

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 25th February 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:	20/11/2007
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	5.11.07
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Miss Kiran Chauhan			2007/4245/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
6 Albert Terrace London NW1 7SU			See decision letter.	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Retention of double entrance gates and single pedestrian entrance gate and railings on the front boundary of dwellinghouse.				
Recommendation(s):		Grant permission		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	01	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	Site notice also displayed.					
CAAC comments:	<p>Primrose Hill CAAC object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">No boundary walls have been demolished since 1983 and this should be taken into account in this important location. <i>Response: Conservation Area Consent is not required for the partial demolition of the boundary walls.</i>The building has special value and para. 3.72 of the RUDP states that walls should be protected. The wall does not detract from the area. <i>Response: See above.</i>Policy PH36 of the CAS states that new boundary structures should respect the original style. <i>Response: Railings are a form of boundary treatment that is found in the surrounding area and therefore they would not appear out of character with the conservation area.</i>Policy PH37 states that conversion of front gardens into areas of hardstanding will not be acceptable and that the parking of vehicles can adversely affect the setting of the building and streetscene. <i>Response: This has already been approved under 2007/1294/P.</i>Policy B3 (parts a and b) of the RUDP is relevant as the wall has been demolished and replaced with gates which are not original and a plastic hedge has been added to the front elevation. <i>Response: The gates do not harm the appearance of the building or the character and appearance of the CA. The plastic hedge does not require planning permission.</i>A tree was removed from the site but was reported as dead and removed. It has not been replanted. Could a new tree on the site be sustained? <i>Response: Tree consent was granted on 8.3.06 for the removal of a front garden lime tree. This tree was severely decayed with around 75% of the base being rotted. That tree application required a replacement tree to be planted by March 2006 but no details were ever submitted. The application 2007/1294/P approved on 29.10.07 also had this condition attached and the applicant will be reminded by informative that it requires compliance.</i>					

- Supporting text to B3 (para. 3.38) states that the retention of boundary enclosures will be sought by the Council where this is a matter than can be regulated.
Response: In this instance, the retention of the boundary enclosures cannot be insisted upon for reasons outlined above.
- The parking area is undesirable, will impact on on-street and off-street parking in the area and the landscaping proposed is unacceptable. This is contrary to policy T9.
Response: The parking area has already been approved under 2007/1294/P. No on-street parking bays were lost as a result of the crossover. The landscaping details proposed are acceptable.

Cllr Rowell has commented on the application on grounds of loss of green space, sustainable drainage, biodiversity and reduced carbon monoxide extraction.

Response: The only area of hardstanding would be for the parking of two cars. This has already been approved under 2007/1294/P. The applicant has stated that the material for the area of hardstanding will be porous.

Cllr Callaghan objects: The Conservation Area Statement states that the loss of gardens should be rejected. A perfectly healthy tree was also removed from the site. The demolition of the wall should not be allowed and would serve set a damaging precedent.

Response: See responses above and assessment below.

Site Description

A 4-storey plus basement semi-detached property on the east side of Albert Terrace. The west elevation of the building faces onto Regents Park Avenue. The building lies within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area and is identified as a building that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA in the CA statement. Site covered by an Article 4 direction.

Relevant History

22/8/2003 – PP granted for the change of use and works of conversion from 6 self-contained flats to a single-family dwelling house.

19/12/2003 – PP granted for a first floor extension, alterations to existing windows and provision of new windows and installation of new windows.

08/2004 – Planning permission refused for erection of a side extension at second floor level.

Appeal dismissed in June 2005 on grounds that extension would not be subordinate and would unbalance the proportions of the existing building.

28/8/2005 – PP granted for alterations to lower ground floor level including two new windows and door of lower ground floor level flat.

EN07/0207 – Enforcement complaint received on grounds that the front garden is being used for car parking hardstanding, new railings and non replacement of trees.

2006/1095/T – Tree consent granted for removal of FRONT GARDEN: 1 x Lime. Condition added to ensure a replacement tree (a Fraxinus excelsior Altena be planted as a heavy-standard with a girth size of 16-18cm) is provided by March 2006.

2007/1294/P – PP granted on 29.10.07 for the extension and conversion of basement including works of excavation to create an indoor swimming pool and associated alterations to single family dwellinghouse (C3).

Relevant policies

S1, S2, SD6, B1, B3, B7, T9

Primrose Hill CAS

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Assessment

The proposal is seeking to retain the vehicular access to the front of the property and to retain the new cast iron gates and railings that have been erected following the demolition of part of the existing boundary wall. Two replacement trees are also proposed.

The main issue is the impact on the appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the CA.

The permission approved last year [2007/1294/P] was for the additional excavation at basement level to create a swimming pool and associated alterations. Originally, the submitted drawings demonstrated an intention to hard pave the entire front garden, in association with creating off street parking. This application was subsequently amended to reduce the area of hardstanding so that the area of hardstanding consisted of only that required for the parking of two cars – this is shown on the revised drawings that were approved as part of this application. There are also other properties along Albert Terrace which have areas of front hardstanding. Highways have granted consent for the crossover. Prior to this approval, the agent had stated that the right hand side (south) of the front garden was all hard paved and that only a small part of the left hand side (north) of the garden was soft and this was around the lime tree which has now been felled.

A new double vehicle gate and a pedestrian gate and railings have been inserted to the front boundary. These have replaced two sections of the previously existing front boundary: a low brick wall with railings on top and a high brick wall. Neither the walls nor the railings have any architectural merit. The railings were not original and the walls contained no special detailing. Conservation Area Consent for their demolition was not required, as the amount of demolition does not amount to being “substantial”.

The replacement railings and gate are considered acceptable. Railings are characteristic of the area and can be found around this part of the CA. Therefore this form of boundary treatment would be preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Two new trees will be planted in the corner of the garden where it meets Regents Park Road – no objection is raised to this, as this is what was required under the approved tree application 2006/1095/T and planning application 2007/1294/P. The applicant will be reminded by informative of the need to submit these details.

Recommendation: Grant