

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>24/09/2010</b>
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>7/9/2010</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Hugh Miller			2010/3481/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
7 Perceval Avenue London NW3 4PY			See 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>					
Erection of new double carport in rear garden adjacent to existing garage and retention of altered timber and brick front garden boundary wall to single-family dwelling house (Class C3)					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Grant 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>					

## Consultations

<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>08</b>	No. of responses	<b>02</b>	No. of objections	<b>02</b>
			No. Electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p><u>14 Perceval Avenue:</u> Objection</p> <p>The applicant has increased the front boundary without waiting for the outcome of the planning application. Increasing the height of the front boundary is inconsistent with the majority of the other properties in the road. The recent decision to allow the owners of no. 10 Perceval Avenue to greatly increase the height of their front boundary should not be taken as a precedent.</p> <p><b>Officer Comment:</b> Please refer to paragraphs 1.6 to 1.9.</p> <p>Cllr Chris Knight objects-          “There are no details on the web for this application but on visiting the site the front wall is of poor design and looks over height to me could this be checked please?          With regard to what has been done without planning permission the construction neither enhances or preserves the conservation area therefore falls foul of UDP B7, Cllr Roberts and I would ask for this application to be refused”.</p> <p><b>Officer Comment:</b> Please refer to paragraphs 1.6 to 1.9.</p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify	<p><u>Fitzjohns/Netherhall CAAC:</u> Object</p> <p>We object to the loss of garden.</p> <p><b>Officer Comment:</b> Please refer to paragraph 1.4</p>					

## Site Description

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached single dwellinghouse within the Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area. The garage in the rear garden has vehicular access via a narrow driveway running from Belsize Lane and between the rear gardens of properties on the east side of Perceval Avenue and the rear gardens of properties on the west side of Haverstock Hill. The front garden boundary has been recently been rebuilt while works are currently underway on building the carport.

## Relevant History

July 2007 – PP granted for Replacement of existing single storey garage in rear garden of dwellinghouse with a larger single-storey garage with dummy pitch roof; 2007/2009/P.

## 10 Perceval Ave.

Retention of replacement boundary fence for single family dwelling house (Class C3). **PP Granted 18/12/2009**

## **Relevant policies**

### **Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006**

B1-General design principles.

B3-Alterations & extensions

B7 conservation areas

SD6 - Amenity for occupiers & neighbours

T7 offstreet parking

### **CPG 2006**

#### ***Draft LDF Core Strategy***

The Inspector's Report into the Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Policies Development Plan documents ("DPD"s) was published on 13th September and found the policies in the DPDs to be sound. This means "considerable weight" can now be given to these LDF policies even though at this stage they have yet to be formally adopted by the Council. Where there is a conflict between UDP policies and these LDF policies the Planning Inspectorate would consider it reasonable to follow the latter. However prior to formal adoption UDP policies should still be taken into account as the Council's adopted Development Plan.

*CS1 – Distribution of growth*

*CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development*

*CS11- promoting sustainable travel*

*CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage*

*DP18 - parking standards*

*DP19 - managing impact of parking*

*DP24 –Securing high quality design*

*DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage / conservation areas*

*DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours*

## Assessment

The application proposes the following:

- ✓ Erection of new double carport at rear [adjacent to existing garage]
- ✓ retention of new timber and brick front boundary wall to single-family dwelling house (Class C3)

### 1.0 Design

#### Single-storey carport

1.1 The application site has an existing single-storey garage building located at the rear of the property and accessed from Belsize Lane, which lies due north of the application site and building (see history section above). It has a part dummy pitch roof and part flat roof with red brick walls.

1.2 The proposed carport comprise part flat and part dummy pitch roof similar to the existing single-storey garage. It measure 6.5m wide by 5.5m deep with a 3.2m height (dummy pitch roof) with a 2.3m high flat roof. The proposed carport would comprise white painted brick walls, part clay tiles and felt roof covering. It would replace a section of the rear garden amenity space of the host building and the relocated timber boundary fence would be located closer to the dwellinghouse. The proposed carport would be lower in height and larger (29sqm) than the existing garage building (24sqm) and together form two single-storey buildings at the rear (northern boundary) of the application site.

