

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	14/06/2012
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	24/05/12
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Angela Ryan			2012/1501/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
19 GROVE TERRACE LONDON NW5 1PH			Refer to 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 a single storey extension to the existing garage structure in rear garden of dwelling house (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	2	No. of responses	5	No. of objections	5
			No. electronic	4		
Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice was displayed from 26/04/12 to 17/05/12 and a notice displayed in the local press from 03/05/12 to 24/05/12. Five letters of objection has been received from the occupiers of 9, 11, 18, 21 and 26 Grove Terrace. A summary of the objections are as follows:- - The proposal would create an undesirable precedent - Overdevelopment - The proposal is detrimental to the setting of the listed building -The proposal would not serve to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and will have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the conservation area -Loss of garden area - Loss of light/overshadowing - Loss of outlook - The wording “ancillary residential purposes” is ambivalent creating the possibility for future garden development -					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<b><u>Dartmouth park CAAC:</u></b> Object of the grounds of:- -The near doubling of the already excessively enlarged and inappropriately roofed building - The proposed extension is distinguishable from the ones that were dismissed by appeal by being larger, more intrusive, more out of line and inferior in respect of the design detailing particularly with regard to the use of UPVC openings  <b><u>English Heritage:</u></b> Were formally consulted as the application proposals are adjacent to a grade II* listed building. No response has been received to date.					

## Site Description

The site comprises a three-storey plus basement mid terrace c1780 building, located on the east side of Grove Terrace. The site lies within a terrace of buildings of similar height and design that are predominantly in residential use. There is an existing ancillary garage structure at the rear of the garden, with access possible onto Grove Terrace Mews at this point. At the time of the site inspection it was ascertained that the garage is currently being used for storage purposes.

The dwelling house is a grade II\* listed building and also lies within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

## Relevant History

### 19 Grove Terrace:

**23/02/50-** Permission **granted** for the erection of a garden shed within the curtilage of No. 19, Grove Terrace. (Ref: TP54470/18335)

**11/01/08-** Listed Building Consent **refused** for the erection of new extension at rear and internal alterations. (REF:2007/5613/L)

**07/04/08-** Permission **granted** for the erection of an extension at rear, lower ground floor with terrace above at ground floor level, conversion of stores into plant and utility room and alterations to levels of rear garden. (Ref: 2008/0857/P)

### 6 Grove Terrace:

**26/08/93-** Listed building consent **refused** and subsequently dismissed on appeal for the erection of a single storey building at the rear of the garden to be used ancillary to the residential dwelling house (Ref: 9201419 R2 & 9270231) (Appeal Ref: T/APP/X5210/A/93/232016/P7)

The application was refused on the basis that it was considered that the proposed building was undesirable in terms of size and height and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the adjoining listed buildings. The appeal was dismissed owing to the size and height of the proposed garden building, together with its overall form and shape would detract from the small scale nature of the other outbuildings in the nearby gardens.

**31/01/2000-** Permission **granted** for the erection of a single storey timber building to the rear of the rear garden (Ref: PE9900977)

### 14 Grove Terrace:

**13/04/72-** Permission **refused** for Demolition of existing garage at rear of 14 Grove Terrace, and erection of a new town house (Ref: CTP/E11/3/12/12994). There were two reasons for refusal:

1. The proposals would constitute undesirable backland development, inconsistent with the character of the surrounding area and
2. The replacement of the existing garage with a town house would deprive the existing house of an off-street parking space.

**13/05/94-** Permission **refused** for the erection of a garage and orangery in the rear garden (Ref: 9300632). There were two reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed building would be reason of its height, size, scale and design, have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area; and
2. The proposed building would, by reason of its height, size, scale and design, have an adverse impact on the setting of the other listed buildings along the mews.

**29/07/94-** Permission and listed building consent **refused** and subsequently dismissed on appeal for the erection of a garage and garden room in the rear garden (Ref: 9400796). (Appeal refs:

T/APP/X5210/A/94/239613/P2 & T/APP/X5210/A/94/241895/P2). There were two reasons for refusal;

1. The proposed building would by reason of its height, size, scale, design and materials have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area; and
2. The proposed building would, by reason of its height, size, scale, design and materials, have

an adverse impact on the setting of the other listed buildings in the Mews. The appeal was dismissed on 05/12/04 owing to the prominence of the structures detracting from the setting of the listed terrace and from the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.

**17/12/98-** Permission and listed building consent **granted** for the erection of a garage and garden room at the end of the garden fronting on to Grove Terrace Mews (Refs: PE9700860R2 & LE9700861R2)

#### **16 Grove Terrace**

**05/06/98-** Permission **refused** for the erection of a single storey garage building in rear Garden. (Ref: PE9800311). There were two reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed use of material (corrugated steel sheet roof covering) not considered appropriate to this location within the South Hill/Dartmouth Part Conservation Area and within the curtilage of a grade 2\* listed building, and being contrary to the design policies set out in the Borough Plan and the draft Unitary Development Plan.

2. The proposed building, by reason of its size and location, will result in damage to the existing mature tree located in the rear garden to 16 Grove Terrace and likely to lead to the premature loss of the tree which would be detrimental to the character, appearance and ecological value of the area.

