

2020/2910/P – 59 Spencer Rise, NW5 1AR



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.



Photo 1 – Front elevation



Photo 2 – street context showing no’s 53-65



Photo 4- Longer oblique view looking east



Photo 5- Longer oblique view looking west



Photo 6 – Rear elevation



Photo 7 – Rear elevation of Spencer Rise properties (Chetwynd Road properties bottom of image)

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	26/08/2020
(Members' Briefing)		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	30/08/2020
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Kristina Smith			2020/2910/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
59 Spencer Rise London NW5 1AR			Refer to Draft Decision Notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of mansard roof extension with dormer windows to front and rear					
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional planning permission			
Application Type:		Householder application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
Informatives:				
Consultations				
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. of responses	05	No. of objections	05
Summary of consultation responses:	<p><u>Publicity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 no. site notices were displayed from 31/07/2020 • A press advert was published on 06/08/2020 <p>Five objections from separate individuals were received on the following grounds:</p> <p><u>Principle</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will create a precedent for further removal of butterfly roofs on Spencer Rise • Those mansards constructed pre-conservation area designation cannot be used to justify more • Overdevelopment <p><i>Officer response: The proposal is considered to be policy compliant and all future applications will continue to be assessed on their own merits.</i></p> <p><u>Design and conservation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further destruction of front and rear roof profiles of historic terrace • Cumulative impact of slate clad mansards will present as a long dark expanse of wall to Chetwynd Road residents, particularly Tudor Mansions. • Object on the grounds it would not accord with conservation area advice • Existing mansards are ugly and obtrusive, the proposed mansard worsen this and threaten views from Tudor Mansions • The rear elevation shows a window out of proportion and looks almost as large as the rear GF door • Parapet line remains a strong and attractive feature that should be protected <p><i>Officer response: refer to 'design and conservation' section below</i></p> <p><u>Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be an impact on privacy of communal garden of Tudor Mansions • Will have a clear view of the mansard especially in winter • Combined with no.59 the proposed mansard would lead to more loss of amenity – outlook, privacy and light of garden • Consideration should be given not just to wellbeing of those who live there but that of those who live nearby too. <p><i>Officer response: refer to Amenity section below</i></p> <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces stock of much needed smaller houses in area • Personal circumstances of applicant cannot be considered as they 			

could move on at any time

- The two storey houses are essential for single people and couples of all ages
- The consideration of house prices should not determine the validity of suitability of house extensions and inability to move to larger homes is somewhat fatuous

Officer response: the decision has been, in part, based on Neighbourhood Plan policy DC4 and its associated justification which seeks to allow families to expand in situ as an alternative to them moving out of the area or living in crowded accommodation. All future applications will continue to be assessed on their own merits.

- Increasing housing density will increase parking pressures leading to overspill on Chetwynd Road

Officer response: as this is not a new development it is not possible to secure as car-free in this instance; however, it is not expected that a relatively small uplift in floorspace would result in additional parking pressure

The Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum (DPNF) wrote in support of the application:

After much consideration, Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum supports this application. It is important that Camden Council understands that this support is based on the following three factors:

- 1. We are only commenting based on the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. Camden Council will be expected to assess against Local Plan and other relevant policies;*
- 2. An understanding that it is a finely balanced issue, with arguments both ways, as summarised below;*
- 3. The support applies only to this particular situation, and is not intended as a precedent in respect of the rest of the street or any other part of our area. Any future application will need to be assessed in its own right.*

The most relevant policies in the made Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan are DC2, DC3, DC4 and, less directly, H1. To some extent, these pull in different directions.

One the one hand, DC2 seeks to protect the area's heritage assets and the integrity of the Conservation Area, and DC3 requires good design, principally by ensuring that development relates to its context. These policies protect against over-development and designs that go against the grain of our special area. Regarding DC2, most roofs on the street are concealed behind parapets and we do have some concerns that the continuity of the roofscape will be damaged. DC3(e), meanwhile, requires that any extensions or modifications to existing buildings be subordinate to the existing development and in keeping with its setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties. The fact that the four adjacent houses in this row (51-57) already have a very similar extension to the one proposed at number 59 counts in the application's favour against these two policies. We note that number 61 next door does not have a roof extension but this is part of a different set of buildings on the terrace.

