

26 West Hill Park London N6 6ND

2017/5176/P



This material has been reproduced from Ordnance Survey digital map data with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

26 West Hill Park London N6 6ND

Site Photographs:

1. Aerial photo (from SE)



2. Aerial photo 2 (from SW)



3. West Hill Park estate (from NE)



4. & 5. Views of property from communal driveway



6. Front elevation from front garden

7. Existing SS pool house and flank elevation



8. Existing flank elevation
9. Existing rear elevation



10. View from Merton Lane



11. Proposed CGI #1



12. Proposed CGI #2



Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	08/12/2017
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	16/11/2017
Officer			Application Number(s)		
John Diver			2017/5176/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
26 West Hill Park London N6 6ND			<i>See draft decision notice</i>		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of 2 storey brick built side extension above existing swimming pool of single family dwelling (Use Class C3)					
Recommendation:		Granted conditional permission			
Application Type:		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice				
Informatives:					
Consultations					
Summary of consultation:	Three site notices were displayed near to the site on the 20/10/2017 (consultation end date 10/11/2017). The development was also advertised in the local press on the 26/10/2017 (consultation end date 16/11/2017).				
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. of responses	06	No. of objections	06
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Letters of objection were submitted from, or on behalf of the owners/occupiers of nos. 18, 25, 27, 35, 36 and 37 West Hill Park. Their objections / comments can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>(1) Adverse effect upon the overall concept, design and unity of the original scheme, currently homogenous and 'as built'</p> <p>(2) Design unsympathetic and overbearing</p> <p>(3) Overdevelopment of site and form of 'Garden grab'</p> <p>(4) Extensions highly prominent in views</p> <p>(5) Existing dwelling already one of the largest in the estate</p> <p>(6) Loss of gap would cause terrace-like effect and loss of open feel</p> <p>(7) Harm to row of matching dwellings</p> <p>(8) Neither preserve or enhance the CA</p> <p>(9) Bricks used in the original development difficult to replicate</p> <p>(10) Precedent for alterations across the estate</p> <p>(11) Loss of private views</p> <p>(12) Loss of privacy</p> <p>(13) Loss of on-street parking due to construction</p> <p>(14) Construction would endanger pedestrians and vehicular traffic</p> <p>(15) Construction noise very disruptive</p> <p>(16) Object to any future felling of trees on site due to loss of privacy</p> <p>(17) Construction would cause damage to protected trees</p> <p>(18) Proposal breaks the covenant of the estate which every new purchaser is made fully aware of prior to completion, agrees to and then signs, when they complete their purchase</p> <p>(19) Two submitted applications should be assessed together to ensure that both cannot be implemented separately</p> <p><u>Officer's response:</u></p> <p>(1-10) Please see section 4 of the report</p> <p>(11-12) Please see section 5 of the report</p> <p>(13-15) Please see para.5.7 and section 6 of the report</p> <p>(16-17) Please see para.4.10 of the report</p> <p>(18) Please see para.3.3 of the main report</p> <p>(19) Although an additional application has been submitted (see history section), no formal determination has been made and as such this is not a material consideration for this scheme. If the development outlined in this application were approved, this would form a material consideration for the second application and the cumulative impact upon the dwelling would be considered.</p>				
Highgate CAAC comments:	<p>A letter of objection was received on behalf of the Highgate CAAC. Their objection comments can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>(1) Loss of privacy</p> <p>(2) Loss of outlook</p> <p>(3) Overbearing impact</p> <p>(4) Disruption to character and original proportions of dwelling</p> <p>(5) Contrary to local plan policies regarding design</p> <p>(6) Harmful to conservation area with no corresponding public benefit</p> <p>(7) CGIs not representative of site and setting</p>				

