

Design & Access Statement **159A Goldhurst Terrace** NW6 3EU

142_DAS Rev A
June 2024



Index

1.0 Introduction

2. 0 Existing house and context

3.0 Relevant Planning History

4.0 The proposal

5.0 Consultation

6.0 Planning Policy

7.0 Heritage

8.0 Conclusion

1.0 Introduction

This Design & Access Statement is to accompany a Planning Application for a proposal to rebuild or part rebuild a ground floor rear extension to the garden flat 159A Goldhurst Terrace.



Rear view of existing extension and garden



Rear view of existing extension



View towards rear of garden



View of existing extension in relation to extension at 155 Goldhurst Terrace



Garden to 157 Goldhurst Terrace towards rear extension at 155 Goldhurst Terrace



Interior view towards of existing conservatory area inside existing extension

2. 0 Existing house and context

159A Goldhurst Terrace is the garden flat to a late 19th Century house in the South Hampstead Conservation Area. It is sited between numbers 157 and 161. Number 157 is also 19th century whilst 161, Wilson House Hostel is a later addition, possibly post war. Numbers 157 and 159 are categorised as Positive buildings in Map 9 South Hampstead CA Townscape plan and are under an Article 4 direction which effects their frontages only. Wilson House is deemed to be neutral and isn't under an Article 4 direction. Whilst the front of 159 is typical of those defining the character of the Conservation Area, the rear is quite plain brick with timber sash windows.



Aerial view showing the extension at No. 155



Wilson House

Aerial view showing the rear extensions Goldhurst Terrace from Wilson House, 171 upwards

Wilson House has a large rear conservatory extension and Number 155 has a 2 storey rear extension. Many of the houses from beyond Wilson House and 171 upwards have large rear extensions most of which are likely to be garden flats.

The Existing Extension

The existing extension has little architectural merit and could be categorised as harmful in design terms to the Conservation Area.

It comprises 2 elements, the first is partly brickwork with a large sliding white aluminium glazed door with an asymmetrical white concrete lintel overhead and a small incongruous grilled window to the left hand side. The secondary element is a fully glazed white aluminium conservatory with one side fully facing towards the existing fence of No. 157. The full width extension has blocked in access from the rear bedroom which has a non original door into the glazed side of the extension. The mixture of different materials and fenestration of different types is visually incongruous and unharmonious.

3.0 Relevant Planning History

2012/3987/P - Alterations to existing single-storey rear extension including replacement of its glass roof, addition of new rooflight, and replacement its windows/doors, all in connection with existing flat (Class C3). - Granted 01-11-2012

9301173 - The erection of a hardwood conservatory at the rear. As shown on site plan A4 drawing & details (A4) of Warwick Conservatory. – Granted 05-11-1993

PWX0103287- Erection of single storey rear extension and conservatory. – Granted 19-06-2001

Pre Application:

Date: Ref: 2023/4391/PRE 28/03/2024 Planning Officer Blythe Smith.

The assessment of the drawings and 3d images of the proposed extension under the Pre-application identified the following points below which we note and where required have made changes.

- a. The principle of the extension could be supported.
- b. An acceptable amount of garden amenity space would be retained and the extension would read as subordinate to the host building in accordance with CPG Home Improvements.
- c. The alterations cannot be seen from the road, and therefore will have no visual impact on the streetscape.
- d. The use of aluminium and white render would be considered appropriate for a contemporary addition on the rear.
- e. The arrangement of two sets of extensive glazing, (the extent of glazing to the side of the proposed extension was much larger including an additional door in the previous proposal) lack design compatibility, are visually incongruous and lacks sympathy with the historic fenestration of the house.
- f. A more symmetrical and simplified fenestration on the rear would be encouraged.
- g. The installation of a green roof is strongly encouraged, especially on the flat roof portion.
- h. Analysis is required for daylight levels to windows in the adjacent properties.
- i. An arboricultural report would be required if the applicant intends to submit a planning application to assess the pro-

posed developments impact to these trees.