On the other hand, policy DC4 supports small residential extensions where certain criteria are met. This policy has been written specifically with applications like this in the streets around Spencer Rise in mind, in response to issues raised during public consultation. DC4(f) supports roof extensions that respect the existing roof form in terms of design, scale, materials and detail; and that are restricted to the rear except where it is part of the established local character. Given the character established by the mansards on 51-57 Spencer Rise and our understanding that the application is modelled on number 57 next door, we are content that the criteria in DC4 are met.

The principle behind H1 is to support and protect a range of housing provision to meet current and future housing needs, and in particular to ensure the provision of smaller homes for downsizing older residents or first home buyers. We have some concern that by increasing the house to 4 bedrooms the application would increase the number of larger, more expensive properties in the area, while reducing the number of small, more

Local Groups/ CAAC comments:

affordable properties. However, we appreciate that the houses in Spencer Rise are already rather expensive for a starter home, and we are persuaded that in this case the increase in size is not disproportionate.

The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee (DPCAAC) objects to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The need to resist the harm being done to, in particular, the butterfly roofs in Spencer Rise and Churchill Road was a key trigger to the decision to designate Dartmouth Park a Conservation Area.
- The Neighbourhood Plan is subservient to the hierarchy of plans above it and cannot be inconsistent with them. The planning system has a statutory obligation in all that they do to seek to preserve and enhance heritage assets.

Officer response: see paragraph 1.5 below

- Following designation, the Council has resisted most of a great number of further attempts at such development and has successfully defended its decisions at numerous Appeals – to reverse this course now would be deeply damaging to the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area.
- The guidance of DPCAAMS is explicit in its resistance to further mansards in this location.
- Supporting the application would be unfair to residents who have been refused this private benefit in the past.
- Harm should be outweighed by public benefits of the proposal, in this case the applicant's need for a larger dwelling for their family is not a public benefits. No evidence is included in this application. Once the precedent is set, developers will be able to take advantage.
- Inspectors have already dealt with the argument that the harm of a further mansard will be attenuated by the presence of existing extensions. Appeal for no.47 was still dismissed.

Officer response: policy context has since changed with the introduction of the DPNP (2020) (particularly policy DC4) which is a material planning consideration that outweighs guidance relating to Spencer Rise in the DPCAAMS

- A dormer roof extension also in the DPNP area, was dismissed on appeal on the grounds of harm to the conservation area. The Inspector did not consider the appellant's need for additional accommodation to outweigh the harm

Officer response: each case is assessed on its own merits

Site Description

The application site is a two-storey single dwelling house on the north side of Spencer Rise that forms a pair with its neighbour at no.57. It belongs to a wider building group of two storey properties with similar characteristics but subtle variations. All properties belonging to the building group would have originally had valley roofs

The property is not listed but it lies within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and is designated as a building that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. It is also situated in the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum.

Relevant History

Application site

None relevant

Same side of street

No.57 (adjoining neighbour)

2007/4644/P - Erection of a mansard roof extension with two front dormer windows to existing single dwelling house. Granted 21/12/2007.

No.23

PEX0300173 - The erection of a mansard roof extension. Refused 01/05/2003 for the following reason:

The bulk and height of the proposed mansard extension are considered unacceptable in that they would cause harm to the appearance of the conservation area, would have a detrimental impact on the symmetry of the terrace, and would be overly bulky and dominant on the existing building form.

No.27

2004/3614/P - The erection of a roof extension and ground floor rear extension. Granted 29/10/2004. Mansard roof not implemented.

No.37

8400923 - Erection of a mansard roof extension. Granted 08/08/1984.

