

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	16/04/2019
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	07/04/2019
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Laura Hazelton			2019/0969/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
Flat Basement and Ground Floor 1 Lyndhurst Road London NW3 5PX			Please refer to decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal					
Creation of off-street parking space and crossover with associated alterations to the front boundary wall.					
Recommendation:		Refuse planning permission			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:			No. of responses No. electronic	00 00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The application was advertised in the local press on 14/03/2019 and a site notice was displayed between 13/03/2019 – 06/04/2019.</p> <p>No responses from neighbouring residents were received.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>One objection was received from the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitting new off-street parking is contrary to the Camden Local Plan, policy T2 and contrary to the Conservation Area Statement for Fitzjohns/Frognaal, which states: "The loss of front boundary walls facilitates the parking of vehicles in part of the property, which would adversely affect the setting of the building and the general street scene. The Council will resist any further loss of front boundary walls and conversion of front gardens into hardstanding parking areas." • 1 Lyndhurst Road is noted as a building that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. • The proposal is contrary to a number of policies in the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan, including DH1 Design, DH2 Conservation area, NE2 (4) Trees and NE4 (1) Biodiversity. • DH1 states that development proposals that fail to respect and enhance the character of the area and the way it functions will not be supported. DH2 says that development must seek to protect and/or enhance buildings (or other elements) which make a positive contribution to the Conservation Areas. • NE2 (4) states: "Where there are no existing trees on a site, unless it can be demonstrated as unfeasible or non-viable, development should allow space for the future planting of trees well suited to local conditions". The proposal would increase the area of hardstanding and reduce the area of soft landscaping that would permit the future planting of trees. • The possible use of hardstanding, such as York stone and granite setts, also is contrary to NE4 (1) – Supporting Biodiversity, which recommends that development increase (not decrease) where feasible the use of permeable surfaces, particularly those that incorporate biodiversity-enhancing features such as gravel turf. The Plan supports proposals for restoring front and back gardens and increasing soft landscaping in order to support biodiversity. • We recommend that Camden refuse this application. <p>No response has been received from the Fitzjohn's/Netherhall Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) to date.</p>					

Site Description

The application site contains a semi-detached Victorian property constructed in the 1860s which has been converted into flats. The current application relates to the basement and ground floor flat.

The host building is four storeys with a raised ground floor, semi-basement and hipped roof. It is constructed from yellow brick with red brick string courses, stone dressings and sash windows with brick mullions and a gothic porch and roof gable detail.

The site is located within the Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area where the building is identified as making a positive contribution to the area and sits within the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum Area.

Relevant History

Application site

No relevant planning history

2 Lyndhurst Road

F7/4/26/1196 - The formation of a new access to Lyndhurst Road from No. 2, Lyndhurst Road, Hampstead. Granted 29/05/1952.

Other relevant applications

2017/5846/P - The Chestnuts, Branch Hill, NW3 - Partial infill of existing front lightwell and repositioning of front staircase to facilitate construction of new driveway and vehicle crossover. Refused 15/12/2017 for the following reasons:

1. The introduction of a forecourt vehicular parking space would result in the loss of front garden space, which contributes to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
2. The proposal would result in the loss of an on-street parking space in a Controlled Parking Zone which would contribute unacceptably to parking stress in the surrounding area, contrary to policies T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport), T2 (Parking and car free development) and A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
3. The proposed on-site parking space is considered to be detrimental to pedestrian and highway safety by reason of inadequate sightlines for vehicles leaving the site and lack of space for manoeuvring. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

Appeal reference APP/X5210/ED/18/3196860 dismissed 03/07/2018. The Inspector made the following comments of relevance to the current application:

- A vehicle parked between the footway and the dwelling would intrude into the separation between the road and the underlying building pattern. It would also add visual clutter.
- The appellant argues that the area is already paved ...whether paved or not, the site is a front garden.
- I conclude that the development would be intrusive and would have an urbanising effect on this section of Branch Hill, which would fail to preserve or enhance the CA. It would also detract from the setting of the buildings noted as making a positive contribution to the character of the CA.
- I conclude that the development would have an adverse effect on parking demand, albeit limited, and would also provide additional on-site parking. This would conflict with local policies with regard to parking and car free development, contrary to the general aims of LP Policies T1 and T2 which taken together seek to decrease reliance on private transport and limit on-site parking, amongst other considerations.

