

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		13/09/2006	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		18/08/2006	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Grant Leggett				2006/3299/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Pedestrian & vehicle entrances Juniper Crescent London NW1 8HA				Site Location Plan 341/110; 341/015A; 341/106; 341/105; 341/104A; 341/107; 341/020; Supporting Statement; 02 Photo Sheets			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		Date:		
Proposal(s)							
Erection of 3.0m high gates and railings to pedestrian and vehicle entrances with access control, planting to pedestrian entrance with associated ground works to existing housing estate (Class C3) for a term of two years.							
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	36	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:		Two letters of support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development would improve safety for visitors and tenants and for children to play. Tenants feel vulnerable walking past the pedestrian access at night. 					
CAAC/Local groups' comments:		Not in any conservation area.					

Site Description

The application relates to the pedestrian and vehicle entrance points to the Juniper Crescent housing estate, an estate of 120 residential flats. Juniper Crescent, including the pedestrian and vehicle entranceways is a private road.

The site is not within any conservation area.

Relevant History

None.

Relevant Policies

London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD1D – Community safety

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 – General design principles

B3 – Alterations and extensions

Supplementary Planning Guidance 2002

3.2 – Community safety

London Plan 4B.2

PPS1 – Sustainable Development

Assessment

Planning permission is sought to erect gates and railings at the pedestrian and vehicular entrances to Juniper Crescent. The gates would be manually opened by tenants. Visitors would contact residents via intercom (disabled residents would be given a remote access device) to open the gates manually from the inside. The purpose of the gating is to improve security at the estate. Permission is sought for a term of two years only.

The gates and railings are not considered to harm the character and appearance of the estate or the visual amenity of the area generally, the residential amenity of neighbours or local transport conditions. Vehicles entering the estate would be able to park on the private road while awaiting entry. This is not considered to cause any harm to local transport conditions as Juniper Crescent is not a through-road and the volume of vehicles parked awaiting access at any given time is not expected to be significant.

The issue of the principle of gating the estate and whether it is necessary to achieve the stated objective of improving security in the estate has been considered. Policy T13 which seeks to ensure that public highways are preserved as part of the public realm and resists gated communities by seeking to ensure that access routes are available to the public as rights of way does not apply because Juniper Crescent is a private road.

There is also no conflict with s.137 of the Highways Act, 1980 which seeks to prevent obstructions to highways. No gating order would be required under the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 (which amended the Highways Act at ss.129A-G).

Policy B1 (3.13) states the borough's places and spaces should be accessible to all and that developments that restrict movement into and through a development such as gated developments will not be permitted. The policy also recognises the needs of importance of providing safe communities (as expressed in SD1D) and that a balance must sometimes be found between community safety and urban design.

These policies reflect London Plan guidance which states that buildings should not provide for their security by fencing enclosing or themselves in, and PPS1 which seeks that developments avoid segregation. However the relevant guidance recognises that in some cases gating is a necessary means of providing security and such measures can be acceptable where it can be demonstrated that there are significant levels of crime or anti-social behaviour and that the gating would overcome these issues.

In the 16 months from April 2004 there were 101 crimes reported in the Juniper Crescent area. A significant number of these crimes were for offences of assault leading to injury, robbery and harassment. This figure does not include the areas surrounding Juniper Crescent and it is thought there is likely to be under-reporting of crime on the estate. This is considered to be an extremely high incidence of crime in the area and it is considered that the extent of the activity is so severe as to warrant such a severe measure as gating to provide for security.

Again, given that Juniper Crescent is a private road the development would not restrict access to the public space or unduly limit public access to any public adopted highway.

The Council's Crime Prevention Design Advisor supports the development.

Recommendation

Planning permission should be **granted** subject to conditions.

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