No.41

2006/3883/P - Erection of a single storey rear extension and roof extension to single family dwelling house (Class C3). Refused 19/12/2006 for the following reasons:

The proposed roof extension, by reason of its bulk, height and design would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the subject dwelling, the terrace of which it forms a part and the surrounding conservation area.

The proposed demolition of the valley roof form, would result in the loss of a feature that is considered to make a valuable contribution to the appearance of the conservation area.

No.49

2012/5467/P – Erection of a mansard roof extension to existing dwelling (Class C3). Refused 29/11/2012 for the following reason:

The proposed mansard roof extension, by reason of its bulk, height and position would materially harm the consistent parapet-line and thus the integrity of the terrace of buildings at nos 39-49

Spencer Rise, which have a largely unimpaired roofline, and thus fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

Appeal ref: APP/X5210/D/13/2190582 dismissed 21/02/2013.

2020/3547/P - Erection of mansard roof extension with dormer windows to front and rear – Pending decision

No.51

CTP/D11/20/14/28768 - The erection of a roof extension at second floor level to provide additional living accommodation. Granted 06/09/1979.

No.53

8903220 - The erection of a roof extension to provide two bedrooms and a single storey rear conservatory to the existing dwelling house. Granted 06/12/1989.

No.55

CTP/D11/20/11/23216 - Erection of an additional storey to provide two bedrooms. Granted 15/10/1976.

Other side of the street

Nos.14 – 22 are two storey townhouses of a similar architectural style as the application site. They all feature mansard roof extensions.

No.14

PEX0000358 - The erection of a mansard roof extension to provide additional two rooms to a single family dwelling. Granted 02/10/2000.

No.16

8802605 - Erection of an additional storey at roof level. Granted 16/03/1989.

Nos.18 & 20

2004/4225/P - The erection of mansard roof extensions to Nos. 18 and 20 Spencer Rise. Granted 29/11/2004.

No.22

2008/1419/P - The erection of mansard roof extension and rear ground floor single storey infill extension to single-family dwellinghouse. Granted 03/06/2008.

No.32

31115 - Erection of an additional storey. Granted 24/10/1980.

No.38

9501088 - Retention of mansard roof extension as a variation of planning permission granted 10/01/1991 (Ref: 9003467) Refused 21/09/1995. Appeal allowed 15/07/1996.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

The London Plan (2016)

The London Plan Intend to Publish version (2019)

Camden Local Plan (2017)

H6 – Housing choice and mix
H7 – Large and small homes
A1 - Managing the impact of development
D1 - Design
D2 – Heritage

Camden Planning Guidance 2018/ 2019

CPG Design
CPG Altering and extending your home
CPG Amenity

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement (DPCAAMS) (2009)

Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan (2020)

H1 – Meeting housing need
DC1 – Enhancing the sense of place
DC2 – Heritage assets
DC3 – Requirement for good design
DC4 – Small residential extensions

Assessment

1. Background

- 1.1. There is an extensive history to the provision of mansard roof extensions on this side of Spencer Rise. The full history can be seen in the 'planning history' section above; however, the most relevant decisions to this application are those relating to no.57, the adjoining neighbour, and no.49.
- 1.2. The application at No.57 was determined at Planning Committee (owing to the applicant being a Councillor). The recommendation to approve was justified on the grounds that the 'proposed extension would not appear out of place or discordant with the street scene and would not unduly dominate the roofscape or the neighbouring buildings thus avoiding harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The committee report goes on to note that 'the principle of mansard developments in this street has already been introduced with the granting of planning permission at nos. 14, 18, 20, 27 and 28, all approved after the dismissed appeal at no. 47'. It is noted that at the time of this decision, the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement (DPCAAMS) has not yet been adopted.
- 1.3. Following this decision, an application for a mansard roof extension at no 49 was refused and later dismissed on appeal. It was refused on the grounds that the subject terrace (no's 37-59) remains largely unimpaired in contrast to the mansards at no's 51-57 which form a group and that the 'provision of a mansard would allow the slow erosion of the largely unimpaired roofscape, and would thus fail to preserve and enhance the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area'. The decision notes that the adoption of the DPCAAMS, with its particular reference to mansard roofs on this side of Spencer Rise, had been introduced.
- 1.4. The appeal decision for no.49 identifies that the roofs of many properties in the terrace remain substantially unaltered and concealed behind the parapet and is regarded as an important characteristic of the terrace. It considers that the introduction of a mansard would involve substantial alteration to the form of the roof and would undermine the architectural integrity of the house and the contribution of the front elevation to the street. At the same time, the Inspector acknowledges that the development would be seen in the context of neighbouring mansard roofs which would reduce the harm to an extent but nevertheless it would extend the run and encroach upon a section of relatively unspoiled roofline. With regards to the relatively recent permission at no.57, the Inspector admits that the scheme is genuinely comparable and struggles to reconcile the different approach the Council has taken. He attaches some weight to this but reaches the