1.3 There are a variety of ancillary garage structures of varying sizes, design and materials within the immediate area of rear gardens and access road. It is considered that the replacement structure, by virtue of its more sympathetic design and use of quality materials will preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. Although the combination of both this carport and existing garage would result in built structures covering the entire width of the frontage here and half of the rear garden, it does not result in loss of any trees or important landscape features and it is considered that on balance this would not be seriously harmful to the character of this backland area. The design as a carport gives a lightweight appearance with only a solid roof on posts and relocated fence and thus it is more acceptable here than if this was a solid walled structure effectively giving the appearance of a triple-car width garage.

1.4 The carport would be located adjacent to an existing garage structure in the rear garden of 7 Perceval Avenue well hidden from the public realm and will not have any impact on the amenity of adjoining residents. It is accepted that rear garden amenity space contributes to the character of townscape and to the distinctive character and appearance of individual buildings and their surroundings. In this instance however, the rear garden space is of a substantive size and its reduction is considered not to compromise or have any significant impact on the occupiers' amenity nor that of neighbours and is therefore satisfactory.

1.5 There are no neighbour amenity issues in this instance, in terms of daylight or outlook.

#### Front boundary wall

1.6 In Perceval Avenue, the boundary treatment to front gardens vary in height, design and use of materials, as seen for example at nos. 3, 5 & 9 on the north side and nos. 2, 6, 8 & 10 on the south side. In particular nos 3, 9 and 10 have high boundary walls, some with timber fence panels, while no 11 has a high hedge. No 9 next to the application site was granted permission on 23.5.97 for a solid brick boundary wall. No 10 was granted permission on 15.12.09 for new boundary treatment comprising timber fence and brick piers. Perceval Avenue is on a gentle slope east to west and the irregular height of front boundary walls accentuate the height differences but not so that they are considered harmful to the appearance of the streetscape.

1.7 At the application site, the original boundary was approx a 1m high brick wall; recently the piers have now been raised and timber infill panels installed above the wall plus timber gates set below the brick pier capping. The boundary treatment as erected is slightly higher than that to no.9 (the submitted plans are inaccurate) but has a similar solid style albeit with a different design. Given the

precedents set elsewhere in this short street, this form of high solid boundary treatment is considered on balance acceptable here, although a somewhat lower height to match the existing neighbouring wall at no.9 would have been preferred.

1.8 For comparative purposes, the boundary fence as erected is substantially smaller in scope to that of no.10, in terms of its road frontage. Moreover, while it is acknowledged that in some instances high boundary fences can have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of buildings, it is considered that on balance the boundary treatment works have been appropriately sited and designed with matching materials; given the variety of treatments found along this road, the wall maintains the integrity of the host building and the wider surrounding area and does not seriously harm the character of the conservation area.

1.9 The proposed front boundary treatment, despite its height and rather bland solid design compared to that of its neighbour at no.9, is on balance considered acceptable.

## ***2.0 Transport***

2.1 The carport will allow parking for 2 cars, which in conjunction with the existing garage will result in a total 3 cars for this property - this exceeds current policies which stipulate only 1 carspace per dwelling. However in this case, the owner could park additional cars in the rear garden as permitted development- the Council has no control over widening or creating new vehicular entrances from the private access road into the rear garden nor can it control the hard surfacing of potentially the entire rear garden for carparking purposes. Given these limitations and the general character of the access way and associated rear gardens for carparking, this expansion of parking is considered acceptable in this instance as an exception to policy. Given that works have already started on site, it is not considered expedient to take enforcement action against this new structure and use.

Recommendation Grant.

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010. For further information see**

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