

**9 TEMPLEWOOD AVENUE**

**HAMPSTEAD NW3**

**PLANNING AND HERITAGE STATEMENT**

**DECEMBER 2012**

## CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Site and Surroundings	3
3.	Proposed Development	5
4.	Policy Context	8
5.	Analysis	10
6.	Conclusion	16

TA Ref: XULL2002  
Office Address: 25 Savile Row  
London  
W1S 2ES  
Telephone 020 7851 4010  
Date of Issue: December 2012

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This statement is prepared by Turley Associates and forms part of an application for planning permission in relation to the ground floor and basement flat at 9 Templewood Avenue, London NW3.
- 1.2 The proposed development includes alterations to the front entrance, replacement of existing side extension, alterations and extension at the rear of the property, enlargement of existing basement including rear light wells, works to front boundary, swimming pool and landscaping.
- 1.3 A range of supporting documents are submitted in relation to the application as follows:
- Planning and Heritage Statement by Turley Associates
  - Application Drawings by XUL Architecture
  - Design and Access Statement by XUL Architecture
  - Arboricultural Report by John Cromar's Arboricultural Company Ltd
  - Noise Assessment by Acoustics Plus
  - Basement Impact Assessment:
    - Structural Stability Review and Basement Impact Assessment by Ian Drummond Consulting Engineers
    - Site Investigation Report by HESI Ltd
    - Hydrogeological Report by Geotechnical Consulting Group
  - Flood Risk Assessment by Water Environment Ltd
  - Ecological Report by RSK
  - M&E / Sustainability Report by ME7
  - Construction Management Plan by A&I Construction
- 1.4 Pre application advice was sought from the Council in relation to the proposed development and the design approach has been altered following this advice as detailed in this statement.

- 1.5 As well as providing relevant background and descriptive information, the purpose of this statement is to demonstrate the acceptability of the proposed development in terms of planning policy and other material considerations.

## **2. Site and Surroundings**

- 2.1 9 Templewood Avenue is occupied by a large detached residential property, originally constructed as a single family dwelling house, now converted to flats. The property has a neo-Georgian style which is characteristic of this location in Hampstead. The property has a red brick finish and clay tiled roof which features dormer windows both at the front and rear of the property. The property has projecting wings at the front and rear of the house as well as an existing side extension, adjacent to no.7 Templewood Avenue.



**Front Elevation from Templewood Avenue**

- 2.2 There is an existing basement at the property which currently has two bedrooms within it. There are existing light wells / excavated areas at both the front and rear.
- 2.3 The property has undergone previous alterations, including the addition of large dormer windows at roof level, the addition of the side extension and alterations at the rear. In terms of the latter, the two wings at the rear of the property are not symmetrical which gives a disjointed appearance.
- 2.4 The application provides the opportunity to improve the existing accommodation.
- 2.5 The property has a generous rear garden, with substantial planting along the boundaries, making the rear of the property difficult to view from surrounding properties and invisible from the wider public realm. The property is set back from the road.

- 2.6 The property is located in the Reddington & Frogna Conservation Area and makes a positive contribution to its character and appearance, although it is not formally listed.
- 2.7 Adjacent to the property are nos. 7 and 11 Templewood Avenue, also identified as making positive contribution to the area's character and appearance. Extensive works to no.11, including basement extension and alterations to the rear of the property, have recently been permitted by the Council (LPA Application Ref: 2012/2842/P).
- 2.8 Substantial works, including basement work, have been undertaken to other houses in the immediate vicinity of the site. Of particular note is no. 12 Templewood Avenue opposite which is a very large property which has been substantially altered including a large basement (LPA Ref: 2007/1575/P). No.4 Templewood Avenue has also had extensive works permitted (LPA Ref: 2011/1710/P).