conclusion that it does not outweigh the harm.

1.5. Since the previous decisions on mansard roof extensions, the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan (2020) has been adopted. The Plan forms part of Camden's Development Plan and has equal weight to the Camden Local Plan (2017) and more weight than the DPCAAMS which supports the Development Plan and offers guidance, much like the CPG documents. The Plan includes a policy (DC4) that supports proposals for small residential developments (subject to criteria, discussed in more detail in para 2.10 below and makes specific reference to the residents of Spencer Rise and a petition that points out that, "*There are many residents on this road who need the extra space that could affordably be provided through a loft conversion. At present many families are either overcrowded or forced to move out of the area*". The policy is designed to respond to such concerns. It also acknowledges the concern that such extensions may increase the number of larger, more expensive properties in the Area, while reducing the number of small, more affordable properties.

2. Proposal

2.1. The applicant seeks planning permission for the following works:

- Erection of a mansard roof extension (70 degree slopes) with two dormer windows to front and one dormer window to rear and rooflight on flat part of roof

2.2. During the course of the application, the following revisions were made:

- Reduction in thickness of dormer cheeks and dormer roof
- Reduction in size of rooflight
- Reduction in size of rear dormer window
- Specification of natural slate cladding

2.3. Assessment

2.4. The planning considerations material to the determination of this application are as follows:

- Design and heritage
- Amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Design and heritage

Principle of a mansard

2.5. The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy D1 (Design) states that all development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings whilst Policy D2 (Heritage) states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.

2.6. CPG *Altering and extending your home* provides specific guidance on the acceptability of roof extensions and alterations, with particular regard to roofs forming a part of a terrace group. It provides guidance on when a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable, with a number of specific examples. The following are considered relevant to the application site:

- *Where there is an unbroken run of valley roofs;*
- *Where there are complete terraces or groups of building that have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a coordinated design;*

- *Where buildings are part of a group where differing heights add visual interest and where a roof extension would detract from this variety of form.*

