

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	13/06/2011
(Members Briefing)		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	19/05/2011
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Elizabeth Beaumont			2011/1047/P 2011/1048/L	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
9 The Grove London N6 6JU			Please refer to decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
<p>Planning permission – Excavation of extension to existing basement with terrace and balustrade above, installation of dormer window, 1 x rooflight and 3 x solar panels on the rear roofslope, replacement of windows, installation of balcony to raised ground floor elevation at ground floor level and balustrade around terrace at first floor level to existing dwelling house (Class C3).</p> <p>Listed building consent - Internal and external alterations including excavation of extension to existing basement with terrace and balustrade above, installation of dormer window, 1 x rooflight and 3 x solar panels on the rear roofslope, replacement of windows, installation of balcony to raised ground floor elevation at ground floor level and balustrade around terrace at first floor level and internal reconfiguration and replacement of staircase to existing dwelling house (Class C3).</p>				
Recommendation(s):		Grant planning permission Grant listed building consent		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission Listed Building Consent		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	03	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
Summary of consultation responses:	Site notice erected on the 21/04/2011 allowing comment until the 12/05/2011 and press notice erected in the Ham&High on the 28/04/2011 allowing comment until the 19/05/2011. 1 x Letter of objection from no.2 Fitzroy Park – Objects for the following reasons; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I only have a partial objection to this application. I believe the additional excavation to the basement is unnecessary and contrary to Camden basement policy. (Please refer to 4-4.47) 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>English Heritage – This application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of our specialist conservation advice.</p> <p>English Heritage (GLAAS) - The present proposals are not considered to have an affect on any significant archaeological remains. Any requirement for an assessment of the archaeological interest of this site in respect to the current application could be waived.</p> <p>Highgate Society - no concerns in principle about the proposals to create a basement terrace and ancillary accommodation, which is modest in scale, or about those to carry out internal works, including a repositioning of the staircase, which we think would be an improvement on the relatively recently installed structure which is there at present. Our only reservation is that, although the applicants will be installing new double glazed units on the rear façade of the original building, as well as new glazed units to the basement terrace, there is insufficient detail available of their proposed design to enable their impact on this very fine Listed building to be assessed adequately. We therefore suggest either that finalised drawings of what is proposed should be available before a decision is made, or that the details of the new rear window units should be a reserved matter in any consent, to be submitted for detailed approval before work commences. (Please refer to 2.7 & 2.8)</p> <p>Highgate CAAC –no adverse comments to make on the proposals in principle, including the proposed extension into the garden at basement level. However, it is concerned that the details of some internal features such as the replacement staircase and the treatment of external features such as the replacement doors and windows on the garden side have not been shown in sufficient detail to demonstrate that they are appropriate for this listed building. We would suggest that further details should be submitted before the application is considered. (Please refer to 2.7 & 2.8)</p>					

Site Description

The site is located on the west side of The Grove south of the junction with Fitzroy Park. The site is located within an Archaeological Priority Area, the garden falls within designated private open space and the site is in an area of underground development constraints (slope stability and surface water). The site comprises a Grade II listed house built in 1832 within the Highgate Village Conservation Area. The house has been variously altered in the past including, being expanded considerably in 1870, two storeys removed (probably due to fire in mid20th Century), subdivided in 1950's. More recently 2 storeys were reinstated in 2001. As a result little of historic fabric remains. Many features such as plaster, stair and joinery have been renewed and the house has lost its historic character internal. There is a TPO tree located within the front garden.

Relevant History

None relevant

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategies

- CS1 (Distribution of growth),
- CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development),
- CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards)
- CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

- DP24 (Securing high quality design),
- DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage),
- DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours),
- DP27 (Basements and lightwells)

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

CPG 1 Design 2011 & CPG 4 Basements 2011

Highgate Village Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 Planning permission and listed building consent are sought for the following;

External alterations

- Erection of dormer window measuring approx. 1.2m wide, 1.1m high and 0.8m deep in the lower rear roofslope.
- Installation of 3 x solar panels and 1 x rooflight on higher rear roofslope
- Single storey extension to existing basement in the place of the raised terrace and creation of terrace on roof of extension. The basement extension would extend 7.5 beyond the rear wall of the main property, 5m in width and will be below the existing terrace and will have an area of approx. 32sqm with the basement floor slab level approx. 3m below current ground level.
- Excavation adjacent to the basement to provide sunken terrace with lawn sloping to garden level.
- Installation of balcony on rear elevation at ground floor level

Internal alterations

- Replacing the existing staircase
- New floors
- Replacement of front elevation windows
- Minor internal reconfiguration
- Refitting of bathrooms