### **3. Proposed Development**

- 3.1 Our client has recently purchased the property at 9 Templewood Avenue and wishes to extend and alter it to meet the requirements of his family, including the needs of a disabled son. The purpose of the proposed works is therefore to improve the appearance of the property and provide a better standard accommodation and living space.
- 3.2 As it is a flat, the property does not benefit from permitted development rights. However, it should be noted that, if the property was a single house, much of the work proposed, which is of a modest scale, would benefit from such rights and would not be subject to the planning application process.

#### **Pre Application Advice**

- 3.3 In August 2012 pre application advice was sought from the Council in relation to an initial design proposal for the property and drawings were submitted for consideration. In the response issued by the Council on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2012 feedback provided as follows:

- It was advised that the basement should be set in from the boundary of no.7
- A possible concern was raised about bedrooms in the basement, in terms of flood risk and daylight and sunlight
- A Construction Management Plan was requested
- A possible issue about a reduction in soft landscaping was raised
- Issues were raised in relation to the treatment of the bays and the infill extension at the rear of the property
- Advice on the scale and materials of the proposed rebuilt side extension was given
- The alterations to the front porch were considered acceptable

Further discussions were undertaken following amendments to the proposed design and a site visit with the planning officer. More recently, feedback has been provided from an officer's case conference meeting. This feedback advised that the existing bay window was considered a positive design feature that should be preserved and that the approach to the alterations/ extension at the rear should

reflect the character of the existing house and the Conservation Area. Implicit within the more recent advice is that the principle of the infill extension at the rear is now considered to be acceptable.

- 3.4 The evolution of the design and the ways in which the proposal has responded to the advice received are described in subsequent sections.

### **Front Alterations**

- 3.5 At the front of the property alterations are proposed to the entrance arrangement including an altered porch design and doorways.
- 3.6 On the site boundary it is proposed to create a new low wall, which would reflect those existing at other properties on the street. A bin store would be incorporated into the wall.

### **Rear Alteration and Extension**

- 3.7 It is proposed to extend and alter the property at the rear to improve the standard of the internal accommodation at ground level, in particular to provide better spaces and natural light levels to the principal rooms.
- 3.8 The rear elevation has been altered previously. As noted above the existing wings at the rear of the property are not symmetrical: one features a curved bay window whilst the other two regular windows which are flush with a squared off projecting element.
- 3.9 It is proposed to create a symmetrical composition through altering the wings at ground floor level and introducing two new matching bay windows. A small infill extension between the two wings is also proposed. The infill extension would be set back from wings to maintain the existing overall architectural composition of two wings with a recessed central element between.

### **Extended Basement**

- 3.10 There is an existing basement at the property, with two bedrooms within in it and existing light wells / excavated areas both at the front and rear. It is proposed to extend the basement to provide improved and additional internal space. The basement would be on one level only and would occupy the footprint of the extended building except at the rear of the property where it would extend outwards beneath a small part of the rear garden. The basement would be naturally lit by light wells at the front (as existing) and at the rear of the property



with full height glazing. The light wells would be discreetly designed and screened by planting.

### **Side Extension**

- 3.11 The property features a single storey existing 1970s side extension and it is proposed to rebuild this element of the building. It is proposed to extend the footprint slightly to the rear whilst maintaining setbacks from the main section of the house, particularly the front, and reducing the overall height compared to the existing.
- 3.12 Other minor changes to the side elevations are proposed as shown on the application drawings.

### **Other Works**

- 3.13 The proposed works would include improved landscaping, alterations to the driveway and permeable surfaces as well as a modestly sized and unheated swimming pool in the rear garden.
- 3.14 Existing trees of value are to be retained and necessary protection measures to be undertaken during construction. Certain trees of low value are to be removed and replaced by new planting as set out in the accompanying arboricultural report.
- 3.15 An improved drainage scheme for the site and an upgrade of the building's energy performance would be integral to the work as detailed in the M&E report.
- 3.16 The property is to be designed to be wheelchair accessible as one of the residents is disabled.

