

Date: 25/10/2023  
Our ref: 2023/3300/PRE  
Contact: Sam FitzPatrick  
Direct line: 020 7974 1343  
Email: sam.fitzpatrick@camden.gov.uk



Planning Solutions Team  
Regeneration and Planning  
Supporting Communities  
Directorate  
London Borough of Camden  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
5 Pancras Square  
London  
N1C 4AG

[REDACTED]

Dear Oscar,

[www.camden.gov.uk/planning](http://www.camden.gov.uk/planning)

**Re: 22 Belsize Lane, London, NW3 5AB**

I refer to your pre-planning application enquiry 2023/3300/PRE at 22 Belsize Lane, London, NW3 5AB. Thank you for sending the documents detailing the proposed alterations to the property.

### 1. Proposal

Replacement of existing single storey extension at lower ground level and associated alterations to rear elevation including installation of external stairs. Alterations to façade of existing outbuilding facing main building.

### 2. Site description

The proposal relates to a flat located at the lower and upper ground levels of a four-storey property (and attic) located on the north side of Belsize Lane, close to the junction with Percival Avenue. The building is divided into three self-contained flats, which is characteristic of these semi-detached buildings in the area. The building is located within the Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area and is identified as a positive contributor, though is not listed.

### 3. Relevant planning history

#### Application site

**2012/4103/P** – Erection of a single storey garden studio and re-landscaping of rear garden and erection of new timber fence on both boundary sides of residential maisonette (Class C3). **Granted 02/10/2012.**

**2012/4102/P** - The erection of bin store, alteration of railing to main stairway, boundary alterations and landscaping to front garden (Class C3). **Granted 08/10/2012.**

**2012/2288/P** - Erection of a single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level including roof terrace and associated glazed balustrade, access staircase plus lean-to extension with rooflight above to lower ground floor level, new French doors as replacement for existing window and replacement refuse storage at front garden to residential maisonette (Class C3). **Granted 26/06/2012.**

### 4. Relevant policies and guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

The London Plan (2021)

The London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017)

- **A1** Managing the impact of development
- **D1** Design
- **D2** Heritage
- **CC3** Water and flooding

Camden Planning Guidance

- CPG Amenity (Jan 2021)
- CPG Design (Jan 2021)
- CPG Home improvements (Jan 2021)
- CPG Water and flooding (2019)

Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2022)

**5. Assessment**

The planning considerations material to the determination of this application are as follows:

- Design and heritage
- Amenity

While it is the intention to cover the works as fully as possible, omission to mention any part of the proposal should not be taken as indicating acceptability.

**6. Design**

The Council's policies on design aim to achieve the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy D1 (Design) requires development, including extensions, to consider the local context, setting, and character, and for development to integrate with the form and scale of surrounding buildings and be constructed of high-quality materials. Policy D2 (Heritage) additionally states that the Council will only permit development both within conservation areas and to listed buildings if it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the heritage assets.

The Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) on 'Design' and 'Home Improvements' also clearly state Camden's expectations for development. CPG 'Design' states that the Council will seek to ensure that development responds positively to the existing context and character of the building and its surroundings. CPG 'Home Improvements' also gives guidance on extensions and outbuildings, both of which are relevant in this instance.

The Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area Management Plan gives general guidelines on development within the conservation area, and states that extensions (including rear extensions) should be subservient to their host buildings in terms of height, scale, and massing.

It should be noted that, as this is not a listed building, the internal works do not require planning permission, so are not referred to further in this pre-application advice.

The replacement of the rear extension of the property is considered to be acceptable in principle. The new extension would not significantly increase the size or massing in comparison to the existing but would regularise the footprint so that it forms a more regular shape. The principle of the rear extension has already been established with the 2012 permission and the proposed extension, while visually quite different, would not constitute a less subservient addition. It would still maintain a similar relationship with the main building and would have very little visibility from the public realm. It would have limited visibility from the private realm too, due to the position at lower ground level. The materiality of the proposed extension would not be objected to; the existing extension is already very contemporary in appearance, so the use of steel does not

substantially differ from the already more modern character of the extension in relation to the more traditional building. The replacement of glazed balustrading with metal railing is supported. The design of the replacement extension is more conventional and potentially more in keeping with the building and wider area, so would not be considered to cause harm to the conservation area.

It should be noted that the choice of colour is quite unusual and could be considered quite bold in relation to the host property and wider area. The Design and Access Statement submitted with any future application should include the design rationale as well as a study of the materiality of surrounding properties to clearly justify the choice of colour (along with the other design elements) so as to make clear how it preserves and/or enhances Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area. The submitted documents reference the "iconic Royal Mail post boxes" and any relevant link that supports this and the general design choices of the proposed works should be demonstrated clearly.

