

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>26/04/2012</b>
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	12/04/2012
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Elaine Quigley			(i) 2011/6241/P (ii) 2011/6287/C		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
14 Chesterford Gardens London NW3 7DE			See draft decision notices		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
(i) Demolition of existing front boundary wall (Class C3) (ii) Erection of front boundary wall (following removal of existing wall) and re-landscaping of front garden including alterations to front entrance steps to flats (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		(i) Grant conservation area consent (ii) Grant planning permission subject to conditions			
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Conservation Area Consent</b> <b>Full Planning Permission</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>02</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>A site notice was displayed on 14/03/2012 (expired 04/04/2012) and press notice was published on 22/03/2012 (expired 12/04/2012).</p> <p>1 letter received from 16 Chesterford Gardens confirming no objections to the proposal.</p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>	<p><b>Heath and Hampstead Society</b> – originally objected  This application could have implications on the appearance and character of the Conservation Area, and we would like to be able to assess it. However, no drawings are included in the information provided on the website. We have no alternative but to oppose the application and call for refusal.</p> <p>The drawings were emailed to Heath and Hampstead Society and they advised that they have no comments to make on the application.</p> <p><b>Reginton/Frogna CAAC</b> notified about the application however no comments received to date.</p> <p><b>English Heritage</b> – confirmed that it is not necessary for the application to be notified to English Heritage</p>					

## Site Description

The application site is located on the west of Chesterford Gardens in close proximity to the junction with Redington Road to the north. The site comprises a 19<sup>th</sup> century three storey red brick detached (plus lower ground floor) property that is separated into 5 self-contained residential flats. The building is set back from the road behind a sizeable front garden which is mainly covered in hardstanding (paving slabs) and contains a London Plane tree within its frontage.

The building is not listed however the site is located within the Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area (sub area 6: Bracknell, Greenaway and Chesterford Gardens). The building is identified as part of a group of buildings (2-30 (even)) as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. In common with neighbouring properties it has a low brick wall that is separated by four piers.

## Relevant History

No relevant planning history associated with the site

### Tree application

No objection was raised by the Council to works to trees in a conservation area application – front garden 1 x London Plane (reduce back to previous points of reduction by 25%) rear garden 1 x Oak (remove lowest westerly limb. Raise crown to balance. Thin crown by 25%) No objections 21/06/2011 (2011/2909/T).

### Adjoining properties

#### 16 Chesterford Gardens

Planning permission was **refused** on 06/06/2000 for erection of two enclosures for the storage of waste bins and bicycles in the front garden (PW0002358). The reason for refusal related to the enclosures resulting in the substantial reduction to the area for landscaping in the front garden due to size and position and would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the building and seriously detract from the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF)  
The London Plan (2011)

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development  
CS13 Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards  
CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage  
CS15 Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity

DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction  
DP23 Water  
DP24 Securing high quality design  
DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage  
DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

### Supplementary Planning Guidance

#### CPG1 Design

Chapter 2 Design excellence  
Chapter 3 Heritage  
Chapter 6 Landscaping design and trees

#### CPG3 Sustainability

Chapter 11 Flooding  
Chapter 12 Adapting to climate change

Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area Statement (CAS)

## Assessment

Planning permission is sought for erection of front boundary wall (following removal of existing wall) and re-landscaping of front garden including alterations to front entrance steps to flats (Class C3). As the wall was erected before 01.07.1948 and is more than 1m in height that adjoins a highway, conservation area consent is required for its demolition. Due to the location of the trunk of the London Plane tree, the front boundary wall is cracking in its northernmost section and has therefore become unstable. It is therefore proposed to demolish the majority of the length of the existing wall together with the gate and gateposts accessing the main entrance.

The proposal would include the following:

- Erection of a new front boundary brick wall in Flemish bond with stone coping varying in height between 0.6m (adjacent to no. 12) and 0.9m (adjacent to no. 16).
- Four new brick piers would also be erected; two at the boundary of the property with nos. 12 and 16 and two adjacent to the entrance steps to the building. They would measure approximately 1.9m in height. The new brick wall would include a 1.3m gap to accommodate the trunk of the existing London Plane tree in the front garden.
- The existing entrance steps would be replaced by 5 new stone steps and Portland stone top landing. The quarry tiles leading up to the entrance steps would be replaced by Portland stone paving.
- Flights of concrete steps adjacent to nos. 12 and 16 would be reconstructed to provide increased space for refuse bins. This would include the removal of two steps at the bottom of the flight of steps adjacent to no. 12 to increase the length of landing at the bottom of the steps from 1.3m to 2.1m.
- Replacement of the crazy paving in the front garden with squared flag stone new stone paving (marshall honeydew)

## Design

The CAS refers to boundary walls as making a positive contribution to the conservation area. Any alterations to the front boundaries between the pavement and properties can dramatically affect and harm the character of the conservation area as brick walls and piers are enormously important to the streetscape. RF8 confirms that *"Proposals should respect the original style of boundary and these should generally be retained and reinstated where they have been lost."*

The south west side of the street is generally characterised by low level brick walls with hedges above and set between higher brick piers. The boundary treatment of the rest of the properties along the street is relatively uniform. The proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the building, the streetscape and the conservation area.

The replacement wall design comprises tall brick gateposts matching the existing gateposts at the north and south end of the property in terms of general height (they will line up with the rise in land levels in the street from south to north). There will be a masonry coping on the length of the main wall and the top of each gatepost, which will match the details and materials of the boundary walls on the neighbouring properties. The wall at No 16 appears to be modern; however there is no relevant planning history to confirm this. However, there is an established pattern of walls and gateposts of this style in the street, which sets a precedent for the proposed design. The break in the wall to give space to the tree trunk is considered necessary for the health of the tree which is a significant contributor to the streetscape.

It should be noted that the current proposal appears to involve the loss of the timber gateposts and pedestrian gate which will be removed. The gateposts are not historic and therefore their removal is considered acceptable. Although, the loss of the timber garden gate is unfortunate, the applicant has confirmed that they are not original and has advised that they are not willing to retain the existing gate or provide an alternative gate. Given that the gateposts and gate are not historic no objection could be raised to their removal.

There are no objections to the rebuilding of the house entrance steps in stone and the re-landscaping of the front garden, both of which will enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

## Trees and landscaping

In terms of the impact on the tree in the front garden, the application is considered acceptable. The arboricultural report confirms that the replacement paving will be permeable and the wall will be built on existing footings and there is no new excavation.

The details of the front boundary wall including the height of the wall and materials were submitted to the Tree Officer and no objections were raised. The proposal would not have an adverse impact on the health and vitality of the London Plane tree and would be considered acceptable.

**Sustainability**

The existing front garden area is mainly covered by crazy paving that is not permeable. The drawings have been annotated to confirm that the replacement flagstone paving will be laid using SUDS requirements for precast concrete/stone paving using the infiltration technique. This is welcomed as it would introduce new areas for water to soak into the ground and reduce surface runoff when compared to the existing situation.

**Amenity**

The proposal would not include any works that would result in loss of light, outlook privacy or sense of enclosure to adjoining residents and would be considered acceptable.

**Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

As no new floor space is being created the proposal would not be liable for CIL.

**Conclusion**

The proposal would be considered acceptable in terms of the demolition of the existing front boundary wall and its replacement with a new front boundary brick wall. The detailed design is considered appropriate and would not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area. The health and vitality of the London Plane tree would be maintained and the use of materials within the front garden would introduce SUDS technique would reduce surface runoff and improve water soak.

**Recommendation**

Grant conservation area consent and planning permission subject to conditions.

**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***