

|  |                            |  |                                     |                                  |             |                   |           |
|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------|
| <b>Delegated Report</b><br><br>(Members Briefing)  |                            | <b>Analysis sheet</b>  |                                     | <b>Expiry Date:</b>              |             | <b>07/11/2006</b> |           |
|  |                            | N/A  |                                     | <b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b> |             | 10/10/2006        |           |
| <b>Officer</b>   |                            |  |                                     | <b>Application Number(s)</b>     |             |                   |           |
| Mary Samuel  |                            |  |                                     | 2006/3947/P                      |             |                   |           |
| <b>Application Address</b>   |                            |  |                                     | <b>Drawing Numbers</b>           |             |                   |           |
| 95 Canfield Gardens<br>London<br>NW6 3DY   |                            |  |                                     | Refer to draft decision notice   |             |                   |           |
| <b>PO 3/4</b>  | <b>Area Team Signature</b> | <b>C&amp;UD</b>  | <b>Authorised Officer Signature</b> |                                  | <b>Date</b> |                   |           |
|  |                            |  |                                     |                                  |             |                   |           |
| <b>Proposal(s)</b>   |                            |  |                                     |                                  |             |                   |           |
| <p>Alterations to front boundary wall including installation of gate piers for new sliding vehicular and pedestrian gates and erection of railings above low wall.</p> |                            |  |                                     |                                  |             |                   |           |
| <b>Recommendation(s):</b>  |                            | Grant conditional permission   |                                     |                                  |             |                   |           |
| <b>Application Type:</b>   |                            | Full Planning Permission   |                                     |                                  |             |                   |           |
| <b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>  |                            | Refer to Draft Decision Notice   |                                     |                                  |             |                   |           |
| <b>Informatives:</b>   |                            |  |                                     |                                  |             |                   |           |
| <b>Consultations</b>   |                            |  |                                     |                                  |             |                   |           |
| <b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>  |                            | No. notified   | <b>09</b>                           | No. of responses                 | <b>00</b>   | No. of objections | <b>00</b> |
| <b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>  |                            | <p>A site was displayed from 19/09/06 to 10/10/06.</p> <p>No reply to date.</p>  |                                     |                                  |             |                   |           |
| <b>Local groups comments:</b>  |                            | <p><b>CRASH</b></p> <p>So much in the way of railings suggests much has to be confined as in a zoo!. It would be pleasant if behind the railings that are not gates some greenery were planted to live up to the name of Canfield Gardens.</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Most of the existing hedge is proposed to be retained and that will mask some of the railings over the low wall and provide greenery. A similar boundary treatment with gates and railings has been allowed at No 93.</p> |                                     |                                  |             |                   |           |

## Site Description

Detached, single dwellinghouse on the south side of Canfield Gardens. The site is located within the Swiss Cottage conservation area.

## Relevant History

### 95 Canfield Gardens

Planning permission was granted on 28/03/06 for extensions and alterations to the dwellinghouse including reinstatement of front bay window and erection of a basement and ground floor rear extension and minor alterations to fenestration.

### 93 Canfield Gardens

Planning permission was granted on 04/06/02 for the erection of railings and gates.

## Relevant policies

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. However it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

### London Borough of Camden adopted Unitary Development Plan (2006)

S1/S2, B1, B3, B7

**Supplementary Planning Guidance 2002 and 2006:** Advice on garden walls

**Swiss Cottage Conservation Area Statement:** Advice on boundary walls in the conservation area

## Assessment

**The proposal** involves the retention of existing piers and low brick wall on a section of the front boundary, the erection of new piers where necessary to support new vehicular and pedestrian gates, and the erection of a new section of low wall and railings over both the existing and proposed low walls.

The proposal is to be revised to reduce the height of the piers to 1.7m and reduce the proposed railings and gates to below the capping stone of the piers (approx. 1.5m). If revised drawings have not been received prior to the 8 week date then a condition is to be attached to secure this.

**Main issues:** Impact on the appearance of the property, the street scene and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

**Assessment:** Although the majority of front garden boundaries have similar piers and walls, railings are more often confined to pedestrian gates rather than vehicular gates and on top of low walls. Hedges or trees are a more common means of enclosure along front gardens. However, this property already has vehicular and pedestrian solid metal gates. Their replacement with gates with open balustrading is welcomed.

The railings above the low walls are to improve security. The applicant confirms that the existing hedge behind the existing low wall will be retained, but slightly reduced to allow for the vehicular gate to slide open. The retention of the hedge will reduce the impact of the railings over the low wall.

The proposal is similar to the boundary treatment approved in 2002 at 93 Canfield Gardens.

**Approval is recommended**

## **Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613***