	<p><u>Officer's response:</u> (1-3) Please see section 5 of the report (4-6) Please see section 4 of the report (7) The submitted CGIs are supporting images only, the development proposed would be that described in submitted plans, sections and elevation drawings.</p>
<p>Highgate Society comments:</p>	<p>A letter of objection was received on behalf of the Highgate Society. Their objection comments can be summarised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) This proposal significantly reduces the gap between dwellings and thus has makes a negative contribution to the conservation area (2) Development would cause substantial and irreparable harm to the Conservation Area (3) Application must be assessed alongside other submitted application as cumulative impact of relevance <p><u>Officer's response:</u> (1-2) Please see section 4 of the report (3) Although an additional application has been submitted (see history section), no formal determination has been made at the time of writing and as such this is not a material consideration for this application. If the development outlined in this application were approved, this would form a material consideration for the second application and the cumulative impact upon the dwelling would be considered</p>
<p>West Hill Park Management Company Ltd.:</p>	<p>A letter of objection was received on behalf of the West Hill Park Management Company. Their objection comments can be summarised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Overbearing and damaging effect to the open cultivated areas (2) Enlargement unsympathetic and oversized (3) Damaging to the original harmonious composition and features designed by Ted Levy Benjamin & Partners which has remained intact and integral (4) Harmful to conservation area (5) Contrary to objectives and policies of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (6) Increased load on parking spaces (7) Impact on the structural integrity of the estate and neighbouring property due to the presence of numerous springs and water-courses (8) Example of creeping development which is seen as threat in the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan and could set a precedent for future changes in the estate <p><u>Officer's response:</u> (1-5) Please see section 4 of the report (6) Please see section 6 of the report (7) The development outlined as part of this application would not require significant excavation and so there would be limited scope for the disruption of ground water (8) The Council has a statutory requirement to assess each application based upon its own merits. Officers note that the following assessment would likely differ were the application in relation to any other dwelling within the estate.</p>

Site Description

The application site relates to a 3 storey (including lower ground floor) detached single family dwelling house situated at the South Western edge of the West Hill Park Estate. The dwelling, as well as the wider estate, is situated on land which features a significant downwards gradient, falling as you go south towards Hampstead Heath. The property features an existing single storey side extension housing a pool at lower ground floor level.

The property was constructed as part of the wider development of the West Hill Park Estate, built in the 1970's and designed by Ted Levy, Benjamin and Partners. The dwelling (as well as all other properties in the estate) features a strong architectural vernacular and there still exists a clear uniformity in appearance across the estate, with few interventions to the original form of properties. The entire estate is included in Camden's 'Local List' of non-designated heritage assets. The application site is also located within the Highgate Village Conservation Area.

When the estate was granted permission in 1972, a condition was attached to the decision to remove all permitted development rights from the properties within the estate. The entire estate is covered by an area tree preservation order (ref. C40-A1 1971) protecting all mature trees. The Council's registers identify the site as being subject to a number of underground development constraints including slope stability, ground water flow as well as surface water and flooding.

Relevant History

The planning history for the application site can be summarised as follows:

2017/5178/P: An application for the proposed '[Lower ground floor rear / front extension and associated alterations to single family dwelling \(Use Class C3\)](#)' was submitted to the Council for determination. At the time of writing no formal recommendation had been issued, with an independent audit of submitted Basement Impact Assessment reporting underway at the time of writing.

2016/3912/PRE: Pre-application advice was issued on the 23/09/2016 for the '*Extension and refurbishment of dwelling (C3) including lower ground and 2 storey side extensions as well as re-landscaping of gardens*'

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

The London Plan (2016)

Camden Local Plan (2017)

- A1 Managing the impact of development
- A4 Noise and vibration
- D1 Design
- D2 Heritage
- T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport
- T2 Parking and car-free development

Camden Planning Guidance:

- CPG 1 – Design
- CPG 6 – Amenity
- CPG 7 – Transport

Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017)

- TR3: Minimising the Impact of Traffic Arising from New Development
- OS2: Protection of Trees and Mature Vegetation
- DH2: Development Proposals in Highgate's Conservation Area
- DH4: Side Extensions

Highgate Village Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2007) (CAAMS)

Assessment

1. The proposal

- 1.1. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey side extension above the existing pool house of the dwelling. The side extension would be of brick construction with a tiled cat slide roof and would include windows of timber frames. As the extension would extend above the existing pool house structure, it would not result in the loss of any garden space or planting.

2. Revisions

- 2.1. It should be noted that during the course of the assessment revisions to the proposed scheme were requested by the Council's planning, design and conservation officers in order to overcome concerns raised. The revision made to the proposed scheme can be summarised as follows:
- Additional brick header details added to windows to match host dwelling
 - Rear window amended to wrap around corner in the same manner as the original rear windows to the dwelling
- 2.2. The revisions made to the scheme did not material affect the scheme and as such were accepted as amendments under the ongoing application.

