

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Tuesday 25th March 2008. For further information see <http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	01/04/2008
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	06/03/2008
Officer		Application Number(s)		
Carlos Martin		2007/5517/P		
Application Address		Drawing Numbers		
5 Courthope Road London NW3 2LE		Refer to Draft Decision Notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Retention of outbuilding in rear garden of ground floor flat.				
Recommendation(s):	Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions			
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	16	No. of responses	06	No. of objections	06
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 14/02/2008 to 06/03/2008.</p> <p><u>Owners / occupiers:</u> 5 objections based on the grounds of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The shed is out of character with the conservation area in terms of materials (blockwork and aluminium openings) and size. 2. The shed is out of character with the conservation area in terms of size. 3. As the property has already been extended, the garden space is further reduced. 4. The shed is electrified and will require a dehumidifier, which is likely to impact on the amenity of neighbours in terms of noise and light. 5. Shed is visible form all neighbouring houses. 6. The proposal constitutes gross-overdevelopment. <p><u>Officer's comments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst blockwork and aluminium are not considered the most suitable materials for a shed, this has been rendered white, minimising its impact on the character of the conservation area. This can be ensured by condition. 2. At 2.4m high at the ridge, the size of shed is not considered unreasonable, especially, as the shed is partly hidden by a trellis and planting. 3. The total garden size is approximately 40.0 sq m, of which the shed occupies 6. The remaining garden space is considered sufficient amenity space for a flat of this size. 4. The installation of electricity and temporary machinery cannot be controlled within the planning system. 5. The shed is surrounded in three of its sides by trellis and planting and is only visible from ground floor level from both adjoining properties and the property immediately to the rear. 6. The outbuilding would be considered "permitted development" if the property was a single-dwelling instead of a flat, and therefore, it cannot be said to constitute "gross overdevelopment" 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>Mansfield CAAC: Object on the grounds that blockwork structures are not sheds.</p> <p><u>Officer's comment:</u> The description of the development has been amended to replace shed with outbuilding.</p>					
Site Description						

The application relates to a three-storey plus attic terraced property situated on the west side of Courthope Road, north of the junction with Mansfield Road. The property has a two-storey back addition and a single-storey side and rear extension. Similar properties adjoin at either side and opposite.

The property is divided into 2 self-contained flats. The building is within the Mansfield Conservation Area.

Relevant History

10/07/2007: pp granted (2007/1314/P) for the erection of a single-storey side and rear extension.

14/08/2007: Enforcement investigation (ref. EN07/0585) in relation to concrete garden structure.

Relevant policies

UDP (2006): S1, S2, SD6; B1; B3; & B7

Camden Planning Guidance

Assessment

Planning permission is sought for the retention of an outbuilding in the rear garden of the ground floor flat.

The outbuilding is 3.0m long by 2.0m wide and features a pitched roof 2.45m high at the ridge and 2.1m high at the eaves. The shed has been constructed in blockwork and rendered white with a green mineral felt roof. It is located in the southwest corner of the garden, near the boundaries of 6 Shirlock Road and 3 Courthope Road.

Impact on the conservation area

The outbuilding is located at the rear and is not visible from the public realm. The appearance of the conservation area is thus preserved. The rear of these properties have been considerably altered with extensions and roof terraces, notably at nos. 3, 5 & 7 Courthope Road and 4 & 6 Shirlock Road, and in this context, the application's outbuilding is not considered to harm significantly the character of the area. The materials are not considered ideal however it does present as a utilitarian structure that is not uncommon in similar garden settings. The treatment of the outbuilding will be conditioned such that the out building is finished and maintained in white render, in order to reduce the impact of the blockwork. The proportions of the outbuilding are considered reasonable for its sitting and sufficient amenity space is retained in the garden.

Impact on neighbours amenity

The existing outbuilding is surrounded in three of its sides by trellis and planting and given its minimal height is subservient in the rear garden from adjoining properties. Its height at the eaves exceeds only marginally 2.0m and does not cause a significant impact on neighbouring gardens in terms of loss of light or outlook.

Conclusion

The outbuilding is considered generally acceptable given its small footprint and minimal height, and does not cause any demonstratable harm to the character of the conservation area or the amenity of neighbours such as to justify a refusal.

Recommendation: Grant.