

Ted Walters

From: Ted Walters [ted.walters@blueyonder.co.uk]
Sent: 19 December 2012 12:19
To: 'walters ted'
Subject: FW: Pre application advise for 40 New End Square (ref CA\2011\ENQ\05200)

PRE - APPLICATION ADVICE - SEPT 2011

From: Wito, Alan [mailto:Alan.Wito@Camden.gov.uk]
Sent: 30 September 2011 18:04
To: ted.walters@blueyonder.co.uk
Subject: **Pre application advise for 40 New End Square (ref CA\2011\ENQ\05200)**

Dear Mr Walters

Thank you for meeting me at the property on the 16th of September, it was very useful for assessing your proposals. I have now had a chance to review the history of the building and can comment as follows to your proposals.

The building dates from circa 1815 but was re-fronted in the mid nineteenth century. The interior is quite rare with the fireplace being located in the spine wall.

Front elevation

Apart from repairs to the façade the only proposal is to insert a small lightwell to give natural light to the front basement area. Given the fact that the front garden is well screened a small lightwell may be possible. It seems unusual that one does not exist at the moment to provide light to the basement area. Potentially one may originally been there and it may have been infilled at a later date. As we discussed you may want to carry out some careful exploratory works such as lifting the modern paving slabs in the front area and to the internal face of the wall in the basement.

RESPONSE An area of the existing slabs have now been lifted and an excavation made to approximately 800 mm depth all along the front basement wall. No evidence of any previous vault, light well or window was revealed as we had anticipated. The earth and slabs have been replaced. Nonetheless, I consider that the proposal fulfil all the design recommendations of the Camden Planning Guidelines for front garden Basement Light wells, i.e. the discreet size of the light well in relation to the overall garden (12%), the screening created by the existing railings and shrubbery, the securing of the light well by a grille that would be flush with the natural ground level, the fenestration details of the proposed window relating to the scale and pane size of the existing windows above.etc

Rear elevation

The main issue here is the construction of a rear extension. The shallow extension seems reasonable and would read as a wing off the staircase, something which is not uncommon for a building of this type.

The two storey extension would fill the gap between number 40 and the building behind. It would not block any view of note and there are minimal views of this area from the surrounding buildings. Its scale, height and bulk would make it subservient to the host building. Again it would read as a rear wing off the building and as such would be in character.

It is noted that immediately to the north is a small terrace which serves number 38. As the party wall would be built up in brick (to replace the existing railing) there may be amenity (daylight and sunlight) concerns in relation to the neighbouring property. Camden Planning Guidance 6 gives further details. I attach a link to the document on the council's website here:

<http://camden.gov.uk/ccm/content/environment/planning-and-built-environment/two/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/camden-planning-guidance.en>

RESPONSE In consideration of the requirements set out in the Camden Planning Guidance for adequate sunlight and daylight; I can confirm that the projection of a line from centre of the lowest window on the small terrace of no 38 to the highest point of the proposed new extension roof line of no 40 will be below 20 degrees, and is therefore unlikely to have any substantial effect on the daylight enjoyed by the occupants of the existing building. The rear elevation and terrace at No 38 faces South West and the new extension will have no effect on their amenity to sunlight throughout the day .

Although a more modern design is proposed, given the extension's size and position it could be acceptable.

It is unlikely that a roof terrace would be acceptable on top of the extension due to amenity (overlooking) concerns.

RESPONSE There will be no proposal for a roof terrace

Internal alterations

Given the extent of alterations that have already taken place to the basement it is likely that the proposed works at this level would be acceptable.

At ground floor the alterations are fairly minor and as long as the doors and architraves are re-used this should be acceptable.

I note from the drawings that it is the intention to replace the floorboards with oak or similar. I did not check this on site. If the boards are historic then they should be retained. However it may be possible to overlay a new timber floor above these.

The proposed reduction in size of the bathroom on the second floor is not contentious given that this is modern insertion.

I hope that this information is helpful but if you have any queries regarding this please do not hesitate to contact me

Alan Wito MSc, BSc (Hons), IHBC
Senior Planner (Conservation)
Regeneration and Planning
Culture and Environment
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 6392
Web: camden.gov.uk

6th Floor
Town Hall Extension (Culture and Environment)
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

Please consider the environment before printing this email.



Ask

ted walters <tedcwalters@gmail.com>

W: 40 NEW END SQ NW3 1LS

message

SITE VISIT

NOV 2012

Ted Walters <ted.walters@blueyonder.co.uk>

Thu, Nov 29, 2012 at 1:52 PM

o: tedcwalters@gmail.com

rod@hammerconstruction.co.uk

---Original Message---

From: Ted Walters [mailto:ted.walters@blueyonder.co.uk]

Sent: 29 November 2012 13:52

To: 'Wito, Alan'

Subject: 40 NEW END SQ NW3 1LS

Dear Mr Wito

RE Application Ref 2011/5217/L

Thank you for coming to the New End Sq site last Wednesday morning to inspect relevant items now exposed for your consideration as to their merit as special architectural and historical value.

As suggested; for your records I now attach photos and minutes of the meeting as follows:

a) The empty fire hearth in the kitchen is to be swept clean and to be covered over with a reclaimed cast iron fire piece to match the dining room. I.e. no building work will disturb the existing condition

e) The t and g flooring and Taurus skirting boards throughout the ground floor were installed in the 1970s and are of no historic value (see photos)

The pine floor boarding to the 1st floor is of historic value so the new floor will be fitted onto packing timbers approx 20 - 80 mm above (see photos)

New item) The breeze block wall at the head of the basement staircase installed in the 1970s is of no historic value and can be removed to BC approval (see photo)

I trust the above is a reasonable description of the meeting and I expect you will be looking at the Approval of Details application with drawings for the windows and doors in due course.

Kind regards

Ted Walters

WALTERS CONSULTANCY LTD

07831 488901

Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

IMG_0786

IMG_0785


IMG_0778

IMG_0782

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

5 attachments

IMG_0786.jpg
44K



IMG_0785.jpg
35K



IMG_0778.jpg
54K




IMG_0782.jpg
24K



IMG_0784.jpg
53K

COPIES OF:



LISTED BUILDING CONSENT
AND.

HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING
APPLICATION CONSENT