

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	19/01/2015
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	18/12/2014
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Darlene Dike			2014/7275/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
34 Brookfield Park London NW5 1ER			Refer to draft decision notice.		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Replacement of part of boundary wall with blockwork and installation of vehicular gate.					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission			
Application Type:		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	08	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed on 25/11/2014 expiring on 16/12/2014 and a public notice published in the local press on 27/11/2014 expiring on 18/12/2014.</p> <p>No responses have been received to date.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p><u>Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee</u> – Object to the application on the following grounds:</p> <p>“The design statement is in parts misleading.</p> <p>The height of the wall along Brookfield Park is 1.66 m. That along St Albans Road is conditioned by the rising ground, and it would be difficult to arrive at an accurate average height.</p> <p>As the design statement points out, the pavement along the St Albans Road side is wide, and it could therefore take a wall of height 1.75 m.; whereas in Brookfield Park, with its narrow pavement such an increase in height would be overbearing, and is totally unnecessary to preserve the privacy of No.34's garden.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed concrete walling is ugly and would not enhance the Conservation Area. The existing (post-war) walling is both ugly and dangerous and does need to be replaced. But the traditional fencing in Brookfield Park is wooden close-boarding as in part of the existing structure (but Not as Design Statement asserts 'wooden palings'), and as seen on the opposite side of the road, and in much of Brookfield Park.</p> <p>The traditional enclosure form in the adjacent part of St Albans Road is privet hedging (prescribed throughout the Brookfield Estate but sadly not maintained by Camden).</p> <p>The new fencing should therefore be close-boarded fencing, at a height of not more than 1.66M.”</p>					

Site Description

The site is occupied by a detached 2 storey building on the south east corner of the intersection of Brookfield Park and St. Albans Road. The building has an existing boundary wall largely comprising uneven concrete panels and unfinished concrete blockwork, which gives way to a part concrete block and part fence configuration, softened by planting, along the Brookfield Park elevation.

The site is located in the Dartmouth Park conservation area and, while not listed, the building is identified in the Conservation Area Statement as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Relevant History

APPLICATION SITE

No relevant history.

NEIGHBOURING SITES

2014/3859/P: 38 Brookfield Park

Removal of existing concrete wall and erection of replacement brick built wall. **Granted 1/8/14.**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

National Planning Practice Guidance

London Plan 2011

Camden LDF Core Strategy 2010

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

Camden Development Policies 2010

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance (updated 2013)

CPG1 Design - Chapters 2 and 6

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2009) - Pages 5, 35 and 44

1. Proposal

1.1 The application seeks to retain existing blockwork sections of the wall, repointing and repairing where required, to the perimeter of the site along Brookfield Park and St Albans Road, and to replace the existing wooden close-boarding, concrete post and concrete panel sections with close-textured blockwork, painted ivory. The retained and replaced sections of the wall will combine to an average height of 1.75m. Also proposed, is the installation of a remotely operated painted steel gate to replace the existing double hinged timber gate.

2. Main Planning Considerations

2.1 The key planning considerations are:

- the impact of proposals on the host building and character and appearance of the conservation area
- amenity

3. Design and Conservation

3.1 34 Brookfield Park is identified as a positive contributor within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, for which the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (paragraph 4.5, page 5) states that “boundary treatments, many original, are quite extensive in their variety, but the common feature is that these elements - gates, walls, fences, hedges or railings - complement the architecture.” Whilst the design of the proposed gate is sympathetic, and boundary wall is appropriate in terms of its location and scale, the choice of material for the proposed boundary wall does not serve to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. Part of the wall is existing blockwork however the Applicant proposes the construction of the rest of the wall in concrete blockwork. This would be contrary to policy DP24 as the proposed scheme would not “incorporate materials of an appropriately high quality” (Paragraph 24.16). In line with the objection from the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee, it is deemed that blockwork would be out of keeping with the area and more suitable materials for the conservation area would be timber close-boarding or brick, as the approval of a brick boundary wall at 38 Brookfield Park demonstrates (see relevant planning history above). The blockwork on such a prominent corner location would be harmful to the appearance of the host building and conservation area.

3.2 In addition the proposed wall would not be softened by the planting that currently diminishes the impact of the existing boundary treatment, and so its design would be unduly prominent and obtrusive, upsetting rather than complementing the setting of the host building and the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. This goes against the design guidance of CPG1 (Paragraph 6.36) which stipulates that “due to the prominence of the boundary treatments in the streetscene we will expect the design, detailing and materials used to provide a strong positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the area and integrate the site into the streetscene” and would not comply with policy DP25 (Paragraph 25.2) that seeks to “only grant planning permission for development in Camden’s conservation areas that preserves and enhances the special character or appearance of the area.”

3.3 CPG1 (paragraph 2.12) also states that “the durability of materials and understanding of how they will weather should be taken in to consideration.” In this case, the proposed rendered finish of white masonry paint would deteriorate quickly, and when weathered would be marked by unsightly peeling and flaking. This would harm the visual amenity of the streetscape and contravene policy CPG1 (paragraph 2.12) by leaving “the quality of a well-designed building...reduced by the use of poor quality or an unsympathetic palette of materials.”

4 Residential Amenity

4.1 The proposed increase in the height of the wall is negligible, and would have no impact on the natural daylight or sunlight, privacy, or outlook to any of the neighbouring properties.

5 Recommendation

5.1 Refuse Planning Permission on design grounds

