

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference numbers

2021/0544/P

Case Officer:

John Sheehy

Application Address:

5A Back Lane
Hampstead
London
NW3 1HL

Proposal

Extensions and alterations to existing dwelling including partially raising and reshaping roof, replacement of the lower ground floor conservatory, replacement glazed stair link at first floor level, replacement of existing terrace structure and terrace screening.

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	0	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	2
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0

Summary of representations

(Officer response(s) in italics)

Site notice displayed 06-05-2021, expired 30-05-2021

Press Notice published 05-05-2021, expired 29-05-2021

Two objections received, one from residents of 3 Streatley Place and one combined objection from residents of 5, 7 and 9 Back Lane:

The issues raised are summarised below

A “brutally modernistic design” more akin to a public building than a home and inconsistent with the neighbouring architecture. The scheme’s appearance and use of glass as building material is out of character with the existing property and Hampstead Conservation Area.

- Officer response: *The building is a former industrial unit at the centre of the block, built in the late 1960s/ early 70s. In age and style it is not consistent with the surrounding fine grained period buildings which date mainly from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It does, however, date from the same period as the buildings in the nearby Lakis Close. The proposal would add to the quality of the building’s modernist design*

by removing poor quality mansard-type roof treatments without adding excessive bulk. Like the Lakis Close buildings, it would be legible as a modernist design, with a horizontal emphasis and a flat roof. The proposal would enhance the modern design qualities of the existing building. Subject to a condition to control facing materials, the proposal would not harm the townscape or Conservation Area.

Number 5A's wall abuts the garden walls of 7, 9, 11 & 13 Back Lane and is 2.0m high. The new wall rises straight up by a further 2-3 metres.

- Officer response: *The wall would be raised by 0.95m over the majority of its course. This would be as a result of re-profiling of the side roof of the building to provide more useable internal space. The additional height would have no harmful impacts on the daylight and sunlight to the Back Lane neighbours as it would not be excessive in scale. It would be located to the north-east of the Back Lane properties and the application property is at a lower level than these properties due to the slope of the land.*

The plan replaces modest dormer windows with large windows at the front, and more in the roof. Whilst the front windows will be part obscured, they overlook our gardens/ windows, affecting privacy and shedding light at night.

- Officer response: *The rooms which would face the Back Lane properties are a gym, three ensuites, a walk-in wardrobe and a bedroom. Unlike living rooms/ dining room/ kitchen these are unlikely to be used intensively in the evening so would not result in light spillage. In addition the sloping roof has been revised to reduce the glazed part to a narrow strip (0.8m wide) located away from the boundary, so with very limited potential for impact on neighbouring properties by light pollution . The glazed roof to these rooms would be above eye level so would not result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.*

The proposal fails to explain the impact on the trees along the garden walls, many of them old, which may not survive the works or need to be cut back significantly, if not removed, should the wall height increase. These are essential to the character of our gardens and conservation area.

- Officer response: *The Council's landscape officer has provided the following advice: "No trees are proposed to be removed in order to facilitate development, excluding T13, a dead tree. The scheme involves the pruning of trees in neighbouring sites that overhang the application site. The pruning works required are not considered to be harmful to the long-term health of the trees or the screening they provide. Development is proposed within root protection area of T11, a birch tree to be retained. The arboricultural report states that strip foundations may cause harm to the tree and states that a "micro pile and ground beam configuration could be implemented to minimise potential damage to tree roots The finished floor level would be*

suspended at the existing ground level, or not exceed the depth of any existing floor level.” No details have been submitted to confirm this type of foundation in that area. The below ground effect of the development on trees is considered to be of an acceptable level provided suitable foundation types are utilised. The arboricultural method statement is considered sufficient to demonstrate that the trees to be retained will be adequately protected throughout development, provided appropriate foundation details are secured.”

The proposed air-conditioning units are positioned directly behind the wall of 5 Back Lane. We note the Nova Acoustics report but remain concerned about initial compliance and potential long-term impact of an ageing unit.

- Officer response: *The Council’s Environmental Health officer has assessed the proposal and provided the following advice: “The AC units to be replaced are currently installed by the driveway and the terrace at the back of the property. The proposed AC units will be installed at the same locations. The proposed plant will operate any time throughout the week. Having reviewed the submitted technical information and acoustic submission, I am satisfied that the submitted acoustic submission sets out reasonable noise criteria to be meet our local plan guidelines given that the suggested noise mitigation strategy is employed. I offer no objections to the application”.*

The planning documents do not explain as how these changes can be achieved without major disruption to the neighbouring properties, nor how access permissions will be obtained. 5A is tightly nestled in its plot; it is not clear that there is space enough to erect scaffolding without encroaching on our gardens and affecting security.

- Officer response: *Should access to other properties be needed to carry out the works, this will need to be discussed with neighbouring land owners.*

The proposed erection and introduction of privacy screens between the new enclosed outdoor kitchen and the house will significantly reduce sunlight in the garden, dining room and master bedroom of 3 Streatley Place. The addition of the roof shoulder, will further significantly reduce sun light in garden of 3 Streatley Place. The outdoor kitchen area would block all view of London’s sky line. The proposed new and enclosed outdoor kitchen is a lot larger than the old, and now demolished kitchen (which was not enclosed)

- Officer response: *The outdoor kitchen and privacy screens would replace previous similar structures without adding excessive additional bulk. They would be located diagonally across from the front of no.3 at ground floor level and would not unreasonably reduce daylight or sunlight to 3 Streatley Place. Views towards Central London are not*

protected by policy but the proposal would not deprive no.3 of such views as first floor rooms would retain these views.

The proposed extension of the terrace all the way to the wall and proposed sliding glass doors facing the terrace, will, if approved, allow residents of 5A Back Lane to overlook 3 Streatley Place from an area where they cannot currently overlook.

- Officer response: *Under the proposals a new link would be created from first floor to the roof terrace. This could potentially open up new views to neighbouring properties so a 1.8m privacy screen has been proposed to prevent direct views to 3 Streatley Place.*

Recommendation:-

Grant planning permission subject to conditions