3. Assessment

- 3.1. The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are as follows:
- The visual impact upon the character and appearance of the host property, streetscene, locally listed estate and the wider Highgate Village Conservation Area (Design and Conservation)
 - The impacts caused upon the residential amenities of any neighbouring occupier (Residential Amenity)
 - The implications upon local transport and highways conditions (Transport)
- 3.2. Various comments received have made refer to the existence of a binding covenant on the estate which has acted to historically limit development. If it is the case that the site is covered by a Restrictive Covenant, then it may be the case that the works hereby proposed could not be implemented without the consent of the enforcing body/covenant beneficiary. If this consent were withheld then similarly, it may not be possible for the applicant to implement any permission. Notwithstanding this the content, management, or enforcement of any possible covenant as well as freeholders consent remains outside of the Council's Planning controls, being private legal matters and are not material planning considerations for this application.

4. Design and Conservation

Policy Context

- 4.1. The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within policy D1 are relevant to the application: development should respect local context and character; comprise details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character; and respond to natural features. Policy D2 'Heritage' states that in order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will not permit development within conservation area that fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of that conservation area. Policy D2 further states that for non-designated heritage assets (i.e. locally listed), the effect of a proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, balancing the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- 4.2. Policy DH4 (Side Extensions) of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017) states that: *"Side extensions to detached or semi-detached properties, including the enlargement of existing garages, should be sensitive to and respect the character of the streetscape, and not block or significantly infill gaps between buildings, or otherwise disrupt the integrity of the individual architectural composition or group where these contribute to the character of the local area. They should be subordinate in scale to the original dwelling and complement its character in terms of design, proportion, materials and detail. They should not harm the amenity of adjacent properties"*.
- 4.3. The adopted Camden Design Guidance document (CPG1) states that extensions to properties should

remain secondary to their host building, respect and preserve original details, proportions and the established townscape, allow the retention of a reasonable sized garden and retain existing natural landscaped features.

Design and Conservation Assessment

- 4.4. West Hill Park, Merton Lane is a fine example of mid-late 20th century housing development adjacent to Hampstead Heath with strong design emphasis characteristic for its period. Although the estate is not nationally/statutorily listed, the Council took steps to designate the estate as a non-designated heritage asset (locally listed) due to its architectural and townscape significance. The Camden 'Local List' describes the estate as follows: *"A housing estate from 1971-3 designed by Ted Levy, Benjamin and Partners whose work is found throughout Camden. Built on the site of St Pelagia's Convent which has been hardly altered since it was built. It consists of houses of varying sizes and the block of flats, West Hill Court. The design is typical of good developments of the period and has considerable architectural significance. It demonstrates how a densely built estate can be designed to sit within the topography of the site and prevent overlooking and ensure privacy"*.
- 4.5. Further to the above, the Highgate Village Conservation Area Appraisal and Management document (2007) describes West Hill Park as follows: *"an interesting late 20th century example of low-level high density brick and concrete housing. The distinctive neo-Vernacular, low-key, dark brick buildings with monopitched roofs, step down the hillside in the tradition of courtyard houses. The standards of maintenance, the control of development and the landscape quality within the estate are the result of restrictive covenants. Much of the frontage to Merton Lane is a brick wall, interspersed with prefabricated concrete fencing and earth banks"*.
- 4.6. The estate contains 42 dwellings in total which include a mixture of sizes, layouts and forms. As the land on which the estate was constructed is subject to a significant North to South downwards gradient (running towards the Heath), the estate was planned to respond to this topography by stepping gradually in line with this slope. The application dwelling (no.26) is the last in a row of three identical houses. The application site marks the edge of the estate both to the West (along Merton Road) as well as to the South (with adjacent nos. 25 and 27 Merton Lane lying outside of the estate). From upper ground floor level upwards, the host property is visually prominent within the local area; with views afforded from Merton Lane as well as glimpses afforded from within the estate, as well as Millfield Lane.
- 4.7. As aforementioned the host dwelling is situated within a residential estate which was developed as a singular architectural piece and which features a strong and defined character via the forms, materials and detailing on dwellings within the estate. The estate therefore features the same architectural language, with few examples of significant interventions to original design. Furthermore, the application dwelling is part of a row of three dwellings featuring a distinct character and style which uniquely responds to the topography of the site. Notwithstanding this, because of the unique siting of the property within the estate and the manner in which its existing flank elevation relates to neighbouring dwellings, officers do not feel that an 'in principle' objection to extensions or alterations would be reasonable.
- 4.8. In this instance, the proposed side extension to the property has been informed by the architectural vernacular of the estate, replicating the materials palette, angled form, with a cascading roof form and detailing of the host dwelling. The form proposed has been designed to following the profile of the main ridgeline of the dwelling, stepped down in order to both ensure that the extension appears subordinate to the host dwelling as well as to respond to the natural gradient of the site. The front roof slope forms a front catslide to better respond to the original roof slope. Although the roof to the side extension would not be set down below the ridgeline by a full storey (as outlined in CGP1), the extension would not project above the line of the rear eaves level and the set down at ridge level proposed (1.5m) would be approximately double the set down between the two original roof volumes of the dwelling. This visual response to the site's topography remains fully in line with the original design intent of the estate. The extension would have a width of 3.8m which would be less than one third of the width of the original dwelling (13.2m). In light of the above, officers consider that the form and scale of the proposed extension would remain visually secondary to the host dwelling and to respond sufficiently to the design of the host dwelling. Officers from the Council's planning, design and conservation teams have reviewed the scheme and conclude that the proposed design would remain sympathetic to the clear design language of the estate, preserving the character of the host dwelling.
- 4.9. In terms of architecture and detailed design, the proposed extension would utilise the same materials as the rest of the estate. Detailing such as the brick headers to windows and the wrap around corner windows to the rear have been negotiated to better respond to the detailing of the original dwelling. As the success

