



Officer: H. G. Miller

Application Number: PE9800624/R1

Address: 62 Savernake Road, NW3

Proposal: The erection of a single storey garage with a pitched roof in the rear garden for use as part garage and part studio.

Drawing Numbers: Appendix 1, 2.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION WITH (CONDITION)

-----  
OFFICER REPORT:

1.0 SITE

There are six lock-up garages R/O Nos. 58-60 Savernake Rd. The garage to the rear of No 62 is a free standing single storey double garage with a shallow pitched roof. It occupies approximately two thirds of the plot width. The rear boundary of the site abuts the railway line, beyond which is Parliament Hill.

The house on the frontage is a 3- storey double bayed semi-detached dwlg. hse. The property is converted into 3- s/c flats.

The site lies within Mansfield C.A.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 **Original:** The erection of a new 2-storey timber garage with a pitched roof in the rear garden including studio workshop at 1st flr. level and measuring approx. 5.3m wide x 6.0m long x 5.0m high.

2.2 R1:- Reduction to single storey.

2.3 The proposed garage and studio space is for use by the applicant, who lives in Mackeson Road nearby. The proposed use is not related to the residential at 62 Savernake Road, the residential property at the front of the site.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

3.1 On 14/12/72 Pp grntd. for double garage.

4.0 RELEVANT POLICIES

4.1 Borough Plan policies are:  
UD3, UD18,

4.2 The Unitary Development Plan policies:-  
EN16, (new) EN27, EN33, EN\*, TR12

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 **Conservation Area Advisory Committee Comments**

Mansfield CAAC:- **Original:-** Object to proposal, loss of garage & gain of workshop/studio not acceptable (no reasons given).

R1:- No response

5.2 **Adjoining Occupiers**

Number Notified	09	R1	24
Replies Received	02		03
Objections	02		03

5.3 **Original:-** Bldg. too high, blocked views. Bldg. height to be similar to extg.

R1:- Loss of views, privacy/ O'looking, building still too high.

6.0 ASSESSMENT

6.1 The main issues relate to i) design, ii) impact on the adjoining occupiers, iii) impact on the chara. & appearance of the C.A, and the introduction of a non-residential use, unrelated to the adjoining residential property.

6.2 The revision comprises a single store garage bldg, using the extg. footprint. Half the bldg. would be used for parking & the remainder would be use as the studio (this would not be for a business use, but rather as an additional 'residential' room for reading, writing etc, by the applicant who lives nearby).

6.3 As revised, the size of the building in itself is acceptable, and the physical form, which matches the existing footprint, although the height of the building will be greater than the existing. Notwithstanding this increase in height, it is not considered that it would impact on existing views from Parliament Hill, or dominate the surroundings. The prop. accord with policies UD3, UD18 & EN16 (new). In terms of design, materials & execution the proposed is acceptable and it accord with EN33. It is considered that the building would be acceptable in terms of its physical form and would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

**Overlooking/Privacy.**

6.4 There would be no direct o'looking into the h'table rooms of no. 62, as the windows are oriented towards the east. Furthermore, they would be approx. 13m away, & from their positioning direct views is not possible. Officers are of the opinion that the proposed would not cause any increase material harm to the adj. occupiers by reason of o'looking or loss of privacy. The prop. accords with EN27.

### **Transport/ Parking**

- 6.6 Savernake Rd. has been identified as a Heavily Parked Street and it is within the CPZ. This application will result in the loss of the two existing spaces; although one will be replaced, this is to be used by the applicant and not by the residents of the residential property to which the land actually belongs. It is therefore considered that two residential parking spaces, associated with the adjoining residential will be lost, with a consequent detrimental impact on the parking in the adjoining heavily parked streets. This would therefore be contrary to the Council's policy TR12 which takes into account the likely effect upon on-street parking in the locality.
- 6.7 However, the loss of one car parking space would not be likely to cause a material harm to on-street car parking stress particularly as one space would be retained for the use of a resident of a nearby street.
- 6.8 The main concern with the proposal is that the scheme introduces an unrelated non-residential use into a residential area and on a residential site. This pattern of use does not relate to the characteristic form of use and development in the area, or the characteristics of this part of the conservation area but is nonetheless considered, in this instance, not to be sufficiently detrimental to the character of the area to warrant the refusal of planning permission.
- 6.9 It is officers' opinion that revision 1 has addressed the substantive objections raised by the adj. occupiers letters of objections.

### **7.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 7.1 That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1 No part of the development hereby approved shall be used for any commercial, business or office use and no goods shall be available for sale or advice service given to members of the public from the premises.

Reason for conditions.

- 2 DF04.

**SavrnkRd62**