

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>10/01/2013</b>
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>26/12/2012</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Tania Skelli-Yaoz			2013/7404/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
The Coach House 18 Rosecroft Avenue London NW3 7QB			See decision notice	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
Erection of building comprising 1-bed flat following demolition of chalet in rear garden				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Grant planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Full Planning Permission			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>
<b>Informatives:</b>	

### Consultations

<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>23</b>	No. of responses	<b>03</b>	No. of objections	<b>02</b>
			No. electronic			

<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>PN advertised 5/12-26/12/12 SN displayed 28/11-19/12/12</p> <p><u>2x Objections:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- concerns over principle of residential development in rear gardens</li> <li>- Overlooking</li> <li>- No mitigation for tree impact offered</li> <li>- UPVC windows stated in application form</li> <li>- Harm to CA</li> <li>- Potential use as separate dwelling to result in issues such as parking stress, refuse collection etc.</li> <li>-</li> </ul> <p>1x Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Can it be sunken further?</li> <li>- Potential garden path lighting to disturb during night-time.</li> <li>- Granny flat should not be used separately</li> </ul>
---	---

<b>CAAC comments:</b>	<p><u>Redington / Frogal CAAC:</u> no response received.</p> <p>Previous Objection. 'This would be contrary to the character of the CA and result in significant garden loss. The character of the building is not that of a typical garden building and would set an unwelcome precedent for rear garden development.'</p>
-----------------------	---

### Site Description

The application site comprises a large semi-detached dwelling house with large rear garden sloping uphill and containing 3-4 large mature deciduous trees.

The site is located on the eastern side of Rosecroft Avenue in the Redington / Frogal Conservation Area. The site originally formed part of the land of the adjacent Grade II listed detached house (No. 18 Rosecroft Ave) and the existing building on the plot was originally the coach house for the main house. The land and former coach house were sold off as a separate plot and has been converted to residential use.

The former coach house on this plot is listed by virtue of being in the curtilage of and contributing to the setting of the original main house (18 Rosecroft Ave).

The rear garden, where the granny annex is proposed, is not visible from the public realm. The existing shed is visible from various adjoining gardens and is not listed and would be demolished to make way for the proposed granny annex.

## Relevant History

Appeal APP/X5210/A/13/2190248 dismissed on 10/07/13.

2012/5744/P pp REFUSED on 19/12/12 for the Erection of single-storey building to provide granny annex (following demolition of existing chalet) (Class C3). Grounds: design and loss of tree.

2004/4794/P - GRANTED on 18/02/2005 for landscaping works entailing changes in ground levels to rear garden.

TP.29532/W/7315 - REFUSED on 04/08/1961 for the erection of a single-storey dwelling-house at the rear of No. 18 Rosecroft Avenue.

TP.29532/NW/26060 - REFUSED on 05/04/1961 for the erection of a single-storey dwelling-house at the rear of No. 18 Rosecroft Avenue, and the conversion of the ground floor of the front portion of the existing building into garage accommodation for six cars.

TP.29532/NW/18255 - REFUSED on 09/12/1960 for the erection of a single storey dwelling house at the rear of 18 Rosecroft Avenue.

20 Rosecroft Avenue:

2011/5735/P – GRANTED on 16/02/2012 for erection of timber shed at rear garden to existing flat (Class C3).

## Relevant policies

### NPPF 2012

### London Plan 2011

#### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS15 Open space and biodiversity

DP2 Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing

DP6 Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes

DP18 Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking

DP19 Managing the impact of parking

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's Heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

#### Camden Planning Guidance (2011)

CPG1 Design

CPG2 Housing

#### Redington/Frogna Conservation Area Statement – January 2003

## Assessment

### Background

The 2013 appeal decision reasons were that the tree is not of concern as it is already in poor conditions.

On visibility; the inspector acknowledged its prominence from neighbouring properties including 16 Rosecroft Avenue and other houses fronting Redington Road to the east and that there is ..'no evident objection to its overall siting and scale (due to the) considerable distances separating it from other buildings.'

On design; the inspector concluded that the proposal would harm the CA by its extensively glazed front façade which would be out of keeping with the varied but more traditionally designed dwellings in the vicinity.

### **Proposal**

Accordingly, the previously dismissed proposal has been revised and permission is sought for the demolition of the existing chalet and replacement with a single-storey building to provide granny annex (flat) to include a new design.

Again, the outbuilding is to be set within the furthest corner from the host house, against the existing boundary fence shared with nos. 79-81 Redington Road and no. 18 Rosecroft Avenue. The front of the building projects further into the garden by some 2m. The outbuilding comprises 1-bedroom and other living accommodation which includes a bathroom, kitchen and lounge/dining area. The building would be accessed via the existing side access to the main building.

The building is mostly designed with a flat roof in all areas adjoining the boundary fences and a long area of pitch roof (with a hipped end) to its centre with about a third of it glazed with roof lights. Previous additional glazing to the rear and front gables are omitted from this scheme. The highest point of the roof is not higher than the existing chalet with the majority of the building set within the 2m height of the boundary wall, allowing for the sloping nature of the garden and some excavation.

The main issues of consideration area:

1. Land use
2. Design
3. Impact on Trees
4. Amenity
5. Transport

### **Land use**

The principle of demolition of the existing shed is considered acceptable and does not require conservation area consent because it is less than 115cubic metres in volume and is not attached to the main building.

Its replacement with a 'granny' annex is acceptable in principle and while could accommodate any member of the family or other occupiers is considered to comply with policy DP2 and the NPPF which encourages the increase in the provision of residential accommodation. However, this should be subject to detailed design and the constraints of each site as discussed below. In addition, if the scheme was otherwise acceptable, an appropriately worded condition would be recommended that the granny flat remain ancillary to the accommodation of the host building.

The land use has not been raised as a reason for concern by the inspectorate.

### **Design**

Previous concerns over the size, scale and height of the building are not raised with this proposal in light of the inspectors' decision. The proposed design is primarily a timber clad building with timber framed windows and door (to be secured by condition as agreed with applicant) and a reduced amount of glazing to the front façade. Accordingly, the proposed design is considered acceptable and complies with Camden's policies DP24 and DP25.

### **Impact on Trees**

As mentioned below the tree is established as in poor condition as therefore no concerns are raised as to its loss as a result on the proposal.

**Amenity**

The proposal is not considered to result in any significant privacy and overlooking impacts to adjoining occupiers, in particular no. 16 Rosecroft and potentially at no. 18 Rosecroft Avenue as window-to-window relationships are greater than 18m and there is no additional overlooking compared to the existing use of the rear garden. This view is supported by the appeal decision.

Furthermore, it is noted that concerns are raised over potential garden night lighting. However, this does not form part of the proposal and would not be subject to planning permission on a domestic scale as such.

**Transport**

The occupiers to the annex are stated as being from the same household as the host building and would therefore benefit from the existing parking arrangements.

Given the size of the main house and rear garden it is considered that cycle parking storage could be provided within the perimeter of the site.

Moreover, as it is recommended to condition this permission by the proposed replacement outbuilding not to be used separately from the main building, the additional parking stress is considered to result in a minimal impact.

**Summary**

The proposal is considered to be acceptable, following the inspector's decision.

**Recommendation**

Grant planning permission.