4.0 The proposal

The owners have a growing family and wish to stay in the area rather than move and also wish to improve the external appearance of the extension. They require an additional bedroom and also wish to make the existing rear bedroom viable as a habitable bedroom with window.

The proposal seeks to extend the original extension by 1.5m and make it 40cm wider. The depth would then match the depth of the extension to No. 155. The rear garden is very large/long and the Pre-Application advice states that it is not felt that this will impinge on the character of the rear garden, which are a characteristic of the Conservation Area which has been confirmed in the Pre-application advice.

It is proposed that the primary brickwork element of the existing extension is extended in white painted rendered blockwork with the rooflight enlarged with a new sliding glazed door. To be as sustainable as possible my client wishes (if possible) to retain as much as the existing extension as possible. It is proposed that the current conservatory of the existing extension is demolished and rebuilt in rendered blockwork with a proportionally sized window subservient to the sliding doors adjacent. It has been designed to meet the area guidelines for a single bedroom and the roof-line has been carefully angled to maintain sufficient daylight levels in the existing secondary bedroom. As per the original part of this extension it is sloped downwards towards the neighbours garden. A daylight sunlight study has been carried out to demonstrate that the once interior bedroom **passes** the daylight sunlight levels required for use as a bedroom.

In making these revisions to the previous proposal reviewed under the pre-application we welcome that the Council is willing in principal to support the extension and note the ways we have addressed their comments e,f,g,h & i below:

e. Glazing

This is a contemporary extension and in its materiality white render and white aluminium fenestration is considered to compliment rather than copy the existing original 19th Century building. The extent of glazing is modest and proportional to the size of the extension and provides practical light, access and ventilation. The composition and simplicity of the glazed door and window is a significant improvement to the existing mixture of opening sizes, materials and styles.

f. Symmetry

By its very nature the design is not symmetrical and as considered to be a contemporary addition thus we feel that the composition of door and window is compatible with the extension itself and there isn't a requirement to relate it to the formal composition of the original building.

g. Green Roof

Whilst we see the biodiverse and sustainable merits of a green roof, it is intended if that to a large extent the existing building is to be reused where possible. It is currently unknown whether the existing roof structure can support the loading requirements of a green roof and therefore it is not included in the design. Where possible and to comply with the Building Regulations the existing energy performance of the building will be greatly improved with considerably less glazing. The extension also sits within a large garden where the owner has agreed to plant additional trees.

h. Daylight Analysis

The updated Daylight Analysis Report demonstrates that the adjacent GF closest windows of no.157 and 161 Goldhurst Terrace have been accurately calculated through the use of Vertical Sky Component (VSC) calculations and have not been unduly affected by the proposal.

i. Arboricultural Report

As per the report and photograph the proposals will require the removal of a small Elder from within the rear garden. The Arboricultural Consultant states that It is not particularly valuable and not visible from outside the site, and neither the amenity or arboreal character of the local area will be affected by its removal. To mitigate any perceived loss, two Photinia Trees are to be planted along the rear boundary.

5.0 Consultation

Pre-Application 2023/4391/PRE 28/03/2024 Planning Officer Blythe Smith.

6.0 Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

London Plan March 2021

Camden Local Plan 2017

A1 Managing the impact of development

A3 Biodiversity

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG Design CPG Amenity

CPG Home Improvements

CGP Trees

CPG Biodiversity

7.0 Heritage

The relevant heritage asset is the South Hampstead Conservation Area and the positive contribution that the front of the house brings to it. The large rear garden is also a positive character and amenity to the area. Both of these are being protected. There are no Listed or Locally Listed buildings in the vicinity.

8.0 Conclusion

The proposal will improve the appearance of the current extension which is without architectural merit by forming a higher quality, more energy efficient building. This modest further extension with only a 7m² overall increase in area would provide a significant advantage to the owners and the quality of housing in the area.

Care has been taken in approaching the council for pre-application and making amendments to the proposals already submitted and we respectfully request that the application be approved.