### **Demolition**

- 3.17 An element of the building is to be removed and replaced as part of the proposals. However, the loss of building fabric as indicated is such that it does not constitute substantial demolition. The proposals are restricted to the loss of modest elements of the house, confined to the existing side extension (which is not original), parts of the rear elevation at ground floor level only and minor works at the front of the property.
- 3.18 It is clear therefore that the proposals do not constitute the substantial demolition of the building (as defined in Appendix E to Environment Circular 14/97 following the Shimizu (UK) Ltd v Westminster City Council Case).

## 4. Policy Context

- 4.1 The adopted Development Plan comprises the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004), Camden's Core Strategy and Camden Development Plan Policies both of which were adopted in November 2010. Other relevant policy considerations are the NPPF, the Redington/Frogna Conservation Area Appraisal and the Council's planning guidance.
- 4.2 A key policy requirement is to preserve or enhance the building's contribution to the Redington/Frogna Conservation Area through using a sensitive design approach. At the local level Core Strategy policy CS14 requires development proposals to promote the highest standard of design whilst respecting local context and character. The policy also seeks to preserve and enhance Camden's heritage assets, including conservation areas. CS14 is supplemented by Development Policy DP24, which reinforces the borough's commitment to design excellence in both contemporary and traditional styles of architecture, and Development Policy DP25 which states a commitment to only permitting development within conservation areas which preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area.
- 4.3 Policy DP26 is also a relevant consideration in that it deals with the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours. It includes the need to ensure issues such as access to sunlight and daylight and overshadowing are acceptable.
- 4.4 Policy DP27 has been adopted as part of the Council's LDF Development Plan Policies document in recognition of the increasing popularity of basements as a means of gaining additional space in homes. Although the policy recognises that such development can help to make efficient use of the borough's limited land it is important that this is done in a way that does not cause harm to the amenity of neighbours, affect the stability of buildings, cause drainage or flooding problems or damage the character of areas or the natural environment.
- 4.5 Policy DP27 states that, in determining proposals for basement and other underground development, the Council will require an assessment of the scheme's impact on drainage, flooding, groundwater conditions and structural stability, where appropriate.
- 4.6 The justification clarifies that the level of information required will be commensurate with the scale and location of the scheme. Larger schemes i.e. those consisting of two or more underground storeys will be expected to provide evidence against each of the considerations a) to h) in policy DP27. Smaller schemes will be expected to submit information which relates to specific concerns for that particular

scheme or location (para 27.3). Further guidance in relation to basements is set out in the Council's planning guidance document CPG4 which has been taken into account as part of the Basement Impact Assessment process.

- 4.7 The Camden Planning Guidance also includes specific information on extensions, as well as other relevant matters. The guidance has been taken into account in developing the proposal.

## **5. Analysis**

- 5.1 The property is considered appropriate for sympathetic alteration and extension to provide upgraded residential floorspace in order to meet the client's requirements. The proposed development has taken account of the Council's pre application advice.
- 5.2 The key planning considerations associated with the proposed development are as follows:
- Design Approach and Heritage Impact
  - Basement Impact Assessment
  - Flood Risk Assessment
  - Amenity Issues
  - Landscaping and Trees
  - Archaeology

### **Design Approach and Heritage Impact**

#### ***Front Elevation***

- 5.3 The works to the front of the building are minimal and restricted to alterations to the entrance and the new porch. The new porch and entrance would be in keeping with the neo-Georgian character of the existing house and would provide a higher quality entrance for all the flats in the building.
- 5.4 The addition of the low front boundary wall would formalise the front boundary of the property similar to the boundary walls of other nearby properties on the Templewood Avenue, for example no. 7 (next door).

#### ***Side Extension***

- 5.5 The rebuilding of the non-original side extension would improve its appearance and allow for a new master bedroom suite inside. The height of the extension would be slightly lower than the existing whilst, in terms of footprint, the extension has been set back from the front of the house substantially following pre application advice from the Council. The extension at the rear meanwhile would have a minimal visual impact.

- 5.6 Previously it was proposed to clad the rear of the side extension in stone. However, the cladding material has now been changed to match the existing brickwork of the building in line with the Council's advice.
- 5.7 Having made the changes in line with the Council's advice, the side extension is subservient to the existing house and appropriate to its character and appearance, with a minimal impact on the Conservation Area.