- 2.7. The site is located within Dartmouth Park Conservation Area sub area 3 (Dartmouth east). Under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013, the Council is required to pay special attention to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- 2.8. The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area statement (2009) provides additional guidance for roof extensions within the area which largely aligns with the guidance provided in CPG (Altering and extending your home), albeit more area-specific.
- 2.9. In relation to the application site, paragraph 7.61 notes that, “Spencer Rise is one of the few Streets in the conservation area which is marred by isolated mansard roof additions which have made their host building too prominent in the street”. The sub area guidance also specifically refers to mansard roof additions on Spencer Rise as ‘Negative Features’ and the ‘Management’ section of the Conservation Area Statement refers to the pressure for extensions within the conservation area and echoes the guidance set out in CPG. It states that “proposals for additional storeys will generally be resisted. Exceptions to this may be made on the south side of Spencer Rise where the majority of buildings in a distinct group already have roof extensions and a mansard roof would infill a gap and reunite the group”.
- 2.10. The guidance set out in the Conservation Area Statement is relatively unequivocal about mansard roof extensions along the northern side of Spencer Rise and has helped to justify previous refusals for such proposals. However, a recent material change to the policy context, namely the adoption of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan in March 2020, has introduced fresh considerations. Subject to certain criteria, policy DC4 supports proposals for small residential developments and makes specific reference to loft conversions on Spencer Rise. The criteria of relevance to this application are as follows:
- subordinate in scale and situation to the original dwelling and complements its character in terms of design, proportion, materials and detail;
 - does not harm the amenity of neighbouring properties (in particular in respect of privacy, overlooking and loss of light);
 - is sensitive to and respects the overall character and appearance of the street scene;
 - in the case of roof extensions or dormers: (i) respects the existing roof form in terms of design, scale, materials and detail; and (ii) is restricted to the rear except where it is part of the established local character.
- 2.11. The proposal is considered to deliver on all of the criteria (the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties is considered in the ‘Amenity’ section). Firstly, the mansard proposed would be adjacent to an existing group of four mansard roof extensions at no’s 51-57 and so would not be an isolated example (as referenced in the DPCAAMS as a negative feature). Secondly, the application site bookends a group of houses (no’s 31-59) that have subtly different features to the wider terrace. Comparing no.59 to its neighbour at no.61, there are variations in their height with the application site sitting taller, evidenced by the parapet height (as well as its style) but also the relative positions of the windows as well as the extra step to the entrance door. The group to which the application site belongs to also have white stucco window surrounds, whilst no.61 onwards have no such detailing. Finally, the application site forms a pair with its neighbour with mansard at no.57. Their entrance doors are centred in the middle of the pair and they generally have a strong symmetry between them. Continuing this symmetry at roof level, therefore, is not considered to bring about harm to the proportions, character and appearance of the building, and the pair.
- 2.12. Notwithstanding this site assessment, there is clearly a degree of judgement here which explains the at times contradictory planning history. However, it is officer opinion in this instance that the introduction of a mansard roof in this location would avoid harm to the host property and

conservation area. It is also considered that the particular site circumstances would avoid a precedent being set in favour of mansard roofs anywhere on the north side of Spencer Rise.

Form and design

- 2.13. In terms of form and design, CPG *Altering and extending your home* offers guidance on the form and design of mansards in terms of height, pitch and profile, and materials.
- 2.14. At 2.43m, the internal height of the proposed mansard would be slightly taller than the suggested 2.3m; however, the height corresponds with the mansard at adjoining neighbour no.57. In accordance with CPG, the mansard and the front slope would be of a 70 degree angle and set behind the front parapet which would remain unaltered. The roof covering would be natural slate which is considered to be a high quality and appropriate finish.
- 2.15. Where there is a valley roof, CPG advises that it should be retained with the new roof addition starting from behind the parapet at hopper head level, forming a continuous slope up to 70 degrees. The proposed mansard follows this guidance allowing the profile of the original valley roof to still be clearly read. The guidance continues to note that conservation style rooflights are usually more appropriate than dormers; however, given the established style of a rear dormer on neighbouring properties, the proposed dormer is considered acceptable.
- 2.16. The flat roof element would incorporate a rooflight that would be sufficiently set back from the front and rear to prevent it from being visible.
- 2.17. The proposal is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. 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 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013. Officers are of the opinion that the proposal would preserve the appearance of the building and the character and appearance of this part of the South Hampstead Conservation Area. The following paragraphs shall go into more detail on why this is the case.

Amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 2.18. Several consultation responses have referred to the impact on properties on Chetwynd Road; however, the closest property on this street would be approximately 30m away, which is significantly over the 18m recommended by CPG Amenity to avoid a loss of privacy. Furthermore, there are already windows situated below the mansard and at the same level on the existing mansard at no.57. As such, the proposal is not considered to result in a loss of privacy.
- 2.19. The mansard extension is likely to result in some additional overlooking to neighbouring gardens; however, this is moderated by the presence of windows below and also the set back of the dormer window from the rear elevation.
- 2.20. Owing to the substantial c.30m distance between the application site and the properties to the rear, there would be no noticeable impact on daylight or outlook to properties on Chetwynd Road either. Whilst the proposed mansard will be visible from rear windows of these properties, and will to some extent impact their view, this must be differentiated from an impact on outlook which is when new massing has an overbearing impact on a neighbour.