of the extension will be significantly influenced by the success of the brick, tile, mortar and bonding choice, conditions are recommended for full details to be provided in this regard. Although submitted details include a brick sample which would appear to be a close match to the original dwelling, these conditions will specify a requirement to submit a fully worked up sample panel demonstrating pointing and bond to ensure that these elements are fully considered prior to commencement. In light of the above the extension is not considered to result in harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling.

- 4.10. The extension would be built above the existing pool house and would not necessitate the removal of any mature trees, boundary vegetation or garden area. The extension would similarly not extend within the Root Protection Area of any protected tree. Whilst officers confirm that once built, the extension would not result in any harm to mature or protected trees, a condition is recommended for the submission of a full Tree Protection measures plan so that the health of nearby trees is protected during the construction phase of works.
- 4.11. As previously discussed no.26 is fairly prominent within public views from within the Conservation Area, in particular the existing flank elevation when viewed from Merton Lane. Within this view, the proposed side extension would project into an existing gap, however it should be noted that this gap is unique in the streetscene and is not characteristic in scale or form. Whereas the gaps retained between dwellings *within* the estate (i.e. between nos.23, 24, 25 and 26 West Hill Park) are highly uniform and characteristic, the gap retained between no.26 and no.25 Merton Lane (gap *outside* the estate) is unique. This is due to the fact that no.26 forms the Southern boundary of the estate, with the adjacent no.25 Merton Lane being considerably set down and away from the existing flank of no.26 at first floor level. Due to the difference in levels between Merton Lane and the ground floor level of the application site, the existing flank wall dominates this view into the retained gap and also restricts views into the West Hill Park estate. While the proposed side extension would project into the existing gap, due to the step down retained this extension would primarily be read against what is currently the blank elevation and would continue the visual transition between the adjoining sites. The extension would also still maintain a gap at 1st floor level of approximately 5m. Glimpses of the dwelling are also afforded from Millfield Lane across the top of no.23 Merton Lane. Within these views, the extension would similarly be read against the bulk of the original dwelling and would not significantly alter the existing roof scape. As the extension would be built above the existing pool house, it would not lead to a loss of garden space and the property would retain generous areas of gardens to both the front and rear. Overall officers consider that the proposed side extension would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 4.12. In terms of the impacts of the proposed extension to the non-designated heritage asset (the locally listed estate), as discussed above the application property marks the corner of the estate, with the flank to be extended facing outwards. Although the dwelling sits within a row of three identical dwellings, the area of the site to be extended is primarily obscured from views from the communal driveway within the estate due to the level changes, planting, as well as the bulk of the original dwellings. As a result, when viewing the row of dwellings from within the estate, the proposed side extension would not be visible and even if all existing vegetation were removed, would still not appear dominant. Whereas the infilling of retained gaps between dwellings *within* the estate would drastically alter (and most likely harm) the character of the dwellings and their relationship with the wider estate, the extension proposed is conversely not considered to result in a similar impact. As well as from the communal driveway, glimpses of the side extension may also be afforded over the top of the stepped path leading down towards the Heath (gated, private access only), views would still be afforded across to the mature trees to the rear of the site and the extension would still be read as secondary to the main dwelling. In light of the above, officers from the planning, conservation and design teams do not consider that the extension proposed would result in harm to the non-designated heritage asset (the locally listed estate).
- 4.13. Subject to the recommended conditions, it is considered that the proposed side extension would not cause a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the host property and would preserve the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area and Locally Listed Estate. The extension is thus considered to remain in accordance with the requirements of policies D1, D1 as well as DH2 and DH4 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Considerable importance and weight has been attached to the harm and special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, under s.72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013.

