

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	03/01/2019
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	15/12/2018
Officer			Application Numbers		
Samir Benmbarek			2018/5641/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
The Old Dairy 2 Falkland Place London NW5 2PT			See decision notice.		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of additional storey at second floor level; erection of three-storey front extension and associated alterations following demolition of existing front conservatory to dwelling house.					
Recommendation:	Refuse planning permission				
Application Type:	Householder Permission				

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
Informatives:				
Consultations				
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	07
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Site notices were displayed in close proximity to the site on 21/11/2018 (expiring on 15/12/2018). To date, 7x objections have been received from the following addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Falkland Road • 10 Falkland Road • 5 Falkland Place • 4 Falkland Place • 13 Falkland Road • 12 Falkland Road • Address Unknown <p>Their comments are as summarised below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inappropriate mass and bulk of the development in relation to the host building and the plot. 2. Inappropriate and unsympathetic design and materials. 3. Proposal would cause appearance of the adjacent Kentish Town Conservation Area. 4. Does not respect the pattern of the local area. 5. Impact of views and vistas from along Falkland Place and Falkland Place Open Space. 6. Rationale for increase from 2x bedrooms to 6x bedrooms 7. Loss of sunlight and daylight as a result of the development. 8. Overshadowing into neighbouring properties. 9. Impact on outlook and will cause a sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties. 			
CAAC/ National Amenity Society comments:	<p>The application site is not within a conservation area. However, the site is in close proximity to the Kentish Town Conservation Area, and the Kentish Town CAAC were consulted. They have objected with their comments as summarised below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plans are difficult to understand 2. No evidence that this was a bomb site 3. Proposal is an overdevelopment of the site 			

Site Description

The application relates to a two-storey dwelling house located on the western side of Falkland Place behind Nos 324-326 Kentish Town Road. The building is not located within a conservation area but is within very close proximity to the Kentish Town Conservation Area. It is not a Listed Building.

The character of the immediate vicinity along Falkland Place is residential with a row of small mews cottages located along the eastern side of Falkland Place. The Falkland Place Open Space also adjoins the site.

The building shares a plot with No. 4 Falkland Place (The Hay Loft). It is understood that existing rights of way allow free passage across the front of the application dwelling to gain access to the front door of No. 4 that faces onto the side elevation of No. 2.

Relevant History

2016/227/PRE- Pre-application advice issued for alterations and extensions to form a 4 storey 6 bedroom dwelling house- **Issued 28/06/2016.**

2016/5780/P- Householder permission for the “Erection of additional storey at second floor level, infilling of first floor level and erection of double storey front extension following demolition of existing conservatory and associated alterations to existing dwelling house”- **Refused 31/03/2017.**

Reasons for refusal of planning application 2016/5780/P dated 31/03/2017:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its height, bulk, location and detailed design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the immediate townscape, the character and appearance of the neighbouring Kentish Town Conservation Area and the character of the Falkland Road Open Space which it faces, contrary to policies CS5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy, DP24 and DP25 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies and policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan Submission Draft 2016.
2. The proposed development, by reason of its bulk, height, massing, detailed design and proximity to adjoining dwellings, would be detrimental to the amenity of the occupants of those dwellings, contrary to policies CS5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy, DP26 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies and policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan Submission Draft 2016.
3. The proposed development, in the absence of a Construction Management Plan, secured by s106 legal agreement, would likely give rise to conflict with pedestrians, cyclists, users of the Falkland Place open space and the amenity of neighbours, contrary to policies CS11 and CS19 of the London Borough of Camden Core Strategy, policies DP20, DP21 and DP26 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies and policy T4 and DM1 of the Camden Local Plan Submission Draft 2015.

Following the refusal a subsequent appeal ref: APP/X5210/D/17/3176428 was dismissed on 08/09/2017, with the reasons for dismissal as summarised and quoted below:

Design

“The proposed second-floor and front extension would not appear subservient to the dwelling but rather envelop the majority of it, significantly increasing its height and depth and eradicating its modest utilitarian appearance. Although its height would broadly match that of the Hay Loft, the Hay Loft has a steeply pitched roof that diminishes in bulk as it rises. The proposed vertical flat façade of the Old Dairy, on the other hand, would emphasise its height and bulk, giving it an excessively large and incongruous appearance (paragraph 8)...