2017/0575/P - 13 Fitzjohn's Avenue, NW3 - Alterations to front garden to form off street parking, including

alterations to existing boundary wall to create shared vehicle and pedestrian access via vehicle crossover from street, relocation of cycle parking and new gate to the side access. Refused 01/06/2017 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would involve the loss of a section of the front boundary wall, which is considered to be an important feature in the streetscene of the conservation area and thus would be detrimental to its character and appearance, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies; and policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of Camden Local Plan Submission Draft 2016.
2. The proposal would result in loss of 3 on-street parking spaces in a CPZ and would contribute unacceptably to parking stress in the surrounding area, contrary to policy CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; policies DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport), DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking), DP19 (Managing the impact of parking) and DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies, and policies T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport), T2 (Parking and car free development), A1 (Managing the impact of development) of Camden Local Plan Submission Draft 2016.

Appeal reference APP/X5210/W/17/3178421 Dismissed 07/11/2017. The inspector made the following comments of relevance to the current application:

- The appeal property is a large detached mansion set back from the road in a generous plot, similar in character and appearance to surrounding properties. The front boundary is denoted by a brick wall with a small punctuated pedestrian access.
- The CAS identifies boundary walls as a consistent feature of the FNCA. Although they vary in their details from street to street and in some streets house to house, the palette of materials, repeated details and underlying design conventions give a remarkable consistency.
- There is some dispute between the parties as to whether the front boundary wall is original. However, there is no compelling evidence before me to suggest that the wall is not original. Notwithstanding, I consider that the front wall makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, bestowing a sense of rhythm and one of the defining features of the street scene. In this context, the removal of approximately 2.8 metres of the front boundary wall to allow for a wider gap for vehicle access would have a small, but nonetheless unduly harmful impact on the street scene. It would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the area.
- I note there are other examples of where either some of or the entire boundary wall has been removed in the locality. To my mind, these have to a noticeable extent materially harmed the character and appearance of the area, eroding the positive contribution the consistent boundary features provide.
- The partial loss of the boundary wall would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the FNCAWhilst the proposal would be of private benefit to the occupiers of the HMO there would be no public benefits as such to outweigh the harm identified above. I have found that the proposal would lead to an unacceptable increase in parking stress and find conflict with Policy A1 of the LP in this regard which states, amongst other things, the Council will resist development that fails to adequately assess and address transport impacts affecting communities, occupiers, neighbours and the existing transport network.

2017/6947/P - 38 Crediton Hill, NW6 - Widening of existing vehicle crossover with associated dropped kerb to allow two additional car parking spaces within the front garden. Refused 09/04/2018 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed demolition of the front wall and use of the entire front garden area for parking would, by virtue of the loss of characteristic boundary treatment, opportunity for soft landscaping and excessive levels of hard-surfaced area, result in detrimental harm to the character and appearance of the host property, streetscene and the West End Green Conservation Area, contrary to Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and Policies 2 and 3 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015.
2. The proposed development, by virtue of the loss of on-street parking and creation of additional private off-street parking capacity, would exacerbate issues of parking stress within the CPZ and surrounding

area and would fail to encourage sustainable modes of transport for the occupiers of the property, contrary to Policies T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport), T2 (Parking and car free development), and A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the Camden Local Plan 2017 as well as Policy 7 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015.

2017/2743/P - 61 Camden Square, NW1 - Formation of crossover and alterations to front boundary wall including vehicle entrance. Refused 27/07/2017 for the following reasons:

1. The introduction of forecourt parking would result in the loss of front garden space and the boundary wall, which contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Camden Square conservation area contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.
2. The proposal would result in loss of a boundary treatment and garden and the loss of an on-street parking space in a Controlled Parking Zone which would contribute unacceptably to parking stress in the surrounding area, contrary to policies T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport), T2 (Parking and car free development) and A1 (Managing the impact of development) of Camden Local Plan.

2017/0896/P - 11 Mansion Gardens, NW3 - Alteration to landscaping of side garden to provide no.1 off street parking space and erection of timber fence to boundary of dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) (part retrospective). Refused and warning of enforcement action to be taken 25/07/2017 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed on-site vehicular parking space and solid timber panelled garden fence would, by virtue of their design and location be visually prominent and harmful to the uniform townscape of the surrounding estate as well as the local green open character, garden amenity and views towards mature vegetation, cumulatively this will harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling as well as the wider estate. The development would therefore contrary to policies D1 and T2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.
2. The creation of an additional onsite parking space would promote the use of private motor vehicles, fail to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport and exacerbate local traffic conditions contrary to policies T1 and T2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.
3. In the absence of supporting evidence (e.g. swept path analysis), the proposed on-site parking space is considered to be detrimental to pedestrian and highway safety by reason of inadequate sightlines for vehicles leaving the site and lack of space for manoeuvring. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy T1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

Appeal reference APP/X5210/D/17/3186971 dismissed 12/03/2018. The Inspector's decision is discussed further in paragraphs 3.9 and 3.10 below.

