

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	02/11/2012
(Member Briefing)		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	18/10/2012
Officer		Application Number(s)		
Craig Raybould		1. 2012/4541/C 2. 2012/4482/P		
Application Address		Drawing Numbers		
York Rise Estate York Rise London NW5 1DU		Refer to draft decision notices		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
1. Demolition of existing boundary wall between the rear of nos. 50-74 Twisden Road and York Rise Estate, associated with existing residential flats (Class C3). 2. Erection of new boundary wall between the rear of nos. 50-74 Twisden Road and York Rise Estate, associated with existing residential flats (Class C3).				
Recommendation(s):		1. Grant Conservation Area Consent; 2. Grant Planning Permission.		
Application Type:		1. Conservation Area Consent; 2. Full Planning Permission.		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	16	No. of responses	04	No. of objections	01
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	A notice was printed in the Ham & High newspaper from 27/09/2012 to expiry (18/10/2012).					
	A site notice was displayed from 19/09/2012 to expiry (10/10/2012).					
	Objections:					
	<u>The occupiers of 54 Twisden Road</u>					
	Objections received on the grounds that:					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Insufficient information has been received in respect of the replacement wall (paras 2.4-2.7);- Trellising affixed to the wall by the owners/occupiers of Twisden Road is not shown in the submitted drawings;- Red brick would be an inappropriate finish (paras 2.4-2.7);- The proposed wall needs expansion joints to stop it from buckling in future;					
	Other comments					
	<u>E-mail comment (no address provided)</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Welcomes the rebuilding of this part of the wall;- The wall should be re-built as a whole using the correct materials, a Flemish Garden bond and lime mortar (paras 2.4-2.7);- The application does not show that the wall properly conserve and enhance the CA (paras 2.4-2.7).					
	<u>The occupiers of 60 Twisden Road</u>					
	No objection to the rebuilding of the wall provided that:					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- During construction, access safety to no. 60 Twisden Road should be assured;- Any garden planting should be protected or replaced (para 2.8);- Height of wall should not exceed existing height (para 1.1);- Work should be carried out without delay.					
	<u>The occupier of no .74 Twisden Road</u>					
	No objection on the rebuilding of the wall provided that:					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- No damage is caused to trees in the rear gardens of properties on Twisden Road (Para 2.8);- Trellising on top of the existing wall should be replaced (para 2.9).					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	The Dartmouth Park CAAC were consulted on 13/09/2012. No response has been received.					
	The Chetwynd and Twisden Roads Residents' Association object to the proposals on the following grounds:					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The proposed use of red brick, non-original bonding and cement repair pointing will have a negative visual impact on the character and appearance of the CA (Paras 2.4-2.7).- Some of the gardens on Twisden Road may have trees that could be affected by the works (para 2.8).					

Site Description

The site pertains to a brick wall 1.9m in height located adjacent to York Rise. The wall provides a continuous boundary treatment between the rear garden of properties on the southern aspect of Twisden Road and York Rise Estate to the rear. The application proposals relate to section of the wall that extends from the rear of nos. 50-74 Twisden Road on its eastern end.

At its western end, the wall is constructed from predominantly yellow stock brick whilst the eastern end is much more altered with patch repairs and sections rebuilt with a variety of brick types.

The site is located within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

Relevant History

No relevant history

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

LDF Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2009)

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 (Design)

CPG6 (Amenity)

The London Plan (2011)

The NPPF 2012

Assessment

1. Proposals

1.1 The application proposes the demolition of a section of the wall at its eastern end, to the rear of nos. 50-74 Twisden Road and the erection of a replacement wall. The proposed replacement wall would be erected to the same height as the existing wall (ranging from 1.9m to 1.6m in height as a result of the changing ground levels).

1.2 The key issues associated with the proposals are: The effect of the works on the appearance of this prominent means of boundary treatment and; the impact the proposals would have on the special character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

2. Analysis

2.1 The section proposed to be demolished is the eastern end which is showing signs of bowing, is propped in places and consists of a patchwork of different brick types. No objection is raised to the extent of demolition proposed which is justified and offers the opportunity of improving the wall with a unified design.

2.2 An analysis of historic maps and the wall itself suggest that it is the original wall for the rear of Twisden Road. Where it survives at the western end it is constructed from yellow stock bricks in a Flemish Garden Wall bond with a soldier course.

2.3 The original application documents included some discrepancies in respect of the proposed materials, with the application forms stating the wall would be re-built in a red stock brick and the D&A Statement stating that a yellow stock brick would be used. The proposed drawings (dwg no. PL_03 Rev A) failed to provide details of materials or the type of pointing to be used.

2.4 Following negotiations with the applicant it has been agreed that a yellow stock brick set in a Flemish Garden Wall bond with a soldier course would be an appropriate material and finish and the applicant has submitted revised drawings annotated to reflect this (dwg no. PL_03 Rev B).

2.5 In order to meet with British Standard and to ensure that the wall does not move, bow or crack in future, expansion joints are proposed at 6m intervals. These are on the rear side and will not be seen from street, and are therefore considered acceptable.

2.6 In order to preserve the historic integrity of the wall and the character of the CA, it is recommended that conditions be attached to any consent requiring:

- Where possible existing historic stock bricks from the demolished section of wall shall be salvaged and used in the reconstructed wall.
- A sample panel of the facing brickwork demonstrating the proposed colour, texture, face-bond and pointing shall be provided on site and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the relevant parts of the works are commenced and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approval given. The approved panel shall be retained on site until the work has been completed.

2.7 This will ensure that the proposals form a coherent composition with the existing original part of the wall and would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the CA. Subject to these conditions, the proposals meet with policies CS5, CS14, DP24, DP25 and DP26 and are considered acceptable in planning and conservation terms.

2.8 Comments have been received from residents of Twisden Road that they are anxious that the rebuilding of the wall could damage trees in their rear gardens and that any damaged planting should be protected or replaced. As the wall is a direct replacement of that which exists, it is not expected that the new wall would encroach on any root protection areas of existing trees. It is not considered appropriate within the scope of an application of this scale to attach onerous conditions in respect protecting and replacing planting in private gardens.

2.9 Comments have also been received from residents stating that the trellising affixed to the existing wall should be reinstated in the new wall. Whilst trellising affixed to the proposed would constitute development requiring planning permission, it is not considered appropriate for consideration as part of this scheme. Indeed, the presence of a variety of trellis panels affixed to the proposed wall may prejudice the acceptability of the application. These details have therefore not been requested.

2.10 As the wall will be a replacement of that which exists and will be erected to the same height, it will not give rise to any amenity concerns in terms of overlooking, privacy or outlook. The proposals therefore comply policies CS5 and DP26.

3. Recommendation

- 2) It is recommended that conservation area consent is granted;
- 3) It is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to the conditions outlined above.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 29th October 2012.

For further information see

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>