2. Design

External alterations

- 2.1 There is an existing basement level under the footprint of the host building with external manifestations in the form of a front and rear lightwell. The rear lightwell projects across the width of the rear elevation of the host building. There are stairs from the lightwell to the raised terrace with steps down to the garden level and lawn. It is proposed to excavate this mound of earth and raised terrace to extend the basement and to create direct access from the basement to the garden with the creation of a sunken terrace. The garden level would then slope up to match the existing level. The roof of the extension would form a terrace with metal railings.
- 2.2 The extension given its position below ground level is considered to be subordinate to the host building in terms of scale and bulk. The rear elevation of the extension would be set below the garden level with the garden landscaped around the extension. The proposal would allow the retention of a large garden and would result in an increase the extent of soft landscaping. The side elevation of the extension would be exposed with a fully glazed

door and large windows. It is considered that the extension would not harm the special interest of the listed building or the character and appearance of the host building.

- 2.3 The proposed metal railing around the terrace on the roof of the extension in the place of the existing terrace is considered an acceptable addition which replicates the design of existing balustrades on the host building.
- 2.4 A balcony with black metal railings on the rear elevation at ground floor level would be introduced to the living room window. It is also proposed to install railings around the existing terrace at first floor level. The railings would match existing balcony on the host building. These additions are considered acceptable and would not harm the special character of the listed building.
- 2.5 There are two existing dormer windows located on the rear roof slope. The proposed dormer would be positioned in-between these dormers in the centre of the roof. The addition would replicate the position, scale and detailed design of the existing dormers. It is considered that the addition would relate well to the host building and would not have a detrimental impact on the special character of the listed building or the character and appearance of the wider conservation area.
- 2.6 It is proposed to introduce three solar panels and an additional rooflight on the upper roof slope above the dormer windows. The panels would only project 0.2m from the roofslope and the rooflight is conservation style. Given the height of the building the visibility of these additions would be limited. It is therefore considered that these additions would not harm the special character of the listed building or the character and appearance of the wider conservation area.
- 2.7 The front elevation consist of a mixture of window types include 2 single-glazed original sash windows and 2 double glazed modern sash windows. The remaining windows are all modern single glazed. It is proposed to replace all modern windows to the front elevation with tripartite timber sash windows to match original but incorporating 'Slimlite' double glazed panels. All original windows will be retained. It is also proposed to carry out repair work to the front and rear elevations which would include, re-pointing the deteriorated area of brickwork and tint the modern brick of the top level of the house to match the original brickwork. It is considered that the slim-lite (double glazed) to the front and rear windows is acceptable as there will be a net improvement to the character and appearance of the façade due to the proposed improvements to the poor quality brickwork and existing poor quality double glazed units and single glazed modern replicas. The detailed design would be secured via condition.
- 2.8 The rear elevation of the building consists of a mixture of window types with single and double glazing. It is proposed to replace all modern windows with like-for-like slim double glazed units. It is also proposed to improve the rear façade in the same manner as proposed for the front elevation. It is therefore considered that the given the overall net improvements to the façade this proposal is acceptable. The detailed design would be secured via condition.

Internal alterations

- 2.9 The existing staircase was installed as part of the refurbishment in 2001 and is considered to be of no historic merit or little design quality. Moreover the existing stair landing cuts across the principal window which is considered inappropriate. The proposed stair would appear more elegant and reduce the impact on the external appearance by re-ordering the risers so the landings do not to cut across the windows as much. It is considered that the new stair would enhance the character of the interior and exterior of the listed building and is a welcomed improvement.
- 2.10 A thorough site investigation has determined that historic floorboards do exist within the building. These boards will be retained and located on the principal ground and first floors. This is common conservation practice which would preserve the historic fabric on the historically important floors.
- 2.11 At basement level new circulation space would be created including the repositioning of the staircase. It is considered that this floor is of least significance in terms of layout and has already been modified in the past. Therefore in this respect the works are not considered to unduly harm the significance of the property.
- 2.12 The double door opening proposed between the kitchen and dinner at ground floor level would be widened and increased in height. At present it is not square with the windows, as such the proposed realignment would improve the symmetry of the spaces. Investigation works to the wall show that no timber or structural members would be affected by the works. These proposals are considered acceptable
- 2.13 The proposed introduction of a door to the landing on the left of the building at first floor level would provide greater symmetry to the landing and is considered acceptable. The proposed single door opening would be installed between two large rooms. This proposal is considered acceptable and would not harm the layout or fabric of the building as historic evidence and site investigations show a door exists here in the past.
- 2.14 The minor works proposed to the upper floors of the building are considered acceptable and would not harm the layout of the building. These floors were rebuilt in 2001 and contain no historic fabric. The existing bathrooms are

of no historic interest therefore it is considered that the proposed refitting would not impact on the special interest of the property and is considered acceptable.

- 2.15 It is considered that the proposed alterations and extensions would not have a detrimental impact on the special interested of the listed building or the character and appearance of the wider conservation area.