Relevant policies

National Planning Framework (2019)

The London Plan (2016)

Camden Local Plan (2017)

A1 Managing the impact of development
A3 Biodiversity
D1 Design
D2 Heritage
T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport
T2 Parking and car-free development

Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2018)

DH1: Design
DH2: Conservation areas and listed buildings
NE4: Supporting biodiversity
TT2: Pedestrian environments
TT4: Cycle and car ownership

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG Amenity (2018)

CPG Design (2019)

CPG Transport (2019)

Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area Statement (2001)

Assessment

1. Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the creation of an off-street parking space within the front forecourt of the application site, associated alterations to the front boundary wall and the creation of a new crossover.
- 1.2 The proposed driveway would measure 3.4m wide and 8.8m long, with an adjacent footpath finished in Yorkstone paving measuring 2m x 11m. The total hardstanding would be approximately 48sqm compared to the existing 37sqm. The proposed driveway would be finished in permeable resin bound paving.
- 1.3 A section of the front boundary wall would be demolished and a new vehicular gate created. The existing pedestrian gate and brick piers would be moved 2.3m to the right. Both gates would be matching black metal railings.
- 1.4 The proposed dropped kerb would measure 3.3m wide to allow access to the new off-street car parking space.

2. Assessment

2.1 The principle considerations in the determination of this application are:

- Transport/Highways issues;
- Design – the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host building, streetscene, and this part of the Fitzjohn's/Netherhall Conservation Area;
- Amenity – the impact of the proposals on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

3. Transport

- 3.1 Policy T1 states that in order to promote sustainable transport choices, development should prioritise the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and ensure that sustainable transport will be the primary means of travel to and from the site. In order to encourage walking, the Council will seek to ensure that developments improve the pedestrian environment.
- 3.2 Policy T2 states that in order to reduce air pollution and congestion and improve the attractiveness of an area for local walking and cycling, the Council will limit the availability of parking within the Borough. Specifically, this policy states that in order to achieve this, the Council will limit on-site parking to spaces designated for disabled people where necessary, and/or essential operational or servicing needs. The policy also states that development of boundary treatments and gardens to provide vehicle crossovers and on-site parking will be resisted.
- 3.3 The site is located in the Hampstead (CA-H) controlled parking zone (CPZ). The CPZ operates on Monday to Saturday between 0900 and 2000 hours. Parking bays are located on Lyndhurst Road directly adjacent to the property. The site does not benefit from any on-site car parking spaces.
- 3.4 The proposal includes alterations to the existing boundary treatment adjacent to Lyndhurst Road, and to the front garden to provide space for car parking. This would result in the loss of at least 2 on-street parking spaces, as acknowledged in paragraph 3.13 of the applicant's planning statement. This loss of spaces would lead to a reduction in the number of spaces available for residents in the adjacent houses and the surrounding area, to the sole benefit of the occupants of the application site, contrary to Policy T2.
- 3.5 Furthermore, the creation of new off-street parking would be contrary to Policy T1 which seeks to prioritise

sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling. The creation of an off-street parking space would promote travel by private motor vehicle for current and future occupants at the site, and create a greater reliance on the use of the car, contrary to Policy T1.

