

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>28/08/2015</b>	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		6/8/15	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Tania Skelli-Yaoz				2015/3653/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
6 Briardale Gardens London NW3 7PP				See decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>				
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Erection of additional storey to existing detached outbuilding including pitched roof, gable window, rooflights & dormer and replacement (sliding) gate from Clorane Gardens.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<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>03</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>	
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>			
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Letters, Site notice and Press notices advertised: no reply received.					
<b>CAAC comments:</b>		<p>Redington / Frogna! CAAC: Objection</p> <p>This garden room, if previously consented, should not have gained consent. Its enlargement should be refused on the grounds of making a viable separate dwelling. HCAAC and Redfrog always Object to such proposals and I wonder how the original outbuilding gained consent,if indeed it did so, taking up so much rear garden, creating such unacceptable precedent. If not previously consented but were to be allowed to remain, proof of its existence for more than 4 years would seem to be required. This out building is clearly a substantial breach of planning policy for this CA and generally in NW3.</p>					
<b>Site Description</b>							
The application site is a semi-detached residential two-storey single-dwelling house situated on the south side of Briardale Gardens on the corner with Clorane Gardens. To its rear is a garden with an outbuilding which was originally intended as a garage (including gates to the street) and has been converted to storage with a kitchen). The house is accessed via the front entrance on Briardale Gardens with the outbuilding accessed via Clorane Gardens.							

The surrounding area is characterised as predominantly residential. The site is within the Redington / Frognal Conservation Area.

### Relevant History

**2008/4693/P** planning permission was refused on 13/10/2008 for alterations to the rear of the dwelling house including replacing the lean-to roof with a glass roof.

#### Adjoining sites:

##### 76 Canfield Gardens

2013/8210/P Retention of two storey outbuilding with basement and mezzanine levels, within rear garden of dwelling house (Class C3). Refused and dismissed at appeal on 05/08/2014.

##### 11 Richborough Road

APP/X5210/D/12/2182129 Appeal dismissed on 17 October 2012. The development proposal comprised the retention of an outhouse (LBC ref. 2011/3546/P refused on 09/05/2012).

### Relevant policies

#### **NPPF 2012**

#### **The London Plan 2011 (with consolidated alterations March 2015)**

Chapters 7.4 and 7.6

#### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

#### **CPG1 Design - July 2015: Chapter 4**

#### **Redington and Frognal Conservation Area Statement 2003**

Policy RF1:

##### **Backland/Rear Gardens**

RF1 Rear gardens contribute to the townscape of the Conservation Area and provide a significant amenity to residents and a habitat for wildlife. Development within gardens is likely to be unacceptable.

### Assessment

**The proposal** involves the extension of an outbuilding within the rear garden. The outbuilding is proposed to serve as ancillary accommodation to the main house. The existing rear garden gates are proposed to be replaced.

**Revisions:** the original submission has been revised to lower the overall height extension from 1.5 additional meters to 1.3 additional metres (as detailed below). The width of the proposed side dormer has been reduced and the existing vehicular garden gates replaced with sliding timber gates.

**Main issues:** Design and impact on the conservation area and impact on the amenity of neighbours.

**Assessment:**

*The current CPG, adopted in July 2015, provides relevant guidance (sections 4.22-4.26) to include:*

- 'garden building...may detract from the generally soft and green nature of gardens...contributing to the loss of amenity for existing and future residents of the property'*
- Large gardens buildings may also affect the amenity value of neighbours gardens...and **intensify the use of garden spaces**.*
- 'Ensure the siting, location, scale and design of the proposed development has a minimal visual impact on, **and is visually subordinate to, the host garden**'*
- 'not detract from the open character and garden amenity of the ..wider surrounding area'*
- 'use suitable soft landscaping to reduce the impact of the proposed development'*

The proposed extension to the outbuilding comprises the raising of the existing low pitched roof (set behind parapet) with an additional 1.5m built height - from existing parapet to new roof ridge. The overall height of the outbuilding will rise from the existing 3.4m to proposed 4.8m. A dormer is proposed to the side pitch roof facing the side elevation of 18 Clorane Gardens and 2x rooflights are proposed to the extended roof facing the main house. The footprint of the building is unchanged but includes a new mezzanine internally which will be lit by the dormer window.

The outbuilding is proposed to be extended with brick to its main elevation, slate to its roof and, lead dormer and Velux windows to the front roof. An existing side door is proposed to be altered to a new window. The existing double doors fronting Clorane Gardens are unchanged but a new semi-circular / arched window (3 x 3 panes) is proposed above the doors within the new gable.

The increase in height will result in a building that fails to appear subordinate to the main building and when viewed from the corner of the two streets will appear like another single-dwelling-house / coach house of domestic style. The height and additional bulk at roof level together with the dormer window and rooflights are uncharacteristic for outbuildings and garden structures which are normally low-level / single storey with low pitched or flat roofs and windows at ground level.

This in combination with the relatively small existing rear garden results in overly dominant development and impacts the traditional relationship between the main house and garden where traditionally garden would be unbuilt or very modestly so. This is contrary to CPG1: Design, section 4.22-4.26, which discusses the importance of the retention of open space in private gardens and the impact by new structures amongst other details.

With regards to the protection of amenity, the proposed dormer window is situated in close proximity to a side small window at 18 Clorane Gardens, which is most likely used as a bathroom or to light a hallway. However, in the absence of further information and no glazing details for the new window this could potentially result in loss of privacy to the adjoining owners. This could be overcome with obscure glazing and / or re-positioning the dormer window.

Increased noise from activity disturbance and light spillage is likely to arise from the use of the outbuilding as ancillary accommodation of the proposed scale, resulting in unacceptable reduction in living conditions, to an extent that would harm the amenities of adjoining residents at nos. 8 and 10 Briardale Gardens and 18 Clorane Gardens. The existing use of the building as storage is likely to generate limited movements by household members, for some hours of the day. However, in its proposed form (over two floors) the building can accommodate on a 24-hours basis at least two persons with potential for more which result in an unacceptable intensification of use in a garden space. This is contrary to policy DP26.

No harm to trees is considered likely as a result from the proposed development.

The replacement of the garden gates with new proposed mechanism and materials is acceptable, however, should the design of the extension have been acceptable it would have been recommended to provide a car-capped development (including re-instatement of existing crossover) as the outbuilding no longer provides parking on site and therefore no off-street access is required.

To summarise, the proposed extension to the outbuilding is considered unacceptable and does not result in a garden structure that appears subordinate to its host building and garden. It is therefore considered to detract from the generally soft and green nature of the garden and its amenity value and would be overly prominent from Clorane Gardens. As such it is considered harmful to its surroundings and the Redington / Frognal Conservation Area. It is thereby contrary to policies DP24, DP25 and DP26.

**Recommendation:** Refuse planning permission.