... The significant bulk and proximity of the proposal, conversely, would unacceptably erode this characteristic openness (paragraph 9)...

... As a result I conclude that the proposed development, by reason of its forward projection, height and bulk, would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the immediate area and, thus, would detract from the setting of the CA. It is therefore contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the LP, which seek to ensure, amongst other matters, high quality design which is required to respect local context and character, integrates well with surrounding open spaces and preserves heritage assets and their setting (paragraph 10)".

Neighbouring Amenity

"Although the southern elevation of the Hay Loft faces open space; the northern elevation and its windows to habitable rooms broadly face and are close to the flank wall of the Old Dairy. The depth and height of the proposed extensions would significantly increase the size of this flank wall – notwithstanding that they would be partially set back. This increase in size, in combination with the boundary wall of the courtyard to the west and east, would result in a severe sense of enclosure when viewed from the habitable room windows of the Hay Loft so that only a narrow aspect would remain. As a result, in my view, the proposal would have an unacceptably overbearing effect which would result in a significantly diminished and generally oppressive outlook, to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupiers of the Hay Loft. It would likewise lead to a significantly diminished and oppressive outlook for the occupiers of 324 Kentish Town Road, due to the proximity of the first-floor windows of its rear projection to the proposed third-floor (paragraph 11)...

... I acknowledge that the appellant's Daylight and Sunlight Assessment suggests that windows 1 to 5 of the Hay Loft and windows 13 and 11 of No 324 Kentish Town Road would retain marginally over 80% of their former value of daylight. Nonetheless, there would be an adverse reduction, adding to the harm already identified in respect to outlook (paragraph 12)...

... Nonetheless, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development, by reason of its bulk, height and proximity to adjoining dwellings, would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the Hay Loft and 324 Kentish Town Road, with particular regard to outlook. It is therefore contrary to policy A1 of the LP, which seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that the amenity of neighbours is protected, considering factors that include outlook and daylight (paragraph 14)".

Conclusion

"I acknowledge that the extensions would provide additional accommodation for the appellant and that there is a shortage of six bedroom family dwellings in the Borough; however this benefit cannot outweigh the permanent harm the development would cause for the reasons given above (paragraph 16).

Consequently, having had regard to all other matters raised, I find that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and immediate area, and to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to LP policies A1, D1 and D2. I therefore dismiss the appeal (paragraph 17)".

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework, 2018

The London Plan 2016

Camden Local Plan 2017

A1 (Managing the impact of development)

A2 Open spaces

D1 (Design)

D2 (Heritage)

T4 (Sustainable movement of goods and materials)

Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (Updated March 2018)

CPG6 Amenity (March 2018)

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 The proposal is for a substantial remodelling of an existing dwelling, comprising of an additional storey at second floor level, a three storey extension at the front of the existing building line to form a three-storey dwelling house with 6x bedrooms. The height of the front extension (and therefore the maximum height of the development) would be 8.3m from ground level, by a depth of 2.3m from the original front elevation of the building. At the rear, the proposed height of the building as result of the additional storey would be 7.4m from ground level. The proposed roof pitch will be 5.5 degrees from the front to rear elevation.

1.2 The materials used in the proposed development are brickwork with a copper cladding for the remodelled second storey and proposed third storey, aluminium double glazed windows and doors, flat roof with copper cladding for the roofing and copper external pipeworks and guttering.

1.3 The main issues for consideration are:

- The impact of the proposal upon the character or appearance of the host building and the nearby conservation area;
- The impact the proposal may have upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.
- Transport implications

2. Assessment of Impact on Host Building and Surrounding Area

2.1 Along the eastern side of the junction of Kentish Town Road and Fortess Road, there are two-storey buildings existing with a group of three-storey buildings forming at the southern end of Fortess Road. To the rear of these buildings is Falkland Place which is characterised by smaller sized buildings situated along a small passage. On the western side of Falkland Place, the host building and No. 4 Falkland Place share the same access point, and on the eastern side is the two-storey terrace of Nos. 1-7 Falkland Place. This terrace is within the Kentish Town Conservation Area. They are also described as building that make a positive contribution to the conservation area. There is also a playpark located on the eastern side of Falkland Place and a playing field on the western side, adjacent to the host building. These are designated open spaces known as Falkland Place Open Space (designation LDF39 and LDF40).