### ***Rear Elevation***

- 5.8 As noted above the rear elevation is currently disjointed with previous alterations having been undertaken and a bay window on only one wing.
- 5.9 The design intent of the alterations has always been to create an architecturally pleasing and symmetrical composition at the rear of the property, thus improving the existing non-original situation. Importantly for the applicant, the works would also facilitate a vastly improved, lighter and more open interior, better suited to modern living.
- 5.10 Prior to feedback from the Council a more contemporary form of glazing was proposed. However, a more traditional approach to the proposed glazing on two matching bay windows is now proposed with timber framed windows that have proportions and glazing bars to relate to those elsewhere on the house.
- 5.11 The approach is in many ways similar in scope to the permitted works at no. 11 Templewood Avenue, but the symmetry proposed is considered to be more positive in terms of creating a better architectural composition overall for the rear of the house and more in keeping with the style of the existing building.
- 5.12 The single storey extension between the two wings would provide a much better internal space and, as noted above, it would be set back from the projecting bay windows of wings. In this way the extension would be subservient and the relationship of the two projecting wings with a recessed central element between would be preserved and enhanced.
- 5.13 Therefore, whilst it is still proposed to alter the existing bay window on the wing closest to no.7, the sensitive design approach now proposed, the improvements over the previously undertaken alterations and the symmetry created mean that, on balance, the proposals should be considered favourably with regard to policies DP24 and DP25 as well as the advice set out in the Council's planning guidance.

## **Basement Impact Assessment**

- 5.14 As the proposals include excavation to extend the existing basement area the proposals need to meet the requirements of policy DP27 which has been adopted as part of the Council's LDF Development Plan Policies document.
- 5.15 Policy DP27 states that, in determining proposals for basement and other underground development, the Council will require an assessment of the scheme's impact on drainage, flooding, groundwater conditions and structural stability, where appropriate.
- 5.16 The justification clarifies that the level of information required will be commensurate with the scale and location of the scheme. Larger schemes i.e. those consisting of two or more underground storeys will be expected to provide evidence against each of the considerations a) to h) in policy DP27. Smaller schemes will be expected to submit information which relates to specific concerns for that particular scheme or location (para 27.3).
- 5.17 In considering the impact of the basement, it is important to reiterate that the property already has a substantial basement including basement level habitable accommodation and light wells.

## ***Structural Stability***

- 5.18 The accompanying Structural Stability Review and Basement Impact Assessment by Ian Drummond Consulting Engineers demonstrates that, using methodologies appropriate to the site, the proposed development will be carried out in such a way that maintains the structural stability of the building and neighbouring properties, avoids adversely affecting drainage and run-off or causing damage to the water environment and avoids cumulative impacts on structural stability or the water environment in the local area.

## ***Groundwater Conditions and Drainage***

- 5.19 The Hydrogeological Report by Geotechnical Consulting Group concludes that the enlarged basement would have no significant impact on local groundwater and confirms that improved drainage – which is proposed – would mitigate any potential increase in the local water level and pore pressure on the uphill wall of the building. The report also notes the improvement to the permeability of the site resulting from the proposed landscaping scheme.

### ***Flood Risk***

- 5.20 The site is not at risk of flooding according to the Environment Agency's flood risk map and is less than 1 hectare in size. However, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been prepared because Templewood Avenue has been noted in CPG4 as having been subject to surface water flooding in the past and an extension to the basement is proposed.
- 5.21 There is an existing basement at the property and this has existing habitable accommodation within it, which has not proved dangerous in terms of flood risk. The proposed works include only one bedroom in the basement with the majority of the sleeping and other habitable accommodation at ground floor level.
- 5.22 The FRA concludes that the risk of flooding at the site is 'acceptably low' and that basement is at low risk of flooding from all sources. The proposals would not increase run off rate, nor would they increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.
- 5.23 It has therefore been demonstrated that the development, including the basement, is acceptable in terms of flood risk.

