



**Date: 19/04/2023**  
**Our ref: 2022/5644/PRE**  
**Contact: Sam FitzPatrick**  
**Direct line: 020 7974 1343**  
**Email: [sam.fitzpatrick@camden.gov.uk](mailto: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

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

Kate Matthews  
FirstPlan  
Broadwall House  
21 Broadwall  
SE1 9PL

Dear Kate Matthews,

**Re: 133 Haverstock Hill, London, NW3 4RU**

I refer to your pre-planning application enquiry 2022/5644/PRE at 133 Haverstock Hill, London, NW3 4RU. Thank you for sending the documents detailing the proposed alterations to the property, as well as the site visit conducted on 16/03/2023.

## 1. Proposal

The proposal involves a number of additions and alterations to the building, which are as follows:

### 1. Replacement rear extension

The existing rear extension at upper ground level is proposed to be demolished and replaced with an enlarged rear extension that covers the full width of the rear elevation, including the rears of both the main building and the side extension. The replacement extension would be designed in a conservatory style with arched detailing to the windows at both lower and upper ground level.

### 2. Side infill extension

The existing side extension is proposed to be infilled at the first-floor level above the entrance of the property with materials to match the existing. The extension would include a small sash window.

### 3. Outbuilding

An outbuilding that would be used for ancillary purposes to the house is proposed at the end of the rear garden, which would accommodate a home office and gym. This would measure approximately 5.7m x 3.3m (spanning the full width of the garden) and would feature a green roof.

### 4. Internal works and alterations

The proposal involves a number of internal works including (but not limited to) the replacement of non-original features (cornices, ceiling roses, skirting, etc), works to flooring throughout the property, replacement of windows requiring repair, and damp-proofing at lower-ground.

## 5. External works and alterations

Some external works are proposed such as the installation of railings to the front lightwell of the lower ground level and landscaping of the existing terrace area to the rear of the property.

## 2. Site description

133 Haverstock Hill is a Grade II listed building situated within the Belsize Conservation Area. It is a four-storey end of terrace building on the south side of Haverstock Hill that is in use as a single dwellinghouse. It is recognised as a positive contributor to the conservation area.

## 3. Relevant planning history

### Application Site

**8803731** – Erection of rear extension at basement level with a conservatory over. **Granted 22/09/1988.**

**8870538** – Demolition of part of the rear wall at basement in connection with the proposal for a basement extension and conservatory over. **Listed building consent granted 22/09/1988.**

**G9/8/5/26310 & G9/8/5/HB1901** – The erection of a side extension at first floor level to provide a bathroom. **Granted 18/07/1978.**

### 131 Haverstock Hill

**2020/0684/P & 2020/1390/L** - Formation of vehicle hardstanding to replace the existing gravel driveway, widening of existing vehicle access, installation of bi-folding gates and proposed access to roof of dwellinghouse with associated balustrade to create a roof terrace (Use Class C3). **Planning permission and listed building consent granted 05/11/2020.**

**2015/1893/P & 2015/2292/L** - Installation of external balustrading, new hatch on existing roof as fire escape and new internal staircase. **Planning permission and listed building consent granted 09/07/2018.**

**9400475 & 2470101** - Erection of a single storey rear extension at basement level with roof terrace over together with alterations to rear elevation and front garden area. **Planning permission and listed building consent granted 29/09/1994.**

### 129 Haverstock Hill

**9370263** – Insertion of new windows to rear elevation. **Listed building consent granted 07/04/1994.**

**8401259 & 8470183** – Erection of a front garden wall. **Planning permission and listed building consent granted 03/10/1984**

## 4. Relevant policies and guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021

London Plan 2021

London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017

- **Policy A1** – Managing the impact of development

- **Policy A3** – Biodiversity
- **Policy D1** – Design
- **Policy D2** – Heritage
- **Policy CC1** – Climate change adaptation

### Belsize Conservation Area Statement 2009

#### 5. Assessment

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

- Design and heritage impacts
- Amenity

#### 6. Design and Heritage

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. The Local Plan also specifies that the prevailing pattern and impact on "*existing rhythms, symmetries, and uniformities in the townscape*" should be considered.

Policy D2 additionally states that the Council will only permit development both within conservation areas and to listed buildings if it preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the heritage assets. In particular, proposals will not be supported where alterations or extensions to a listed building would harm the special architectural and historic interest of the building.

The Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) on 'Design' and 'Home Improvements' also lays out 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. In the case of listed buildings, proposals should seek to "*respond to the special historic and architectural constraints of the listed building, rather than significantly change them*". CPG 'Home Improvements' also gives guidance on extensions and outbuildings, both of which are relevant in this instance.

