

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>20/06/2012</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		07/06/2012	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Lauren McMahon				2012/1856/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
17 Oakeshott Avenue LONDON N6 6NT				Refer to draft 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>							
Retention of a single-storey timber outbuilding in the rear garden ancillary to the existing dwelling house (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Grant Planning Permission</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Householder Application</b>					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>03</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
				No. Electronic	<b>01</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>The application was advertised in the local press Ham &amp; High from 17/05/2012 to 07/06/2012 and a site notice was displayed from 09/05/2012 to 30/05/2012.</p> <p>One response was received from the adjoining neighbour to the west, no. 15 Oakeshott Avenue, who raised concerns about the window along the western boundary which could potentially affect the neighbours privacy as the subject site is on higher grounds.</p> <p><i>Officers response: refer to paragraph 3.3.</i></p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>		<p>Holly Lodge CAAC: There is no plan of the existing structure. However, on the basis that the new construction is the same size as the original one, we have no objection.</p> <p><i>Officers response: no photos or plans were submitted with the planning application to illustrate the size of the original structure. However, on site it was confirmed by the owner that the erected outbuilding is similar in size to the original however it is slightly longer. The design and access statement stipulates that existing outbuilding is the maximum height of the pitched roof of the original shed. Furthermore, the design of the outbuilding is further discussed in paragraph 2.1.</i></p>					

## Site Description

A 2-storey detached house situated on the north side of Oakeshott Avenue. The property is sited close to the front boundary of the plot and has a large rear garden. The property is located within Holly Lodge Estate conservation area. It is not listed.

## Relevant History

CA\2011\ENQ\07152 – erection of a large outbuilding which has replaced a small shed – ongoing investigation.

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy

**CS1** – Distribution of growth

**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

**Holly Lodge Estate draft Conservation Area Statement 2011**  
**Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

## Assessment

### 1.0 Proposal

1.1 The application proposes the retention of an outbuilding in the rear garden which is used for additional storage ancillary to the family dwelling house. The outbuilding measures approximately 7.7m in length, 3.2m wide and 2.6m high. The outbuilding faces south towards the rear of the host property. It is located at the rear of the garden set in approximately 0.2m from the rear boundary. The timber cladding structure is positioned on a raised concrete platform and incorporates sliding glass doors to the south (front) elevation, a window to the east (side) elevation and a flat felt roof structure with a slight slope to the rear for drainage.

1.2 According to the owner of the subject site, the original shed in the rear garden which was demolished and the outbuilding was constructed to replace it. No photographic evidence or existing plans have been submitted with the planning application to illustrate the size or design of the original shed. However it has been noted that the outbuilding is slightly longer than the shed, also the existing outbuilding is the maximum height of the pitched roof of the original shed.

1.3 The main issues for consideration are:

- The visual impact of the proposal upon the character or appearance of the host building and the surrounding conservation area;
- The impact that the proposal may have upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties; and
- Enforcement matters.

These issues are addressed below in the context of planning policy and other material considerations.

### 2.0 Visual impact

2.1 The outbuilding is located in the rear garden and is not visible from the public realm. The property benefits from a fairly substantial garden of approximately 25m by 9.5m (area 237.5sqm). The design and size of the outbuilding is considered to respect the appearance and character of the existing property and its surroundings, whilst the use of timber cladding is regarded to be appropriate for the garden setting. It should also be noted that the extensive amount of existing vegetation and trees in the garden ensures that the building does not represent an over dominant feature within the site as it is well screened. On balance, the proposal is considered not to harm the character and appearance of the existing building and the wider conservation area and is therefore in accordance with Policy DP25 of the LDF.

### 3.0 Residential amenity

3.1 The proposed outbuilding is approximately 18m from the rear of the property and would take up only a

small proportion of the rear garden. Given the reasonable height (2.6m) and site coverage (24.7sqm) of the proposed outbuilding, the proposal would not significantly reduce the amenity value of the existing open space. Furthermore it is not considered that the use of the outbuilding for ancillary domestic purposes would alter the fundamental character of the rear garden.

3.2 The outbuilding would not be highly visible from neighbouring properties as a result of the mature trees surrounding. Given the positioning and height of the outbuilding, and its proximity to the neighbouring properties, it would not have an impact in terms of access to sunlight, daylight, visual bulk or sense of enclosure.

3.3 With regard to privacy, noise and disturbance, the outbuilding features glazed doors to the front (south) elevation and a window to the side (west) elevation. Within this context, it is considered, by virtue of its surrounding screening and level of activity associated with the use of the outbuilding, it is considered the outbuilding would not result in a significant increase in overlooking, associated noise and disturbance to the adverse harm of the neighbouring properties.

#### **4.0 Enforcement Matters**

4.1 In November 2011 it was reported to the LB Camden that an unauthorised timber outbuilding had been erected in the rear garden of the property (being investigated under CA\2011\ENQ\07152). As the outbuilding is considered acceptable on policy grounds, the enforcement should be closed as it will benefit from planning permission.

#### **5.0 Recommendation**

5.1 Grant planning permission.

#### **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> July 2012. For further information please click [here](#).**