Planning balance

- 2.21. There are a number of policy considerations at play and in assessing the planning balance, officers have sought to weigh up the various, often competing factors including design and heritage; amenity; and the Neighbourhood Plan objective to enable existing families to remain in the area.

2.22. In recognition of families moving out of the area, or living in overcrowded properties, policy DC4 has been introduced to support small residential extensions to enable them to expand in situ. The policy recognises the tension between preserving the character and appearance of the area and enabling growing families to stay in the area. It is therefore subject to a criteria to ensure extensions are only supported where they would respect the character and appearance of the area and neighbouring amenity. Whether the proposal achieves this is a matter of judgement and the subjectivity of this matter has been illustrated by previous planning decisions. In this situation, however, it is considered that the proposal would avoid harm to the host building and conservation area. The proposed mansard would extend the established style of roof extension seen on no's 51-57 and would serve to complete the pair of properties it forms a part of. Furthermore, the mansard would be appropriately designed in accordance with CPG.

2.23. It is important to emphasise that the adoption of the DPNP and policy DC4 *does not* mean that a mansard would be acceptable on any of the Spencer Rise properties and each case will continue to be assessed on its own merits.

3. Recommendation

3.1 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 21st September, 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: 2020/2910/P
Contact: Kristina Smith
Tel: 020 7974 4986
Email: Kristina.Smith@camden.gov.uk
Date: 14 September 2020

Development Management
Regeneration and Planning
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE
Phone: 020 7974 4444
planning@camden.gov.uk
www.camden.gov.uk

Trevor Brown Architect
Suite 409, Ashley House
235-239 High Road
London
N22 8HF
United Kingdom

DRAFT

Dear Sir/Madam

DECISION

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Householder Application Granted

Address:
59 Spencer Rise
London
NW5 1AR

DECISION

Proposal:
Erection of mansard roof extension with dormer windows to front and rear

Drawing Nos: 0000; 1000; 0001; 0002; 0100; 0200; 0201; 1001; 1002; 1100; 1200 (Rev A);
1201; Design and access statement (prepared by Trevor Brown Associates)

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: 0000; 1000; 0001; 0002; 0100; 0200; 0201; 1001; 1002; 1100; 1200 (Rev A); 1201; Design and access statement (prepared by Trevor Brown Associates)

Reason:

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

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 This approval does not authorise the use of the public highway. Any requirement to use the public highway, such as for hoardings, temporary road closures and suspension of parking bays, will be subject to approval of relevant licence from the Council's Streetworks Authorisations & Compliance Team London Borough of Camden 5 Pancras Square c/o Town Hall, Judd Street London WC1H 9JE (Tel. No 020 7974 4444) . Licences and authorisations need to be sought in advance of proposed works. Where development is subject to a Construction Management Plan (through a requirement in a S106 agreement), no licence or authorisation will be granted until the Construction Management Plan is approved by the Council.
- 3 All works should be conducted in accordance with the Camden Minimum Requirements - a copy is available on the Council's website at <https://beta.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/1269042/Camden+Minimum+Requirements+%281%29.pdf/bb2cd0a2-88b1-aa6d-61f9-525ca0f71319> or contact the Council's Noise and Licensing Enforcement Team, 5 Pancras Square c/o Town Hall, Judd Street London WC1H 9JE (Tel. No. 020 7974 4444)

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 must secure the approval of the Council's Noise and Licensing Enforcement Team prior to undertaking such activities outside these hours.

In dealing with the application, the Council has sought to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way in accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

You can find advice about your rights of appeal at:

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

Yours faithfully

Director of Economy, Regeneration and Investment

DRAFT

DECISION