The Belsize Conservation Area Statement gives general guidelines on development within the conservation area and provides the following on rear and side extensions:

- Rear extensions should be designed to be as unobtrusive as possible so that they do not negatively impact the character of the building or the conservation area and should not be of insensitive scale or design.
- Rear extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions.
- Side extensions would only be acceptable where they do not upset the character and relationship between properties, and the infilling of gaps should be resisted where the symmetry of the composition of a building would be impaired.

This pre-application has been discussed with a Council Conservation Officer who attended the site visit and has provided observations on the proposals. It should be noted that the proposals for this site encompass the whole house and its setting. 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.

133 Haverstock Hill is part of a designed composition of three houses dating from c.1820. It is Grade II listed and is within the Belsize Park Conservation Area. Its significance includes its architectural design and materials, plan-form, evidential value as an early C19th house, and its townscape value including its garden setting and contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

For simplicity, the proposed works will be split into the previously established areas of alteration and assessed separately.

### Rear Extension

There is no objection in principle to the replacement of the existing conservatory structure at upper ground level, nor the works to the rear extension at lower ground level. The existing rear extension is a non-original addition constructed in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, so its replacement would not be resisted. The proposals for the rear extension are generally acceptable and the design of the glazing pattern is considered to be appropriate in the context of the building and the surrounding area. Given that the upper section of the rear extension is replacing an existing conservatory-style sunroom, the amount of glazing in the proposed rear extension would likely be considered to be acceptable.

However, although elements of the extension are acceptable, the scale is not supported. The proposal currently shows the extension as exceeding the width of the main elevation and into the rear elevation of the side extension. This would constitute an overly-dominant extension and would disrupt the separation between the extension and the original house, harming the architectural and historic interest. In order to be acceptable, the rear extension should only extend the width of the original building. As such, the need to relocate the existing rear window at upper ground level would be removed and it could be maintained in its current position.

### Side Infill Extension

The front extension at first floor level on the side wing of the building is not supported due to the impact of the composition of the terrace as a whole, the architectural significance of the host building, and the townscape contribution made to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The properties at no.129-133 currently read as a symmetrical terrace, with both no.129 and no.133 featuring a side extension of matching design. The Belsize Conservation Area Statement is also clear that side extensions should not harm the existing symmetry of buildings. Therefore, infilling the side extension would be inappropriate and would not be supported.

### Outbuilding

The garden is large enough to accommodate the proposed outbuilding, and the footprint of the outbuilding would leave more than enough garden space for the garden to be considered reasonably sized. Its position in the far corner of the garden would be appropriate, and even though it would be visible from the allotments at the rear, it would be far enough removed and subordinate in scale so as not to be considered as harmful to the setting of the listed building.

However, the outbuilding taking up the full width of the garden is unlikely to be acceptable, and it may be more appropriate to opt for a design wherein the longest elevation of the outbuilding runs along the boundary and a gap is maintained so that the full depth of the garden can be read.

The use of the outbuilding as incidental to the main property would need to be secured via a condition to ensure that the amenity of neighbouring occupiers is not adversely affected. Elevations of the proposed outbuilding have not been provided so it is difficult to comment on this aspect, but when designing the outbuilding, the CPG 'Home Improvements' should be considered.; The use of materials that would complement the setting such as timber and the inclusion of features such as the green roof and bird/bat boxes would be encouraged.

### Internal Alterations

The basement has been heavily altered in terms of finishes and plan-form, but it still contains some of its original fixtures and character, such as the chimney breast. The proposed visual re-separation of the rooms by arched partitions would reinstate some sense of the original cellular planform. The alteration of the wall between the basement of the side wing and the basement of the main house is likely to be acceptable given it does not involve the loss of the plan-form/circulation and would read as a traditional Victorian pantry-type divide. If cornicing is introduced it should be very plain, i.e. commensurate with the basement status, and hierarchy of the house as a whole. It may be possible to open the chimney breast very modestly within the width of the existing opening, but given it is one of the few original features left in the basement, consent will not be granted for anything other than an extremely modest alteration.

The basement appears to lack the sensitivity which would make damp proofing works unacceptable in principle, i.e. it has essentially already been "tanked" in cement on the floor and wall finishes. Some form of damp proofing solution could be acceptable, but it is noted that the property appears to have been empty for some time and the engineer's report notes that gutters and drains are blocked which may have exacerbated the issue of damp in the immediate term. The heritage impact of the proposed damp-proof works on fabric will need to be set out and justified in the documents accompanying an application containing such works, but given the loss of the original breathability of the basement fabric which has already occurred, it is likely that the solution set out in the report accompanying this application could be acceptable.