2.2 The host building shares a plot with No. 4 Falkland Place (The Hay Loft), a two storey dwelling house with a pitched roof and situated 2.6m south (at the closest point) from the application building. To the west are Nos. 324-326 Kentish Town Road which are three-storey flat roof buildings and to the north are the three-storey buildings of No. 2 Falkland Road. The host building is a smaller two-storey dwelling house with a semi-pitched roof with a single-storey front conservatory. The site is constrained with a small front garden and pathway connecting the site to Falkland Place which is shared access with No. 4 Falkland Place. The application

site area is 52.0sqm (not including the shared pathway).

- 2.3 The site is outside, but immediately adjoins and faces onto the Kentish Town Conservation Area. Of this part of Kentish Town, the CAMS notes (para 5.1) *“Falkland Place runs perpendicular to the north off Leverton Place. Here is the smallest scale terraced development in the area, and the layout is fragmented where part of the terraces was cleared to form the public gardens and play area in Falkland Place.”*
- 2.4 It continues by describing the specific Leverton Street and Falkland Place character area (p.17) *“Falkland Place retains a short row of altered terraced cottages to the north end and then opens out where houses have been cleared, leaving the backs of the adjoining streets exposed and a play and open space have been created. Also the south end of Falkland Place, which turns from street to path, is flanked by a very old wall. This may be one of the oldest structures in the areas, possibly predating 304 Kentish Town Road. The has been incised with new openings.”*
- 2.5 Local Plan policies expect respect for the local character as an intrinsic aim of development. In particular, policy D1 and D2 require new development to respond with careful consideration of the characteristics of the site, features of local distinctiveness, and the wider context to be demonstrated in order to achieve high quality development which integrates into its surroundings. Within areas of distinctive character or adjacent to one, it is considered development should reinforce those elements which contribute to and create the character.

Character

- 2.6 Falkland Place is ringed immediately by low two-storey dwellings and outbuilding/rear extensions, with taller three and four-storey buildings located along the main road set further apart from the place. The character of the Place is relatively intimate and small, as acknowledged in the CAMS. The public children’s playground and open space sits within the centre of the block and is enclosed by low buildings and developments that are at maximum of two-storeys. These small buildings are also within small and confined plots. While a number of adjacent buildings overlook the open space, their character is generally of piecemeal accretions added to existing buildings and the overlooking is usually screened or low key.
- 2.7 The existing building is considered to be a complete composition within a limited plot area which can be evident when observed in comparison to the larger building that surrounds it on Kentish Town Road., Fortess Road and Falkland Road. This is in terms of both its scale, and detailed design, which is of a different character to the larger neighbouring buildings. The building is screened from the open space by a brick wall, which, combined with the low building height and setback front elevation means that the building is recessive when viewed from the public space. It doesn’t intrude on the character of the open space nor the character of the conservation area. The building feels like a backland low-key structure and allows this of the Place to maintain a sense of the village character from which Kentish Town rose.
- 2.8 The neighbouring building at No. 4 Falkland Place (The Hay Loft) is taller than the application building and taller than the predominant height adjoining the open space, but turns a flank wall with steeply pitched slate roof to the open space and is not a dominant structure when viewed from the space but reads as part of the fragmented composition of the Place, as identified in the CAMS.

Bulk and Mass

- 2.9 The erection of the additional storey (which also includes the infilling and remodelling at first floor level) as well as the erection of the three-storey front extension would remove all signs of the composition of this smaller scale building and overwhelm it. The proposed extensions to the dwelling would result in the host building disappearing within the new structure, thereby contradicting all aspects of the design guidance of CPG1, which expects extensions to existing developments to:

- Be secondary to the building being extended in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, and dimensions and detailing;
- Respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;
- Respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area including the ratio of built to unbuilt space;
- Allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden;
- Not cause loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking and sense of enclosure.