3. Open Space/landscaping

- 3.1 Part of the garden is designated as private open space, known as 'Gardens of The Grove' partially wooded open space located to the rear of the properties along The Grove. The proposed extension is in connection with an existing residential use on site, therefore is considered to be an ancillary development. The basement extension is set below garden level and the overall scheme results in an increase in soft landscaping. In the context of the host building and the scale of the plot and given the extension is set below garden level it is considered that the addition would not detract from the openness of the open space in compliance with policy CS15.

- 3.2 The paved terrace will be reinstated on the roof of the basement extension and the garden will be landscaped to slope down from the existing garden level to basement level to form a sunken garden. This slope will be soft landscaped. The remainder of the garden will remain as lawn with planting around the edge. The proposed landscaping scheme is considered appropriate. There are five large trees in the garden comprises a Prunus, Pear Tree, Sycamore, Holmes Oak and Magnolia. The Magnolia and the Prunus are the closest trees to the proposed extension. An Arboricultural Report was not submitted with the application therefore a condition is recommended requiring the submission of a detailed method statement illustrating how the foundations of the extension and the proposed tree protection showing how the development would avoid damaging the roots and protect the tree is required prior to the commencement of development. A further condition is also recommended ensuring the retention of all existing trees on site.

4. Basement/structural issues

- 4.1 There is an existing basement level located under the footprint of the host building with front and rear lightwells. It is proposed to extend the basement level into the rear garden to create a gym. The rear elevation of the existing basement level is exposed with a lightwell positioned in-between the existing basement and the raised patio. The garden level is set below the patio area. A Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) was submitted during the course of the application in order to assess the potential impacts of the proposed extension and associated works. The report complies with the Camden Planning Guidance for Basements and Lightwells 4 and the 'Camden Geological, Hydrogeological and Hydrological Study'.

- 4.2 The BIA states that the groundwater table in the general site area lies at a depth significantly below the existing and proposed basement extension depth. There is no site specific information with regard to the depth of the water table however it is considered unlikely given the existing basement that the proposed extension would extend below the water table such that it would impede ground water flows. Furthermore, the retaining wall to the existing lightwell to the rear of the property was noted to contain weep holes and the floor of the lightwell contained a drain. The BIA states that no evidence of water flows or flooding was noted during the site reconnaissance, which might otherwise indicate the presence of groundwater at shallow levels. The basement extension will be located parallel to the anticipated groundwater flow direction in the site area therefore would not form any more of a barrier to potential groundwater flow than the existing basement.

- 4.3 The BIA illustrates that the site does not lie within the vicinity of any sensitive watercourses, wells or spring lines that could be adversely affected by the proposed development. There are no proposed surface covers or drainage changes that will adversely affect the hydrology or hydrogeology in the site area. The proposed development will not result in any increased flood risk and given the increase in soft landscaping in comparison to the existing situation the levels of runoff would be reduced.

- 4.4 The BIA states that as there are existing basements beneath adjoining properties it is considered that the proposed basement extension will not result in any differential foundation depths. Furthermore party walls are to be underpinned to resist any structural damage. A structural Engineers report was submitted as part of the application to specify the method of proposed construction for the basement extension. It is proposed to provide mass concrete underpinning to the boundary wall which would be supported by cross whaling to resist lateral earth pressures. The inner reinforced-concrete basement wall will be designed to resist lateral forces and the excavations adjacent to the boundary with no. 9B will be supported by underpinning.

- 4.5 It is considered that the Basement Impact Assessment and the Engineers Report illustrate that the proposed extension to the existing basement would not harm cause harm to the built and natural environment, including to the local water environment and ground conditions.

5. Amenity

- 5.1 There are existing dormers on the rear roof slope therefore the introduction of an additional dormer would not harm the amenity of any neighbouring occupiers in comparison to the existing situation.

- 5.2 The proposed balcony at ground floor level and the terrace on the roof of the basement extension would be at the same level as the existing terrace therefore would not detrimentally affect the amenity of any neighbouring occupiers compared to the existing situation. The terrace at first floor level is existing therefore the addition of a metal balustrade would not affect the amenity of any neighbouring occupiers or residents in comparison to the existing situation.
- 5.3 The proposed basement extension would be set below the boundary walls with the neighbouring properties. Sufficient information has been provided regarding the likely impact of the addition. It is therefore considered that the basement extension would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of any neighbouring occupiers or residents.
- 6. Other issues**
- 6.1 The proposed basement floor level is accessible separately from the main dwelling via the front lightwell. It is proposed that part of this level will form a space for one of the older children of the occupant. There is no proposal to block the internal access from the floors above. Furthermore planning permission and listed building consent would be required for any future proposed to subdivide the building and block access to the basement level.
- 7. Recommendation**
- 7.1 Grant planning permission and listed building consent.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 13th June 2011.

For further information see

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>