#### 5 October 2011



Gavin Sexton
London Borough of Camden
Planning & Development Control
Camden Town Hall
Argyle Street
London
WC1H 8EQ

Nick Grant E: ngrant@savills.com DL: +44 (0) 20 3320 8233 F: +44 (0) 20 7566 7323

25 Finsbury Circus London EC2M 7EE T: +44 (0) 20 7499 8644 savills.com

Dear Mr Sexton,

# 12 Greenaway Gardens (Ref: 2011/4061/P) - Further Information & Revised Drawings

Further to your recent correspondence on 29<sup>th</sup> September and 3<sup>rd</sup> October concerning a number of issues with regards to the above application, we can now come back to you with the information and amendments you requested.

# **Retention of Chimneys**

You emphasised in your email of 3<sup>rd</sup> October that officers consider that the chimneys are a particularly characteristic and prominent feature of the houses locally and that you would resist their demolition without clear justification. We have considered these comments and now include for you with this letter, revised drawings illustrating the retention of the chimneys. We now consider that this element meets officers concerns and trust that the amendments resolve this issue.

## **Amendments to Rear Elevation**

In your email to Tim Johnstone on 29<sup>th</sup> September, you outlined some suggested amendments to the rear elevation details. We have again taken these comments on board and enclosed with this letter amended drawings which show:

- The squaring off of the rear curved bay so that the elevation projects slightly further into the garden, beneath the same roof profile;
- Incorporated a full width single storey infill extension between the drawing Room and kitchen wings.
   The extension is recessed by one brick from the existing kitchen wing; and
- Incorporated changes to the two storey flat roofed side extension where it faces the garden, including new windows, a new imperial brickwork garden elevation to match the existing house with segmental arches to door and window heads. We have retained the height, bulk and massing of the existing extension, so that it remains subservient to the host building, as you suggested.

We consider that these amendments respond to the comments made, to ensure that these elements will enhance the building and its contribution to the conservation area as a whole.

### **Further Demolition Details**

In your email to Tim Johnstone on 29th September, you also outlined that the existing demolition drawings, particularly of the roof, appear indicative only. You requested that further information be submitted in respect of the exact extent of the demolition. We have included with this letter a statement from HMB Architects



which details the roof works and methodology for retention, protection and support, as well as drawings illustrating the extent of demolition.

We consider that this further information demonstrates that the works involved do not involve substantial demolition, especially when considering how the scheme has evolved since the previously withdrawn application. The extent of demolition works have been considerably reduced following advice taken from the Council and with the further incorporation of amendments to the design, it is now considered that the application can be determined without the need for Conservation Area Consent.

# Response to CAAC

With regards to the objection letter received from CAAC, we would respond to each of their points as follows:

- 1. The application goes against CA philosophy as it implies any structure may be demolished to create large basement. Only part of the building is being taken down at the rear and this is to allow the reconfiguration of the rear facade. These small elements of demolition are not necessary to enable the basement.
- 2. The envelope of house extended by 6m into rear garden. This is not correct; the envelope does not extend this far as illustrated on the submitted proposed drawings.
- 3. The height of existing basement would be greatly deepened. It is considered that the proposed basement height meets is requirements to ensure a high standard of accommodation is provided.
- 4. The BIA states that it hopes possible problems will not occur. The report clearly states that the potential impact on surface water flow & local flooding risk will be negligible. It states the potential impact on ground movement and slope stability will also be negligible. Finally it states the potential impact of the proposed basement on slope stability will be negligible due to the general stability of the existing natural slope.
- 5. The impact on water environment is not clear. The BIA clearly outlines that mitigation measures have already been incorporated into the design to ensure that the proposed underdrainage system will effectively maintain the local groundwater regime in its current state.
- 6. The proposal is extending the basement beyond line of number 11 would aggravate threat of flooding to neighbours. The BIA clearly states that the potential impact of the proposed basement on surface water flow and local flooding risk is considered negligible.
- 7. The south flank elevation implies more than single storey basement which should not be considered without further BIA. This is not correct - the basement is only a single storey.

We note that the CAAC are not opposed to the general scheme, but in specifically object to the principal of the basement. The Basement Impact Assessment submitted with the application clearly demonstrates that the proposal would not have any adverse affects and as such we consider that the points raised in this objection have been sufficiently addressed.

As detailed above, included with this letter is the following information:

- Drawing:
  - o 988-P121 revision D
  - o 988-P122 revision D
  - o 988-P123 revision D
  - o 988-P124 revision D
  - o 988-P126 revision D

  - o 988-P127 revision E o 988-P128 revision C
  - o 988-P129 revision E



- o 988-P130 revision C
- o 988-P131 revision C
- o 988-P133 revision D
- o 988-P136 revision A
- o 988-P138 revision A
- o 988-P139 revision A
- 988-P141 revision A
- o 988-P143 revision A
- Demolition Statement

I trust the enclosed information is satisfactory and that we have addressed the concerns you have raised, however should you require any further information or wish to discuss further, please contact myself or Alex Graham.

Yours sincerely

Nick Grant Senior Planner

Enc: As above