2.10 It is considered that there is limited relevance to assessing the proposal as discrete extensions to the dwelling, which would be indistinguishable from the resulting dwelling. Instead this assessment focuses on the overall approach and impact of the proposals.

2.11 The existing dwelling makes a limited contribution to the character of the area through its detailed design, other than through it recessive and discrete form and low key appearance. The proposals, in contrast, would create an awkward and imbalanced relationship with the neighbouring buildings by competing with them in height, scale and massing. This would be viewed from along Falkland Place and the open spaces as an incongruous and overbearingly large building, which looms over the open space by reason of the additional storey and increased proximity to the open space.

2.12 Due to the layout and constraints of the application site, the host building has a front garden which used in the same manner as a rear garden. The existing conservatory would be replaced by the erection of the three-storey front extension (dimensions in paragraph 1.2). The single storey traditional conservatory of the existing building is not visible from the open space. It sits 1.2m from the boundary wall at its closest point. The existing front elevation of the dwelling sits between 4 and 5.5m from the same boundary wall. The proposal would bring the ground, first and second floors forward by 2.3m from the existing front elevation of the dwelling. This would result in the extended building being located 1.5m from the wall at its closest point and 3.3 at its furthest. When combined with the increase in height, the impact of the building would loom over the open space, removing any sense of the existing subordinate relationship between the existing dwelling and the open space, and its immediate neighbours.

2.13 In assessing the contribution of Falkland Place Open Space to the character of the conservation area, the CAMS states (s 2.8) that “*the play area and gardens are the only public open spaces in the area. This is an important space and a quiet area for relaxation, play and a pedestrian route, although the edges appear vulnerable where the houses back onto the area*”.

2.14 Policy A2 of the Local Plan states “*the Council will protect and improve Camden’s parks and open spaces*”. Furthermore, the supporting text makes it clear that the Council “*will only allow for development on sites adjacent to an open space that respects the size, form and use of that open space and does not cause harm to its wholeness, appearance or setting, or harm public enjoyment of the space.*”

2.15 It is considered that the additional height and bulk would add significant visual weight to the building, which would be overbearing and out of character with the immediate area, and have a detrimental impact upon the character of the surrounding area, the conservation area and the adjoining open space.

2.16 Furthermore, the proposal has demonstrated no attempt to address the Inspectorate’s comments within the previous dismissal of appeal ref: APP/X5210/D/17/3176428. Within the Inspectorate’s dismissal of appeal reference: APP/X5210/D/17/3176428, it was commented

that “*The proposed second-floor and front extension would not appear subservient to the dwelling but rather envelop the majority of it, significantly increasing its height and depth*” and; “*that the proposed development, by reason of its forward projection, height and bulk, would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the immediate area and, thus, would detract from the setting of the CA*”. Due to its similar, height, bulk and massing, the proposal has demonstrated non attempt to address these comments and the concerns of its bulk and mass remain.

