.17).

The Council has considered your application and decided to **refuse** planning permission for the following reason(s):

Reason(s) for Refusal

- 1 The proposed development by virtue of its height, bulk, siting and detailed design would appear overly dominant and harmful to the character and appearance of adjacent dwellings and of the conservation area generally. The development would therefore remain contrary to policies D1, D2 and A5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
- 2 The proposed basement excavation by virtue of its siting, scale and design would fail to be subordinate to the host building and property harming the character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to policies D1, D2 and A5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
- 3 The proposed development by virtue of its height, width, bulk and siting would result in loss of outlook to 64 Fitzjohn's Avenue and 12 Akenside Road contrary to policy A1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
- 4 The proposed landscaping and access arrangement would fail to enable vehicles to leave the site in a forward gear impacting on pedestrian and highway safety contrary to policy T1 and A1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.
- 5 In the absence of a legal agreement to secure car free housing and by virtue of the proposed on-site parking provision in this highly accessible location, the development would fail to encourage car free lifestyles, promote sustainable ways of travelling, help to reduce the impact of traffic and would increase the demand for on-street parking in the CPZ, all contrary to policy T2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
- 6 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a Construction Management Plan and associated monitoring fee, would be likely to give rise to conflicts with other road users, and be detrimental to the amenities of the area generally, contrary to policies A1, A5 and T4 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
- 7 The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards public highway works, would be likely to harm the Borough's public realm, contrary to policies A1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

Informative(s):

1 It is noted that were the development found to be otherwise acceptable, reasons for refusal (5), (6) and (7) could have been either fully or partially addressed via the

securing of a legal agreement.

In dealing with the application, the Council has sought to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way in accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

You can find advice about your rights of appeal at:

http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/appeals/guidance/guidancecontent

Yours faithfully

favid T. Joyce

David Joyce Director of Regeneration and Planning