### **Amenity Issues**

- 5.24 Most of the habitable accommodation and principal rooms within the flat are to be located at ground floor level. Nevertheless, the basement would provide very high quality rooms with good levels of amenity. The full length windows serving the basement rooms within the proposed rear light well would maximise the level of natural light within the new basement and would be a vast improvement over the existing basement, which does not have as good access to natural light.
- 5.25 The scale of the proposed extensions to the rear and side of the property and the situation of the house in relation to its neighbours are such that there would be a minimal impact in terms of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing. No extensions above ground floor level are proposed and the side extension is lower than the existing, with only a modest increase in footprint to the front and rear.
- 5.26 During the officer's site visit, attention was drawn to a facing window at no. 7 which could be affected by the side extension. Due to the small scale of the extension and the reduction in height, any impact is considered to be minimal. Furthermore, the room which this window serves has another window on the other side of the room, which would be entirely unaffected. There would not therefore be any detrimental impact on no. 7.

- 5.27 A/C and swimming pool plant equipment is proposed next to the basement light wells. The accompanying noise assessment demonstrates that the impact of the plant would be acceptable in terms of nearby occupiers. It is also worth noting that there are existing A/C units at the property and these would no longer be needed.
- 5.28 The proposed development is therefore in accordance with policy DP26.

### **Trees & Landscaping**

- 5.29 As shown in the accompanying Arboricultural Report by John Cromar's Arboricultural Company Ltd, the impact of the proposed development on trees would be acceptable. The trees that are to be removed are of low value with a limited life expectancy and will be replaced. Where applicable the existing trees would be fully protected during the proposed works and root areas would not be negatively impacted.
- 5.30 The amount of hard landscaping has been reduced following pre application advice and the improvements to the hard and soft landscaping surrounding the building would be undertaken and these would improve its setting and the permeability of the surrounding surfaces.

### **Sustainability**

- 5.31 Whilst this is not an explicit policy requirement in relation to this type of development, as part of the works, the building would be significantly upgraded in sustainability terms as detailed in the M&E Report.
- 5.32 Through use of appropriate passive and building fabric design and energy saving measures the building will release lower net annual CO2 emissions against baseline levels and satisfies the current Building Regulation Part L requirements.
- 5.33 Included within the M&E Report is an appraisal of various renewable technologies, demonstrating their viability and appropriateness to the environment and nature of the development.
- 5.34 It is proposed that an air source heat pump (ASHP) system will be suitable for providing heating and cooling to some of occupied areas, with gas boilers for other areas, back up and domestic hot water production. The ASHP system will reduce the CO2 emissions.
- 5.35 The proposals would include improvements to the drainage system which are also considered positive in sustainability terms.



## **Archaeology**

- 5.36 The property is located in Archaeological Priority Area. A desktop archaeological assessment was recently undertaken in respect of the permitted works at no. 11 Templewood Avenue by Museum of London Archaeology. The findings and recommendations of that report are likely to be similarly applicable to the application site, which is located immediately next door and was originally developed at around the same time.
- 5.37 The background potential for archaeological remains is considered to be of low to moderate significance because the site was only developed in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Previous construction works when the property was first built and later altered, as well as the man made landscaping at the site, are likely to mean that present archaeological survival on site is generally low.
- 5.38 It is considered therefore that the archaeological implications of the development would be minor.

## **6. Conclusion**

- 6.1 In finalising the proposed design, full account has been taken of the Council's pre application advice and due consideration has also been given to local policy requirements and guidance, including policy DP27, relating to basement excavations.
- 6.2 The proposed development would substantially improve the quality of the accommodation at the property and the works have been sensitively designed by a local architectural practice that is experienced at working in the area. The external works would enhance the appearance of the building in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing house and the Conservation Area. All relevant technical matters have been addressed in the submission.
- 6.3 On this basis it is considered that the proposed development should be granted planning permission.