Detailed Design

- 2.17 The existing building is white painted brick with a modern zinc roof. While local buildings exhibit stucco at lower floors, the choice of fully rendered cladding with a white finish does not relate well to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the existing building, nor to the proposed building.
- 2.18 The proposed front elevation which faces the conservation area and open space would be flat, with no apparent articulation or modelling in the roof form of the building itself. It is unclear whether there would be any depth of reveal to the windows. It would be rendered at ground floor level with the first and second floor level, clad in a copper system. The fenestration consist of overly large windows that results along with the use of copper, a primary elevation with alien and awkward appearance which bears nothing to any sense of hierarchy, composition or contextual relevant. The extensive glazing on the primary elevation further exacerbates the harmful and overbearing relationship (“looming over”) of the proposed building to the adjacent open space. The fenestration appears to make reference to grander and older buildings within the vicinity through the size of windows (located in the adjacent Kentish Town Conservation Area) but does not relate well to its own composition. At the rear elevation, the proposed elevation is considered as adequate.
- 2.19 The south and north elevations would be white render at ground floor level and copper cladding for the first and second floor levels. This would result in an awkward contrast between the top and bottom of the building as well as providing limited depth or interest. The rear elevation, in very close proximity to a number of neighbouring upper floor dwellings, would be characterised by square opaque glazed openings, with vents/stacks rising to roof level at various points. The paucity of design detail in this elevation does little to mitigate the impact on outlook from the nearest residential flats (discussed in the next section).
- 2.20 Remedial works are included within the proposal which include replacing the granite cobbles with re-laid cobbles. These works are considered as acceptable.
- 2.21 Although not located within a conservation area, the application site is located in very close proximity to the Kentish Town Conservation Area. The boundary of the conservation area is Falkland Place with the eastern side being within the Kentish Town Conservation Area. Any additions or alterations that can be viewed from Falkland Place are considered to have an impact upon the setting of the conservation area. Text supporting Local Plan policy D2 states (para 7.48) “*Due to the largely dense urban nature of Camden, the character or appearance of our conservation areas can also be affected by development which is outside of conservation areas, but visible from within them. This includes high or bulky buildings, which can have an impact on areas some distance away, as well as adjacent premises. The Council will therefore not permit development in locations outside conservation areas that it considers would cause harm to the character, appearance or setting of such an area*”.
- 2.22 Following the previous scheme that was refused (2016/5780/P) and subsequently dismissed (APP/X5210/D/17/3176428), it is still considered that this scheme lacks a clear design vision. It is still neither well composed or detailed and does not make an attempt of reproducing the better characteristics of this small but characterful part of the area. Overall, the bulk, height and detailed design still combine to result in an overbearing, incongruous and poorly detailed building which has not responded to the comments of the Council, nor the Inspectorate. This still results in harm being caused to the host building, the character of the local townscape and open space and the

character and appearance of the Kentish Town Conservation Area. The size and design of proposals are therefore contrary to Local Plan policies A2 (Open space), D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) and form a reason for refusal of the current application.

3. Amenity

3.1 As mentioned previously, the host building and site is located within a constrained space. In addition, the host building is located within close proximity to various adjoining residential buildings as listed below:

- No. 4 Falkland Place- 3.3m (south)
- No. 324 Kentish Town Road- 6.3m (west)
- No. 326 Kentish Town Road- 8.4m (west)
- No. 2 Fortess Road- 3.8m (west)
- No.2A, 2B and 2C Falkland Place- 10.0m (northeast)
- Nos. 1-7 (odd) Falkland Place- 14.5m (east)

3.2 Within the Local Plan, protecting the quality of life for occupiers and neighbours is important. In particular, policy A1 ensures that development will not cause adverse amenity impacts upon neighbours in terms of sunlight, daylight, overshadowing, overlooking and outlook.

Daylight/Sunlight

3.3 The applicant has submitted a daylight/sunlight by T16 Design assessment along with the application which appears to demonstrate that directly affected habitable windows of adjoining residential properties will not be adversely impacted by the proposal in terms of sunlight and daylight levels experienced.

3.4 However, in light of the Inspectorate's previous comments within appeal ref: APP/X5210/D/17/3176428, it is considered that there would be adverse impacts upon daylight and sunlight towards No. 4 Falkland Place by virtue of the short separation distance between No.4 and No.2 Falkland of 4.7m. (this measurement includes the proposed setback of the additional storey). Although the separation distance of the upper storeys and No. 4 Falkland Place has increased from the previous proposal, it is not considered that this overcomes the concerns in regards to access to light. This is also due to the conjunction of the increased height of the building at 3.3m and the extended depth of the building at the front.

3.5 Furthermore, following the Inspectorate's comments in appeal ref: APP/X5210/D/17/3176428, which read, "*I acknowledge that the appellant's Daylight and Sunlight Assessment suggests that windows 1 to 5 of the Hay Loft and windows 13 and 11 of No 324 Kentish Town Road would retain marginally over 80% of their former value of daylight. Nonetheless, there would be an adverse reduction, adding to the harm already identified in respect to outlook*". As this proposal of the same height and scale as the previous proposal, it is considered there is no improvement on the amenity in regards to sunlight and daylight for both No. 4 Falkland Place (The Hay Loft) and No. 324 Kentish Town Road.