It is also proposed to re-open a side window where one was previously blocked up at lower ground level. Given the pre-existing position of the window, the reinstatement in the same location would not be objected to. The window detail should match the existing windows in terms of method of opening, materials and glazing bars proportions. In historic buildings the use of traditional materials (timber framed windows) is normally preferred, though it is accepted that the more contemporary style of the extension may mean this is not appropriate.

The façade of the outbuilding that faces the host building currently mirrors the extension in style, with a chamfered design at an irregular angle. The proposal would level this out so that the façade comprises a flat elevation with sliding doors. These would be of similar appearance to the existing outbuilding and the works would not substantially alter the appearance of the structure. Although the footprint would be increased slightly due to the levelling out of the elevation, this would not substantially alter the scale or massing of the outbuilding, and as such it would still remain subservient to the main property. The works to the outbuilding would therefore not raise concerns in terms of footprint or design.

## **7. Amenity**

Local Plan Policy A1 (Amenity) and the CPG 'Amenity' both seek to ensure that the amenity of neighbours is protected, including visual privacy, outlook, sunlight, daylight, and overshadowing.

None of the proposed works are considered to result in impacts that would harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. The siting and positioning of the proposed rear extension is approximately the same as the existing extension, and the scale would also be unlikely to have any significant impacts on daylight/sunlight or the privacy of neighbouring occupiers. The design of the proposed extension would likely result in less light spill than the current design due to there being less glazing, so there is not considered to be any harm to neighbouring amenity in terms of light spill or glare.

Although new external stairs would be erected and the roof terrace above the rear extension would be increased in size slightly, this increase is only marginal and neither element would create any additional opportunities for overlooking or be considered to contribute to noise disturbance in any meaningful way. The proposed stairs would provide access to the roof terrace from the lower ground floor patio and would adjoin the existing raised walkway along the north-eastern boundary of the site. Given the sunken nature of the lower ground floor and the function of the stairs as a means of access rather than an amenity space, they would not lead to an increase in overlooking over and above the existing situation. However, it should be noted that the proposed extension of the roof terrace and resultant increased depth could potentially create views into the neighbouring upper ground floor window of the adjacent property. If this is the case and the neighbouring window serves a habitable room, then the proposed balustrade should follow the line of the

existing in this corner so as to avoid impacts on privacy. Otherwise, it is not considered that any of the works would result in any harm to neighbouring amenity.

It should also be noted that the site is located on a previously flooded street. As such, special consideration should be made to ensure that the proposal is compliant with the Local Plan Policy CC3 (Water and Flooding), which aims to ensure development does not increase flood risk and reduces the risk of flooding where possible. This could involve incorporating flood resilient measures and utilising Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) where possible.

## 8. Conclusion

The replacement rear extension is considered to be acceptable in principle by way of its scale, siting, and materiality, and would not be considered to cause harm to the building or conservation area. The reinstatement of the previously existing window to the side elevation, as well as the changes to the façade of the outbuilding would also be considered appropriate changes. When submitting a full planning application, care should be taken to ensure that the materiality and design choices (such as colour) are fully justified to ensure that it is clear that the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the building and conservation area.

## 9. Planning application information

If you submit a planning application which addresses the outstanding issue detailed in this report satisfactorily, I would advise you to submit the following for a valid planning application:

- Completed form – ‘Full Planning Application’;
- An Ordnance Survey based location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red;
- Floor plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled ‘existing’ and ‘proposed’;
- Elevation drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled ‘existing’ and ‘proposed’;
- Section drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled ‘existing’ and ‘proposed’;
- Design and access statement (including material study);
- The appropriate fee - £206
- Please see [supporting information for planning applications](#) for more information.

We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would put up a site notice on or near the site and, advertise in a local newspaper. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received. Whilst no consultation with interested parties is undertaken as part of the pre-application process, it would in the applicant's interest to discuss this application with the neighbours and also with local groups before an application is submitted. The latter would include the Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

It is likely that a proposal of this size would be determined under delegated powers, however, if more than 3 objections from neighbours or an objection from a local amenity group is received the application will be referred to the Members Briefing Panel should it be recommended for approval by officers. For more details click [here](#).

**This document represents an initial informal officer view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage and would not be binding upon the Council, nor prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.**

If you have any queries about the above letter, please do not hesitate to contact Sam FitzPatrick through the email or number above.

Thank you for using Camden's pre-application advice service.

Yours sincerely,

Sam FitzPatrick

Planning Officer  
Planning Solutions Team