- 3.6 A transport note has been submitted in support of the application which provides details of parking surveys undertaken on Lyndhurst Road, Lyndhurst Gardens, Akenside Road, Fitzjohn's Avenue, Lyndhurst Terrace and Thurlow Road, all within the same CPZ. The surveys were undertaken on 28th November 2018 at 01:00 and 29th November 2018 at 02:45 in accordance with the widely applied industry standard Lambeth Methodology. Surveys are undertaken overnight to capture the peak resident demand for on-street parking in a given area.
- 3.7 The survey results indicate that within the CA-H CPZ, of the 157 parking spaces available, an average (across the two nights) of 78 cars were observed to be parked, leaving 79 available spaces (approx. 50%). The report states that a parking zone is not considered to suffer from undue parking stress until an occupancy of 90% or more is reached.
- 3.8 However, the impact on existing on-street parking stress levels is not the only consideration when assessing the creation of off-street parking. Taken together, it is clear that Policies T1 and T2 seek to resist development that promotes reliance on the private motor vehicle, seek to promote sustainable forms of travel and limit the availability of parking in the borough by resisting vehicle crossovers and on-site parking.
- 3.9 The applicant also argues that although there is a general presumption against new off-street parking, the LPA may depart from policy where material considerations indicate that the plan should not be followed, and highlights an appeal decision at 11 Mansion Gardens, NW3 dated 14th February 2018 (Ref: APP/X5210/D/17/3186971) where although the appeal was dismissed, the Inspector gave considerable weight to other material considerations, including the former car parking on site. The applicant has also submitted revised drawings to include an electric vehicle charging point to encourage electric vehicle use and reduce air pollution.
- 3.10 In the appeal decision letter, the Inspector acknowledges that Policy T2 seeks to limit the availability of parking within the Borough but notes that there was previously on-site parking in the form of the integral garage prior to its conversion to a habitable room. There would therefore be "*no net additional parking on the site compared to its original longstanding provision. All the other properties on the estate have on-site parking and I note that the Council acknowledges that the PTAL rating for the site is unusually low compared to the wider Borough*" (PTAL rating of 2). As such, the Inspector did not object to the "principle of replacement parking".
- 3.11 In this instance, the application site has never historically benefitted from an on-site motor vehicle parking space and has a PTAL rating of 3, although it sits on the border between PTAL 3 and PTAL 5 zones. Furthermore, electric vehicle charging points are generally only supported where a need for new parking has been established and agreed (CPG Transport).
- 3.12 In conclusion, the creation of an on-site parking space, associated loss of two on-street parking spaces and creation of a new crossover would be contrary to Policies T1 and T2. It is not considered that there are other planning considerations which would allow an exception being made in this instance, and as such, it is recommended the application is refused on this basis.

4. Design

- 4.1 Policy D1 aims to ensure the highest design standards for developments. Policy D1 paragraph 7.2 states that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and to respect the character, setting, form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the character and proportions of the existing building.
- 4.2 Policy D2 states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves or, where possible, enhances' its established character and appearance, and will preserve garden spaces which contribute to the character and appearance of a conservation area. Policy D2 also advises that in order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management strategies when assessing application within conservation areas.

- 4.3 Policy DH1 of the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan expects development proposals to respond and contribute positively to the distinctiveness and history of Hampstead's character areas, and states that design should be sympathetic to established building lines and arrangements of front gardens, walls, railings or hedges. Policy DH2 expects development proposals to enhance the conservation areas by protecting and, where appropriate, restoring original architectural features, including walls, windows, doors, etc., that would make a positive contribution to the conservation areas. This policy goes on to state that development should maintain and enhance the historic street character of the immediate context through choice of façade materials, provision of setbacks, boundary conditions, building entrances and plantings.
- 4.4 Paragraph 4.38 of the Council's Design CPG recognises the contribution that front gardens make to the townscape of the Borough and to the character and appearance of individual buildings and their surroundings. The design of front gardens and forecourt spaces should consider the relative amounts of hard and soft landscaping, retain trees and vegetation which contribute to the character of the site and surrounding area, and retain or re-introduce original surface materials and boundary features, such as walls, railings and hedges, where they have been removed, especially in Conservation Areas.
- 4.5 The Fitzjohn's/Netherhall Conservation Area Statement describes the application building (and neighbouring properties nos. 1-11 (consecutive) as making a positive contribution to the area. It is noted that throughout the Conservation Area, the contribution made by the streetscape is significant; the trees (public and private), the vegetation, the boundaries between private gardens and the street, and the rear gardens. Original boundary walls are described as being distinctive, using materials and details to echo the architecture behind, and the loss of traditional boundaries and front gardens, excessive hard paving and car parking are described as negative features in the conservation area. In the statement, it is described how alterations to the front boundaries between the pavement and properties can dramatically affect and harm the character of the Conservation Area. Brick walls and piers are enormously important to the streetscape and there is a rich variety of detail and materials.
- 4.6 It is noted that although large, the majority of properties were not provided with vehicular access to the front garden and the continuous walls, many with hedges, form the character of the streetscape. Furthermore, a number of front gardens have been turned into parking areas and what should be a soft landscape with a path, possibly tiled, becomes a hard surface. The conservation area statement states that "the principle is not acceptable and further loss will be resisted".
- 4.7 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ("the Listed Buildings Act") is relevant, which requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area when considering applications relating to land or buildings within that Area. The effect of this section of the Listed Buildings Act is that there is a statutory presumption in favour of the preservation of the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. Considerable importance and weight should be attached to their preservation. A proposal which would cause harm should only be permitted where there are strong countervailing planning considerations which are sufficiently powerful to outweigh the presumption.
- 4.8 This part of the Fitzjohn's Netherhall Conservation Area is characterised by large houses with generous front and rear gardens, and as described above, its significance is considered to derive partly from the streetscape. The contribution that front gardens and boundary walls make to the character of the conservation area is significant.
- 4.9 The proposals involve the demolition of the existing brick wall to the left of the pedestrian gate and the installation of new vehicular gates in its place. The existing soft landscaping including a front lawn and flower beds would be reduced in size to allow for the creation of a new paved driveway. The area of soft landscaping within the front garden area would be reduced from approximately 59sqm (62%) to 45sqm (47%). The new vehicular gates would be black metal railings, and a new matching pedestrian entrance gate and brick piers would be introduced directly in front of the front entrance steps. The proposed boundary alterations would be similar to that seen at adjoining property no.2.
- 4.10 The applicant highlights a 2006 approval at no.2 for alterations to the front boundary treatment (reference 2006/4001/P); however, it is noted that this was for the creation of a new pedestrian gate to the front boundary. The vehicular gates were already in existence having been granted permission in 1952, some 32 years before the designation of the Fitzjohn's Netherhall Conservation Area in 1984.