With regards to fireplaces throughout, unless evidence to the contrary can be found, it is assumed that all chimneypieces and grates to the property are original and cannot be removed. If the proposed 'log burners' are required, then details will be required to show how they can be fitted without historic fabric being lost. Note that the use of these may not be acceptable unless compliant with Camden's advice on the appropriate use of wood burning for heating: <https://www.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/0/Healthy+Air+for+All+->

[+Wood+Burning+and+Smoke+Control+Nov-21+FINAL.pdf/41c6dac8-77a6-d219-8716-9c68962f990f?t=1637158290779](#)).

On the ground floor, it is proposed to undertake alterations to the doors between the front and rear rooms. These are not historic doors, although they are not badly detailed. It is proposed to install pocket doors, which seems very challenging to achieve as it involves substantial intervention to the spine wall. Although much more typical of the Victorian period than the Georgian era, it may be possible to support an application for the replacement of modern doors with pocket doors subject to detail and no change to the alignment of the spine wall.

The replacement of the modern floor finishes at ground floor level is acceptable.

At the first-floor level, notwithstanding the aforementioned matters of the side extension and chimneypieces, the works to this floor largely comprise the reconfiguration of modern bathrooms and appear to be generally acceptable as all existing pipe runs can be reused. A door between front and rear rooms would only be acceptable if it was a jib door.

The works proposed on the second floor are acceptable given the plan-form has already been altered to more or less the form now proposed. Consent will not be given for the removal of the 1830s Colebrookdale chimneypieces, but it is understood that it is not proposed to remove them. It seems extremely unfortunate to conceal them from view but, providing this was a very reversible and light-touch casing, there would be no reason it would be refused.

The pre-application statement refers to heating/cooling of the building, but there are no specific details provided. We could potentially support methods such as an air source heat pump, as the Council encourages sustainable energy subject to detail; however this would need to be justified at the application stage with details provided.

### External Alterations

The landscaping to the rear terrace is considered acceptable and appropriate in the context of the building and the wider conservation area. The works to the rear garden including the removal of the tree to facilitate the outdoor seating area will require an arboricultural statement/tree survey to show how the proposed development will affect planting.

Railings to the front lightwell are unlikely to be supported unless there is evidence that there were some historically (none seems apparent from our attempts to find this). However, if the issue is related to safety, then a grille concealed within the void is likely to be acceptable.

Some of the windows in the rear of the property have already been replaced in slim double glazing, although consent does not appear to have been granted for this. In panes with modern (late C20th) glass it could be acceptable to replace in thermally treated single glazing such as Histoglass mono laminate or equivalent. However, several of the windows contain historic glass and there is no scope for replacement of these; on such windows secondary glazing is probably the only option available, subject to nil impact on fabric. A window survey will be needed for any application to replace glazing.

Any proposed alterations to the front boundary would need to reflect the historic treatment; although the existing metal gates are not historic, they are appropriate to the significance of the listed building and its setting. It is difficult to judge without elevation drawings of the proposed timber gates, but in order to be acceptable these would need to preserve and enhance the character of the site and wider conservation area.

## 7. Amenity

Local Plan policy A1 and the CPG 'Amenity' 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 additional overlooking that would harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. The siting and positioning of the proposed rear extension is the same as the existing extension, and the scale would also be limited enough that there would likely not be significant impacts on daylight/sunlight or privacy of neighbours. Although the design of the rear extension would result in some light spill, this would likely be similar to the existing conservatory that the extension would replace and is not considered to be harmful to neighbouring amenity.

## 8. Conclusion

The rear extension is considered to be acceptable in principle; however, it would need to be reduced in size in order to be subordinate and preserve the character of the host property. The side infill would not be appropriate and could not be supported. The outbuilding to the rear garden is considered to be acceptable in principle, though should be amended in design so that it does not cover the entire width of the garden. The external and internal alterations would mostly be considered acceptable, though there are areas that would require revisions such as the railings to the front lightwell and all changes would be subject to the submission of further details.

## 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 application form – both 'Householder Application' and 'Listed Building Consent';
- An Ordnance Survey based location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red;
- Floor plans (including roof plan) 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';
- Internal sections for internal works and any timber fixed to the building (including windows) at a scale of 1:10 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed';
- Design and Access Statement (making specific reference to the conservation area);
- Heritage statement (making specific reference to heritage asset of the listed building);
- Photographs dated and numbered showing the areas of the building where alterations are proposed, both internally and externally;
- Arboricultural assessment including tree survey;
- If an ASHP is proposed, a noise impact assessment;
- The appropriate fee of £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 be in your client's interests to discuss this with the neighbours and also with local groups before an application is submitted. The latter would include:

- Belsize Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

It is likely that 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 or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact Sam FitzPatrick at the email or number above.

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

Yours sincerely,

Sam FitzPatrick

Planning Officer  
Planning Solutions Team