3.6 Also following the Inspectorate's decision of appeal ref: APP/X5210/D/17/3176428, it is considered that the proposed scheme would still harm access to daylight and/or sunlight towards No 326 Kentish Town Road and No. 2 Fortess Road but at "*less pronounced*" levels.

3.7 It is considered the proposal would not impact adversely upon the other neighbouring sites listed in paragraph 3.1.

Overshadowing

3.8 It is considered that the proposal will not contribute adversely to the existing overshadowing situation in relation to neighbouring buildings and the adjacent open spaces.

Overlooking/Privacy

3.9 It is not considered the proposal will lead to issues of overlooking between adjoining residential properties as no new windows are proposed on the side elevation. This is apart from a window to the side elevation at ground floor level which replicates the existing situation with the existing conservatory. Windows are proposed to the rear elevation which will be opaque glazed and will serve the staircase and proposed bathrooms. A condition to require these windows to be obscured glazed and fixed shut to an internal height of 1.7m from finished floor level would be required if the scheme had been considered acceptable. Therefore it is not considered there would be issues of overlooking into the rear habitable windows of Nos. 324 - 326 Kentish Town Road and No. 2 Fortess Road. It is also not considered there would not be direct overlooking across the open space into Nos. 1-7 Falkland Place.

Outlook

3.10 The principal elevation of No.4 Falkland Place which directly fronts onto the application building and the proposed extensions contains habitable windows which serve the living room and kitchen. The outlook from these windows and resulting sense of enclosure by virtue by the proposal will be severely compromised due to the overbearing sense of the development from the short separation distance between No. 4 and No. 2 Falkland Place and the absence of any significant relief in terms of setback, modulation or design interest on the flank wall. It is considered that the further setback (of an additional 1.2m) of the uppers stories in comparison to the previous scheme does little to alleviate these concerns.

3.11 The outlook and resulting sense of enclosure from the rear first floor habitable windows of No. 324 Kentish Town Road are also considered to be adversely impacted by the proposal for the same reasons of the short separation distance, the increased height of the application building and the stark elevation. Views from these windows would be of the rear wall and the proposed windows of the extended building, which would lead to an increased sense of enclosure. Again, it is considered that this amended scheme does not address this issue.

3.12 Also following the Inspectorate's decision of appeal ref: APP/X5210/D/17/3176428, it is considered that the proposed scheme would still harm outlook towards No 326 Kentish Town Road and No. 2 Fortess Road but at "*less pronounced*" levels.

3.13 Overall, the proposal would contribute to harm to the quality of amenity of neighbouring buildings, contrary to policy A1 of the Local Plan, and it be refused on that basis.

4. Transport

4.1 The site's Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) is 5 and the site falls within the East Kentish Town Controlled Parking Zone.

Construction Management Plan

4.2 Further details of how the site will be accessed and serviced during the construction have been requested to be submitted by the Council's Transport Department due the constraints of the site and local highway network. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the submission and implementation of a Construction Management Plan with an associated financial contribution, it would be likely to contribute unacceptably to traffic disruption and road safety hazards and be detrimental to the amenities of the area generally, contrary to policies A1 and T4 of the Local Plan.

Highways Works

4.3 In line with policy A1 and T4 of the Local Plan, it is necessary to secure a financial contribution for highways works (repaving the footway) directly adjacent to the site on Messina Avenue to allow for any damage caused during the construction of the proposed development to be repaired. This should also be secured by a S106 legal agreement. In the absence of a legal securing the highways contribution, there could be no guarantee that potential damage to the public highway as result of the construction works would be repaired, contrary to policy A1 and T4 of the Camden Local Plan.

5. Community Infrastructure Levy

5.1 Should the application be granted planning permission, the scheme would have been liable for the Mayoral CIL. This is as the scheme involves an uplift of more than 100sqm of residential floorspace. Based on the information given on the submitted plans, the charge is likely to be £5,500 (110sqm x £50) for the Mayor's CIL.

6. Recommendation

6.1 Refuse planning permission

