

# CONSULTATION SUMMARY

## Case reference number(s)

2015/5088/P

## Case Officer:

Darlene Dike

## Application Address:

7 Grange Gardens

London

NW3 7XG

## Proposal(s)

Erection of a brick wall and two brick posts with hanging chain to front driveway.

## Representations

|                       |              |    |                  |   |                   |   |
|-----------------------|--------------|----|------------------|---|-------------------|---|
| <b>Consultations:</b> | No. notified | 17 | No. of responses | 2 | No. of objections | 2 |
|                       |              |    |                  |   | No of comments    | 0 |
|                       |              |    |                  |   | No of support     | 0 |

## Summary of representations

### *(Officer response(s) in italics)*

The owner/occupier of No's 4 and 6 Grange Gardens have objected to the application on the following grounds:

1. Plans were posted on the final day of consultation leaving insufficient time for comments to be made
2. In the Grange Gardens development of 11 houses only 2 neighbours were consulted. Yet 14 other people were notified who would have no view of the site or the proposed works.
3. Construction of the proposed wall would have the effect of closing in the property, affecting the openness of the estate, where front lawns

are generally open. In this way, erecting a wall along the boundary with No. 6 Grange Gardens is not in keeping with the character of the Grange Gardens development

4. There is a possibility that the owners will alter plans in future, as has occurred with previous development at the site, and this could result in a full electronic gate between the posts, for instance, or a raised boundary wall.
5. Proposals will affect the views from the front living room and bedroom of 6 Grange Gardens in a negative way
6. The works do not affect a courtyard as detailed in the development description but a driveway
7. The only purpose served by the erection of a new wall is to mark the property boundary of 7 Grange Gardens, keeping people off. Other walls in the vicinity are not ornamental or cosmetic in nature in this way, but structural.
8. Someone needs to come out and see the proposed site, in order to make an informed decision.
9. Incremental changes in the general development of this house are encroaching on its original design through, for example, the addition of a second floor to the rear raising the roof line, and the insertion of an unapproved window to the front.

#### **Officers Response**

1. *Owing to an administrative error, it was the case that plans were only made public on the final day of the 21 day consultation period. To compensate for this however the period was informally extended and comments accepted for over 21 days after the posted closing date.*
2. *As per Camden protocol, consultation letters were forwarded to all properties that are contiguous to the application site. This comprised neighbours at 6 and 8 Grange Gardens, but no other properties within the Grange Gardens estate, and all 14 owner/occupiers of 18 Templewood Avenue, which may not share a view of the site, but is nonetheless contiguous.*
3. *It is acknowledged that the erection of a dwarf boundary wall between 6 and 7 Grange Gardens will result in a mildly more closed off site at number 7, however the impact of this wall on the openness of the Grange Gardens estate would be extremely minimal as the wall would stand at a height of only 0.5m. At this height it would still be*

*possible for clear views through the estate to be maintained, and so there would be no impact on visual openness. Also, as the wall could be stepped over, it would not act as a significant physical barrier within the estate, and so there would be only a very limited impact on physical openness as a result of proposals. Front lawns within the estate not consistently open, with examples of very similar boundary treatments to that proposed under this scheme already present at numbers 1,4,8 and 12 Grange Gardens. Consequently, it is not felt that proposals are out of keeping with the character of the Grange Gardens development as a whole.*

- 4. A condition will be attached to the decision notice for this case stipulating that works are carried out in accordance with approved plans, to prevent the opportunity for changes to proposals not in line with the consent granted. If in future, however, the applicant's wished to amend the scheme they would need to apply to the Council to do so, and any future applications would be subject to a full assessment on its own merits.*
- 5. Proposals would have very little impact on the views from the front rooms of 6 Grange Gardens, as, at a height of 0.5m, the proposed boundary wall is simply too low to disturb the views or outlook enjoyed by the neighbouring property.*
- 6. The development description has been amended to address the fact that works affect the front driveway, and not courtyard.*
- 7. Boundary walls at numbers 1,4,8 and 12 Grange Gardens serve the same purpose as the proposed wall, in delineating the boundaries of these properties so this is not an uncommon feature of the Grange Gardens estate.*
- 8. A site visit was conducted at 11.00am on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2015.*
- 9. Previous changes to the property do not form part of the current application and so are not under consideration here. Notwithstanding, works to install a rear dormer extension which resulted in a new second floor and raised the rear roof line were permitted under certificate of lawfulness application (for proposed works) 2014/7191/P. Similarly the insertion of a front elevation window, was not unauthorised, as it was approved under the non-material amendment application 2015/4248/P.*

**Recommendation:-**

**Grant planning permission**

