

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2015/5030/P

Case Officer:

Charles Thuaire

Application Address:

47 Talacre Road

London

NW5 3PJ

Proposal(s)

Variation of condition 3 (development in accordance with approved plans) of planning permission ref 2011/0474/P dated 07/10/2011 (for installation of 'grasscrete' surfacing in rear garden to provide 3 carparking spaces for existing residential flats, associated part removal of existing boundary fence and replacement with timber gates and creation of a new vehicular access to Rhyl Street), namely to allow retention of brick paviers in rear garden and wider timber access gates and installation of new safety mirrors on gateposts.

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	8	No. of responses	1	No. of objections	0
					No of comments	1
					No of support	0

Summary of representations

(Officer response(s) in italics)

Objection/comment from 50-56 Talacre Road-

The conditions imposed back in 2011 have been flagrantly disregarded in respect of fencing geometry, paving, width of the access, the absence of convex safety mirrors. The relevant grant of planning permission with clearcut conditions was so that conditions might overcome serious earlier objections.

In our view not only is the failure to comply with the agreed conditions a serious matter but a condition relating to convex mirrors is inoperable and therefore incapable of making any meaningful contribution to highway safety. The site has been in uses for long enough to demonstrate that cars are driven into it in forward gear so that when emerging the driver is seated

remotely from any possible mirror assistance. The mirror plan is a sticking plaster that does little to address the Rhyl Street hazard of youngsters hidden by an adult height length of gate/fencing.

In respect of the width of the vehicular crossover, it is plainly wrong and departs from the approved scheme.

Were the planning department to reiterate its opinion that "grasscrete" should be installed, I have little doubt that stiletto heeled visitors could cope.

Apart from the installation of convex mirrors compliance with the original Camden approved conditioned plans seems appropriate. Mirrors installed within the confines of the Application Site limits seem pointless. Furthermore highway mirrors in a largely domestic scale Conservation Area seem incongruous and lacking scale.

Officer comment-

The implemented works on site have to be considered on their merits, regardless of the Council's originally imposed conditions on the earlier permission. The scheme has been in place and operational for over a year and no complaints have been made by the public (other than by the consultee) concerning the carpark's operation and safety. It is considered that the works as implemented are not so seriously harmful that enforcement action is warranted or expedient.

It is agreed that the mirrors are not appropriate for the street and conservation area and that they are only partly workable by allowing some views for drivers and pedestrians depending on their position. Thus the Council will not insist on their installation secured by condition. Moreover the sightlines from the carpark are the same as those approved, as the varied gate design has the same overall width as the approved version with lower fixed panels, and the crossover as installed by the Council is wider than previously shown on the approved plans, thus the visibility splays remain the same. It is thus considered the revised arrangement does not harm local road safety or cause a hazard to schoolchildren.

The revised paving is considered appropriate to this backland setting behind high boundary fencing and does not harm the streetscene or CA.

Recommendation:-

Grant planning permission