5. Residential Amenity

- 5.1. Policy A1 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of residents. This includes factors such as privacy, outlook, implications to natural light, artificial light spill, odour and fumes as well as impacts caused from the construction phase of development. Policy A4 seeks to ensure that residents are not adversely affected by issues including noise or vibrations.
- 5.2. Due to the siting and orientation of the application site, the only dwellings which could potentially be impacted upon as a result of the built extension would be nos.23 and 25 Merton Lane as well as no.27 West Hill Park. This is illustrated in figure one below.



Figure one – relationship between proposed extension and neighbouring properties

- 5.3. Nos.23 and 25 Merton Lane are those situated in closest proximity to the proposed extension and as such concern was initially raised with regard to the impact upon these neighbouring properties. In terms of natural light, as the extension would be almost due North of 23 and North East of 25 Merton Lane, officers do not consider there to be any risk of significant loss of daylight or sunlight into these adjoining properties. Similarly due to its orientation and siting, overshadowing is not of concern in this instance.
- 5.4. In terms of outlook, although the main aspect of both of these properties faces South West (towards the Heath), both dwellings do feature clear glazed windows at first floor level which face back up the hill towards the application site. Notwithstanding this due to its relative positioning the side extension would not project directly in front of any rear facing windows to these properties other than to the rear of the front wing of no.25 as demonstrated in figure one above. As this window would be situated over 17m from the proposed flank elevation and the existing view from this window would be the existing (larger) flank elevation, this relationship is not considered harmful. Similarly, although the extension would be visible in oblique angles from the other first floor rear windows to these properties, the minor infringement into the periphery of these views is not considered to constitute a detrimental loss of outlook that might warrant a reason for refusal.
- 5.5. In terms of privacy, the extension would not include side windows other than the wrap-around rear windows which was requested for reasons of design and conservation. Whilst the rear facing windows would essentially offer the same views as the existing rear facing windows, these wrap around windows would allow views towards no.25 Merton Lane and as such officers considered it necessary to add a condition that these glazed panels should be obscured and non-opening. To the front, the extension would include glazing at ground floor level to serve the proposed art studio. While this glazing would be less than 10m from the aforementioned rear facing windows to no.23, these views would be oblique and are similar to the views afforded from the existing opening to the main lounge.
- 5.6. No.27 West Hill Park does not feature any side habitable room windows which face towards the site although it does feature a private terrace at 1st floor level in its Western corner where views are afforded towards the site. As this terrace is situated over 20m from the proposed extension and considerably to the South, the proposed extension would not result in the harmful loss of daylight, sunlight or privacy. Whilst officers acknowledge that the extension may project into the North Western views afforded from this terrace, more than half of the existing gap would be retained and with a distance of over 20m retained this would not be considered to result in a harmful loss of outlook (with no impact at all to the main Southern

aspect from this terrace). As a section of flat roof to the pool house would be retained in front of the extension the railing to the existing front terrace would be extended to meet the front of the extension. As this railing would only allow space for access this is not considered to result in a worse arrangement in terms of privacy than existing. Notwithstanding this a condition is recommended that the area of flat roof outside of this railing is not used as a terrace to avoid an exacerbation of the existing relationship in this regard.

- 5.7. The development would not include excavation or substantial demolition and as such would not require particularly large volumes of heavy good vehicles. By virtue of the minor scale of development proposed and relatively straightforward construction requirements, the Council's Transport officers confirmed that a Construction Management Plan would not be required in this instance. As such the impacts in terms of noise, dust and other construction matters would not be a major concern in this instance which might necessitate a CMP. The Council would maintain powers to control such matters under separate legislative powers (i.e. Environmental Health Act 1990 and the Control of Pollution Act 1974).
- 5.8. Subject to the conditions outlined above, the proposed development is not considered to result in a detrimental loss of amenity to any adjoining occupiers. The development is thus considered to be in accordance with policies A1 and A4.

