

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	13/12/2013
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	28/11/2013
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Carlos Martin			2013/6720/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
53 Compayne Gardens London NW6 3DB			Refer to draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of outbuilding in rear garden.				
Recommendation(s):		Grant		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	25	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	01
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>No. electronic 02</p> <p>Press notice published from 07/11/02013 to 28/11/2013 Site notice displayed from 30/10/2013 to 20/11/2013</p> <p>1x support comment and 1x objection based on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Outbuildings in rear gardens are detrimental to the character of conservation areas. 2. Proposal will result in loss of garden space and soft landscaping. 3. The cumulative effect of this proposal with the outbuilding at no. 76 Canfield Gardens will detract from the general feeling of openness. 4. The protruding lightwell will result in loss of outlook to surrounding flats. 5. Proposal will result in increase noise and activity and light spillage to the detriment of neighbouring occupiers. 6. Proposal will set another precedent which will further harm the biodiversity and tranquil qualities of the conservation area. <p><u>Officers comments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The South Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal advises that “<i>any development of rear garden spaces should not detract from the general feeling of openness, and should ensure that most of the existing garden space is retained</i>”. The proposed outbuilding would only cover a small proportion of the generously sized garden, ensuring that most of the existing garden space is preserved. 2. Only a small proportion of the garden space would be lost. 3. Given the size and scale of the proposed outbuilding and its location near the larger outbuilding at no. 76 Canfield Gardens it is not considered that it would detract from the general feeling of openness. 4. The proposed out building would be partially screened by the existing mature trees at no. 78 Canfield Gardens and the application site as well as by the outbuilding at no. 76 Canfield Gardens. Therefore, in this location, it is not considered to result in a significant loss of outlook. 5. No loss of amenity is considered to be likely as a result of the proposal to any adjoining occupiers at the site or adjoining the site directly, due to the siting of proposed outbuilding and the large plot of the site. 6. Given its size and location it is not considered that the proposal will harm biodiversity and no trees would be affected. 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	None; no local CAAC active at present.					

Site Description

The application site comprises a large semi-detached property located on the south side of Compayne Gardens. The property is divided into flats and this application relates to the ground floor flat. The property is in the South Hampstead Conservation Area but is not listed.

Relevant History

2008/0371/P: pp granted for the erection of a rear extension and outbuilding for use in association with the ground floor flat at no. 76 Canfield Gardens.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

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)

CPG6 (Amenity)

South Hampstead Conservation Area character appraisal and management strategy 2011

Assessment

Proposal

The proposed outbuilding/garden room would be built in timber and would feature a copper roof and a set of sliding screens and two opaque glass windows. It would be 5.0m wide by 4.0m deep and 3.7m high. It would be located at the far end of the existing garden.

The proposal has been amended to incorporate translucent glass on its two windows and to replace the originally proposed clerestory with a rooflight.

Main planning considerations

The main planning issues to be considered are: the impact of the proposal in terms of design and conservation and the impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbours.

Design

The proposed outbuilding is higher than average. However, the rear garden is also large and the property would retain a generously sized garden where mature vegetation could be sustained. The proposed timber material is considered appropriate for a back garden development and would assist to integrate the structure in the garden, minimising its visual impact. Given its location, at the far end of the garden, the proposal is not considered harmful to the character and appearance of the property or the conservation area generally.

The proposed garden structure would not result in the removal of any trees. There are mature trees in the surrounding gardens considered to be of important visual amenity and biodiversity, however they will not be detrimentally impacted by the proposed works according to the arboricultural report submitted. However, details of the foundations and the layout, with dimensions and levels, of service trenches and other excavations on site in so far as these may affect trees should be requested by condition to ensure that the development will not have an adverse effect on existing trees.

Amenity

No loss of amenity is considered to be likely as a result of the proposal to any adjoining occupiers at the site or adjoining the site directly, due to the siting of the structure and the large plot of the site. The windows of the proposed garden structure would be opaque and so they will not result in any detrimental impact on the current levels of privacy of neighbouring occupiers. The potential light spillage from the proposed rooflight has been considered; however, given its distance from the adjoining houses it is not considered to create any loss of

amenity or harm to wildlife.

Recommendation

In summary, it is considered that the proposal would broadly comply with relevant design and amenity policies and consequently approval is recommended.