

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		17/04/2013	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		04/04/2013	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Carlos Martin				2013/1081/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
32 St Albans Road London NW5 1QU				Refer to draft decision notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Alterations to boundary wall to accommodate a new gate and new parking bay in front garden in connection with existing residential dwelling (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	04	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	02		
Summary of consultation responses:		Press notice published from 14/03/2013 to 04/04/2013. Site notice displayed from 08/03/2013 to 29/03/2013. 2x support comments.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		Dartmouth Park CAAC: No response.					

Site Description

The property is a semi-detached single family dwelling house located on the north side of St. Albans Road within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

Relevant History

2012/5947/P: Erection of a single storey rear extension, installation of two rooflights, replacement of existing balcony balustrade and alterations to balcony's access doors of existing dwelling house (Class C3). Granted 31/12/2012.

2008/1461/P: Erection of railings around flat roof to the rear of the dwelling to facilitate use of roof as a terrace. Granted 06/06/2008.

2007/3974/P: Alterations at rear second floor level to flat roof area in connection with use as a balcony. Refused 12/11/2007.

8601025: The retention of a roof extension at second-floor level to provide an additional bedroom and a bathroom and the erection of a glazed conservatory at ground-floor level at the rear. Granted 11/09/1986.

8700252: Change of use of the flat roof to a roof terrace including the erection of a new tiled sloping parapet (screened balustrade). Refused 12/11/1987.

Relevant policies

NPPF 2012

The London Plan 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

DP18 (Parking Standards and Limiting the Availability of Car Parking)

DP19 (Managing the Impact of Parking)

DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)

DP23 (Water)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 Design – chapter 6, para. 6.25.

Dartmouth Park conservation area appraisal and management strategy 2009

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the replacement of part of the existing boundary wall with a metal gate to provide a vehicular access to the forecourt and the provision of a hard standing for parking one single car.

2.1 Proposal requires planning permission because the front boundary wall is higher than 1m high.

2.0 Main planning considerations

2.1 The main planning considerations are the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and the conservation area and its impact on parking and drainage.

3.0 Design and conservation

3.1 In general this proposal is considered to be contrary to the principles of good design (LDF policy DP24 - Securing high quality design) and the principle for the design of front garden areas set out in the SPD, notably that changes should not result in more than 50% of the garden area becoming hard landscaping" and "where forecourt parking areas involve the loss of front garden space there is a presumption against the loss of garden space. The removal of vegetation, its replacement with a hard standing and the proximity of the cars to the building can all detract from the appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

3.2 The character of front gardens in this area, generally, is one of well-planted front gardens behind brick walls or hedges. The front garden of no. 32 fits with this character with mature planting in one of the borders and a paved pathway around a grass area. The proposals would clearly result in an increase in hard standing of greater than 50% of the front garden area. An attempt at maintaining a front boundary treatment is made- however it is considered that the open nature and large width of the proposed metal gates would not provide sufficient enclosure of the frontage to maintain the dominant character of front gardens within the conservation area. The open nature of the metal gates also exposes the increased area of hard surface. The loss of the garden to hard surfacing and carparking and the substantial loss of the brick wall would result in the erosion of the character of the streetscene and this part of the conservation area to its detriment.

3.3 It is noted that a number of front gardens nearby have front parking areas with similar proportions of planting and hard standing to that proposed. The treatment of these gardens serves to demonstrate the erosion of character of the area. The council has no records of recent applications granting permission for these alterations and possibly had no control over these gardens as the houses appear to be single-family dwellings and their original front boundary walls may have been less than 1m high. Nos 20-34 St Albans Road is a group of mostly semidetached properties built by the Smerdon Brothers in 1914 with slightly differing designs but grouped by their scale and use of tiled hipped roofs, gables and stucco. Of these, only the pair of nos. 20-22 does not have vehicular access. The pair of nos. 24-26, no. 28 and no. 34 all have car parking areas in their forecourts, to the detriment of their appearance, while in the pair of nos. 30-32 only no. 32 does not have a vehicular entrance. On the opposite side of the street there is a group of Arts & Crafts properties that have preserved their front gardens. The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2009) states that "*front and rear gardens within residential streets make an important contribution to the streetscape and character of the residential area. The Council will resist the loss of soft landscaping and original boundary walls and railings.*" The proposal is therefore unacceptable in terms of impact on appearance of the property and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

4.0 Parking issues

4.1 The proposal would involve the loss of 1 existing on-street parking space outside the property. Even although the proposal would provide 1 off-street parking space it needs to be noted that the new parking space would be for the sole use of the occupier of number 32 St Albans Road. Therefore, 1 on-street parking space would still be lost to local residents. It should be noted that this contravenes our development policies; specifically DP19 (Managing the impact of parking).

4.2 The ratio of parking permits to parking spaces in the Highgate CPZ is 0.66. This suggests that parking stress is not a significant issue in the CPZ. However, it is not known if parking stress is an issue in the vicinity

of the site. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the existing on-street parking provision would not be adversely affected. Such evidence is generally provided in the form of a parking beat survey. In the absence of such information, the proposal is unacceptable due to the loss of 1 on-street parking space outside the property.

5.0 Drainage

5.1 The guidance in CPG1 states that planning permission will not be granted for hard standings greater than 5m² that do not incorporate sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) into the design. SUDS incorporate permeable surfaces to allow water to soak into the subsoil, rather than being diverted into the stormwater system. The development proposals would result in the creation of a minimum of 21m² of hardstanding and the applicant has failed to provide any drawings or supporting information which demonstrate the inclusion of SUDS. Policy DP23 part b) requires the development to limit the amount and rate of run-off and waste water entering the combined storm water and sewer network and the proposals are therefore unacceptable.

6.0 Recommendation: Refuse