6. Transport

- 6.1. The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 1b, which is relatively low and it is within a Controlled Parking Zone (CA-U - Highgate). The development would not result in the creation of new units and so there would be no requirements to secure car-capped or cycle parking provision. The works would not result in the loss of any on street or off street parking spaces and the dwelling would retain its double garage to the front of the site.
- 6.2. As the estate is a private estate, the management of internal driveways would be managed by the Management Company rather than by the Council. As a result the applicants will need to discuss matters such as deliveries and agreed eventualities in case of any damage whilst works are completed with the Management Company. Notwithstanding this the property benefits from a sizeable private drive way and double garage which would allow for materials to be stored and vehicles to be manoeuvred safely. The development is not considered to result in significant disruption in terms of the local transport network.

7. Recommendation

- 7.1. Grant conditional Planning Permission

The decision to refer an application to Planning Committee lies with the Director of Regeneration and Planning. Following the Members Briefing panel on Monday 19th March 2018, nominated members will advise whether they consider this application should be reported to the Planning Committee. For further information, please go to www.camden.gov.uk and search for 'Members Briefing'.

Application ref: 2017/5176/P
Contact: John Diver
Tel: 020 7974 6368
Date: 15 March 2018

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

Phone: 020 7974 4444

camden.gov.uk

planning@camden.gov.uk

www.camden.gov.uk

26 West Hill Park
London
N6 6ND

DRAFT

Dear Sir/Madam

DECISION

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Householder Application Granted

Address:

**26 West Hill Park
London
N6 6ND**

DECISION

Proposal: Erection of 2 storey brick built side extension above existing swimming pool of single family dwelling

Drawing Nos: 001, 01-E, 02-E, 03-E, 04-E Rev 1, 05-E Rev 1, 06-E Rev 1, 07-E, 08-E, 09-E, 11-E

The Council has considered your application and decided to grant permission subject to the following condition(s):

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

- 1 The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the end of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In order to comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 All new external work shall be carried out in materials that resemble, as closely as possible, in colour and texture those of the existing building, unless otherwise specified in the approved application.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area in accordance with the requirements of policy D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 001, 01-E, 02-E, 03-E, 04-E Rev 1, 05-E Rev 1, 06-E Rev 1, 07-E, 08-E, 09-E, 11-E

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

- 4 Before the relevant part of the work is begun, detailed drawings, or samples of materials as appropriate, in respect of the following, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

a) Typical elevation and section (@ 1:20) of the extended railing to the front ground floor terrace

b) Manufacturer's specification details of the proposed roof tile (to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority) and a sample tile (to be provided on site)

The relevant part of the works shall be carried out in accordance with the details thus approved and all approved samples shall be retained on site during the course of the works.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area in accordance with the requirements of policy D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

- 5 Prior to the first use of the extension hereby approved, the glazing to the side windows of the extension at upper ground and first floor levels which face towards no.25 Merton Lane shall be obscured. The obscure glazing shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to prevent overlooking of the neighbouring occupiers in accordance with the requirements of policy A1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017

- 6 Before the brickwork is commenced, a sample panel of the facing brickwork demonstrating the proposed colour, texture, face-bond and pointing measuring 1.5m x 1.5m shall be provided on site and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approval given. The approved panel shall be retained on site until the work has been completed.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area in accordance with the requirements of policy D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

- 7 The area of retained flat roof at upper ground floor level to the East of the side extension hereby approved as shown on drawing 04-E-REV1 shall at no point be used as an amenity area / terrace.

Reason: In order to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring premises in accordance with the requirements of policy A1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

Informative(s):

- 1 Your proposals may be subject to control under the Building Regulations and/or the London Buildings Acts that cover aspects including fire and emergency escape, access and facilities for people with disabilities and sound insulation between dwellings. You are advised to consult the Council's Building Control Service, Camden Town Hall, Judd St, Kings Cross, London NW1 2QS (tel: 020-7974 6941).
- 2 Noise from demolition and construction works is subject to control under the Control of Pollution Act 1974. You must carry out any building works that can be heard at the boundary of the site only between 08.00 and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays. You are advised to consult the Council's Noise and Licensing Enforcement Team, Camden Town Hall, Judd St, Kings Cross, London NW1 2QS (Tel. No. 020 7974 4444 or search for 'environmental health' on the Camden website or seek prior approval under Section 61 of the Act if you anticipate any difficulty in carrying out construction other than within the hours stated above.
- 3 In good time, prior to the start of construction (or if appropriate, demolition) on site, the contractor shall discuss and agree with the Council's Engineering Service Network Management team (tel: 020-7974 2410) detailed arrangements for the transportation of goods and materials to and from the site. The Council will prosecute those responsible for any breaches of the provisions of the Highways and Litter Acts which occur as a result of construction on the site.

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

David Joyce
Director of Regeneration and Planning