- 4.11 Although there is an argument to be had for the re-introduction of a symmetrical front boundary treatment for the pair of semi-detached properties, it is not considered appropriate to further encourage harmful development given that the supporting example was approved many years before the designation of the conservation area and the adoption of the current Local Plan and guidance. Nos. 3 – 6 remain as symmetrical piers with a single pedestrian entrance gate to each dwelling. The alterations to the front boundary of no.2 are considered harmful to the streetscape and the character of this part of the conservation area, and as such, it is not considered to constitute justification to further this harm.
- 4.12 In support of the application, an historic ordnance survey map dated 1871 has been submitted showing an 'in and out' carriage entrance, which enters at no.1, sweeps round in a semi-circle, and exits at no.2. However, the properties were constructed before private motor vehicles were available in England and the in/out entrance would have been used by horse and carriage. Furthermore, given the alterations to the front gardens of nos. 1 and 2 throughout the years and the subsequent subdivision of the gardens with a brick boundary wall, the introduction of a new vehicular gate is not considered to represent a re-instatement of an original historic feature which would overcome the harm previously identified. The buildings originally featured a single entrance each, with a semi-circular driveway. There would be no perception of this original layout by the introduction of a new vehicular gate and driveway. The proposals would result in the further loss of the front boundary wall, and are considered to cause harm to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.
- 4.13 Although this harm is considered to be less than substantial, paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that where a development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposals would be to the sole benefit of the occupier of the property, and are not considered to provide any public benefits. As such, the proposals would be contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan and policies DH1 and DH2 of the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan and it is recommended that planning permission is refused on this basis.
- 4.14 An objection has been received from the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum in response to the proposed York stone and granite sett hardstanding, which would be contrary to policy NE4 (1) – Supporting Biodiversity of the neighbourhood plan. This policy recommends that development increase (not decrease), where feasible, the use of permeable surfaces, particularly those that incorporate biodiversity-enhancing features such as gravel turf. The Plan supports proposals for restoring front and back gardens and increasing soft landscaping in order to support biodiversity. The proposal would result in the loss of front garden space that contributes to the character and appearance of the conservation area. However it must be noted that it would just be the York stone paving from the front gate to the entrance door that would be impermeable, and it is not considered that this would constitute a reason for refusal.

5. Amenity

- 5.1 Policy A1 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered.
- 5.2 Due to the location and nature of the proposed development, it is not considered to cause harm to neighbouring amenity by way of loss of outlook, daylight, or privacy.
- 5.3 Policy A1 paragraph 6.9 also states that any development or works affecting the highway will be expected to avoid disruption to the highway network, particularly emergency vehicle routes and avoid creating a shortfall to existing on-street parking conditions or amendments to Controlled Parking Zones. Paragraph 6.10 states that highway safety, with a focus on vulnerable road users should also be considered, including provision of adequate sightlines for vehicles leaving the site. As highlighted in section 3 (Transport) above, the proposal would lead to the loss of at least 2 on-street parking space within a CPZ and create an unnecessary hazard on the public highway, contrary to Policy A1.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 The introduction of a vehicular parking space would result in the loss of front garden space and part of the front boundary wall, which contributes to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and as such, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Fitzjohn's Netherhall Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and

Policies DH1 (Design) and DH2 (Conservation areas and listed buildings) of the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2018.

6.2 The creation of an on-site parking space would promote the use of private motor vehicles, fail to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport and result in the loss of on-street parking in the surrounding area, contrary to policies T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport), T2 (Parking and car free development) and A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.