#### **24 Grove Terrace:**

**09/05/11-** Permission and listed building consent **granted** with warning of enforcement action for retention of a single storey garage and sunroom at rear garden of residential dwelling (Class C3) (Refs: 2011/0465/P & 2011/0466/L)

### **Relevant policies**

#### **National Planning Policy Framework 2012**

On 27<sup>th</sup> March 2012 the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The policies contained in the NPPF are material considerations which should be taken into account (from 27<sup>th</sup> March 2012) in determining planning applications. The NPPF replaces a number of national planning policy documents (listed at Annex 3 of the NPPF).

#### **The London Plan (2011)**

Policy 7.6 (Architecture)

#### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

##### **Core Strategy:**

**CS5-** (Managing the impact of growth and development)

**CS14-** (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

**CS15-** (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity)

##### **Development Policies:**

**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- Chapter 1-** Introduction; **Chapter 2-** Design excellence; **Chapter 3-** Heritage and **Chapter 4-** Extensions, alterations and conservatories

**CPG6- Amenity-Chapter 6-** Daylight and sunlight; **Chapter 7-** Overlooking, privacy and outlook

#### **Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement 2009**

## Assessment

### Proposal:

The applicant proposes to add a single storey conservatory type extension to the existing single storey garage structure located at the bottom of the garden at the application site. It not clear when the garage was built however the site visit ascertained that it is a modern intervention and is not of historic interest. The extension is proposed to be attached to the existing garage building resulting in the form protruding deeper into the garden area (towards the rear elevation of the house).

It should be noted that various applications in respect of structures in the rear gardens of buildings along Grove Terrace have been refused and dismissed on appeal for either creating a prominent and somewhat intrusive feature in the overall vista of the rear garden of the terrace detracting from the setting of the listed terrace and for being harmful to the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. These decisions were made in the 1990's and it is acknowledged that since then policy and guidance have advanced, although they are still of consideration in this application (see relevant planning history).

Moreover, it is also acknowledged that several approvals have also been granted for structures in the rear gardens of some properties along Grove Terrace the most recent approval granted in 2011 in respect of a structure in the rear garden of no. 24 Grove Terrace (see relevant planning history). It should also be noted that many of the buildings in the terrace now feature an outbuilding at the end of their gardens which are predominantly used for garages and are accessed off Grove Terrace Mews. Therefore it is considered that appropriate development could be considered at the application site and there is no in-principle objection to any development at this part of the site.

The key issues to consider are:

- The impact of the development on the setting of the listed building and character and appearance of the conservation area;
- The impact on amenity

### **The impact of the development on the setting of the listed building and character and appearance of the conservation area:**

Policy 7.6 B of the London Plan stipulates that structures should (b) be of a proportion, composition, scale and orientation that enhances, activates and appropriately defines the public realm.

Paragraph 7.21 also says that architecture should contribute to the creation of a cohesive built environment that enhances the experience of living, working or visiting in the city, which is often best achieved by ensuring new buildings reference, but not necessarily replicate, the scale, mass and detail of the predominant built form surrounding them. This is further supported by policies CS14 paragraph 14.7 and DP25, paragraph 25.2 which seek to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas, and seek to manage change in a way that retains the distinctive characters of conservation areas and expect new developments to contribute to this.

The proposed structure is proposed to be predominantly glazed and will be approximately 3.7m high, 4.7m wide and 4.2m deep and would result in providing approximately 17.1m of additional floorspace understood to be ancillary to the existing residential use at the site. It is proposed to be constructed of lightweight timber and glass and a pitched roof, and abut the existing listed boundary walls on either side of the application site. It is proposed to be constructed in such a way (cladding affixed to frames) so not to be attached to the existing walls and bear down on them. In design terms whilst no objections are raised to the traditional design approach the framing for the glazing is proposed to be PVUC which is considered to be harmful to the setting of the listed building by virtue of the use of inappropriate material.

Moreover, the proposal would more than double the size of the existing garage building to an overall length of approximately 10m and is considered would result in the creation in itself of an overly large

and bulky outbuilding in the rear garden. This would be particularly evident from views from the surrounding gardens and from the upper floors of the adjoining properties on Grove Terrace. In addition the proposed building would project into the garden significantly more than existing similar structures along the terrace.

An aboricultural report accompanied the application and confirmed that an existing taxa tree located in the rear garden is of some merit. It was concluded that the tree could handle extension of the wall to within 1m of it provide that some mitigation measures are put in place. The remainder of the greenery in the vicinity of the extension will be cut back and pruned. Given that the greenery would be retained no objections are raised. However, it is recommended that an informative is added on the decision notice informing that a separate consent is required for any works to trees.

It is considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area by reason of its bulk, mass, detailed design and use of inappropriate materials and is thereby contrary to policies CS14 and DP25 of Camden's LDF.

**Amenity:**

Objections have been raised in respect to the loss of light, overshadowing and loss of outlook by virtue of the proposal. In terms of the loss of light it is considered that the proposal would not result in any significant loss of light or create overshadowing than that which already exists as a result of the height and location of the dense greenery located on the side boundary of the properties to the rear. The proposed outbuilding would extend from a range of approximately 1.2 to 2.5m above the side boundary wall and would be visible from the adjoining properties. It is considered that there would be no significant loss of outlook as the building would be located some distance away from the main house.

**Recommendation: Refuse**

**Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444***