

HERITAGE AND PLANNING
POLICY STATEMENT

**19 EAST HEATH ROAD,
HAMPSTEAD**

Prepared For

MR. PETER REGIS

Job No. SA/4091



Bell Cornwell

CHARTERED TOWN PLANNERS

Oakview House, Station Road,
Hook, Hampshire RG27 9TP

T 01256 766673

F 01256 768490

E bcp@bell-cornwell.co.uk

www.bell-cornwell.co.uk

Contents

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| | The Proposal..... | 1 |
| | The Comparison with the Approved Scheme..... | 2 |
| 2 | Planning Policy Assessment | 3 |
| 3 | Conclusions | 5 |

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this statement is to complement the Design and Access Statement by European Urban Architecture, the Tree Appraisal and Protection Report by ACS, the Hydrogeological Review by GCG, the Archaeological Brief Method Statement by the Museum of London, the RYB: Konault Report on the Code for Sustainable Homes, Energy Strategy and Drainage Strategy respectively, together with the Structural Method Statement by Price & Myers. This Planning Policy Statement draws on the findings of those reports and the evidence of the drawings submitted in comparison with the scheme as currently approved to assess the compliance of the scheme with the prevailing development plan policies.
- 1.2 The London Plan Review deals with strategic scale planning and its principles are embraced within the extant Unitary Development Plan Review (UDPR) of 2006 and the accompanying Camden Planning Guide. Specific reference to the London Plan Review is not therefore necessary.

The Proposal

- 1.3 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing garages on site and the erection of a single dwelling on ground and basement floor levels.
- 1.4 There are extant consents for this, which thereby have significant material weight, such that the principle planning matter is the difference between what has been approved and could be built, compared to what is now approved.
- 1.5 The extant approval thereby establishes as acceptable:-
- i) the principle of demolition;
 - ii) the principle of new development;
 - iii) creation of a single family dwelling with associated landscaping and parking;
 - iv) the layout and distribution of accommodation in this location at ground and basement levels;

- v) the height of the new house above ground;
- vi) the visual bulk of the house above ground;
- vii) the design aesthetic of both the building and the landscaping;
- viii) the amount and distribution of on-site parking.

The Comparison with the Approved Scheme

- 1.6 The proposal continues to comply with all eight of the above planning considerations which have been approved and established for this site.
- 1.7 The opportunity has been taken to enhance the detailed visual appearance, whilst remaining at the same height and scale above ground level, as described in the D&AS.
- 1.8 The further opportunity has been taken to enhance the environmental sustainability of the scheme with the introduction of an enhanced SUDS system and an improved renewable energy system, which employs geothermal heating.
- 1.9 The approved basement area has been extended beneath the parking courtyard for accommodating plant geothermal heating equipment and ancillary residential leisure space.
- 1.10 All other elements repeat those of the extant approval and are not therefore at issue.

2 PLANNING POLICY ASSESSMENT

- 2.1 The planning policy issues are thereby limited to those matters which differ from the extant approval, as set out in paragraphs 1.7- 1.9 above, namely the improved environmental and aesthetic design features and the extension of the basement beneath the parking courtyard.
- 2.2 Applying that assessment principle to the new scheme, it complies with Policy SDI enhancing the "quality of life", with a more sustainable development.
- 2.3 The density of development is unchanged and there is no greater visual impact on the surrounding area, in compliance with Policy SD4.
- 2.4 The amenity of occupiers and neighbours is not changed, in compliance with Policy SD6.
- 2.5 There is no increased noise, light or vibration pollution, in compliance with Policy SD7.
- 2.6 There is no greater impact from plant or machinery, in compliance with Policy SD8.
- 2.7 Waste and energy resources are better managed in this proposal, in compliance with Policy SD9.
- 2.8 There continues to be a net increase of housing, in compliance with Policy H1.
- 2.9 This continues to comply with Part M, in accord with Policy H7.
- 2.10 The general design principles are retained, as is the layout. The impacts on the conservation area and archaeology are unchanged. The scheme thereby complies with Policies B1, B2, B7 and B8.
- 2.11 Biodiversity opportunities taken by the approved scheme are retained, in compliance with Policy N5. Trees continue to be safeguarded in accord with Policy N8.

- 2.12 There is no change in transport considerations and the scheme continues to comply with the T Policies of Section 5.
- 2.13 The proposals thereby comply also with Camden Planning Guide 2006.
- 2.14 On that basis the scheme is entirely in accord with the "development plan" and benefits thereby from the positive presumption of Section 38(6).
- 2.15 There are no other material considerations which out weigh that positive presumption.

6th May 2008

3 CONCLUSIONS

- 3.1 The scheme is very little different from the approved scheme. The increased space is entirely out of sight. Stability of surrounding buildings is demonstrably safeguarded still.
- 3.2 The appearance is improved and environmental sustainability significantly enhanced.
- 3.3 The prevailing development plan policies are satisfied.
- 3.4 On that basis the proposals should be approved.



PRICE & MYERS

Consulting Engineers

30 Newman Street
London W1T 1LT
T 020 7631 5128
F 020 7462 1390
E mail@pricemyers.com
www.pricemyers.com

James Mills
Paul Whitley Architects
4th Floor
Sophia House
32-35 Featherstone Street
London EC1Y 8QX

17th August 2009

Ref: 14061

Dear James,

19 East heath Road, NW3

You have asked me to comment on the structural implications of deepening the basement of the proposed scheme for 19 East Heath Road by about 1.3m over what was shown in the Planning Report which was submitted in May 2008. I do not anticipate the proposed deepening having any significant implications on the general nature of the structure. Temporary works requirements are likely to be more costly and involved, although following a similar sequence to that outlined in our original report.

Yours sincerely,
for Price & Myers



Paul batty
pbatty@pricemyers.com

 STRUCTURES  GEOMETRICS  SUSTAINABILITY

Steve Wickham MA MRICE MRIBuild Jonathan Darnell BSc MRIBuild David Derby BSc AGGANCE PRIBuild Philip Hudson BSc MCE MRIBuild Ian Frewitt MEng MSc MRIBuild Paul Toplis MA PRIBuild John Helyer OBE MCE MRIBuild
Andy Toohay MEng MRIBuild Paul Batty BSc MCE MRIBuild Steve Machin BSc MRIBuild Tim Lucas MEng Associates: Harry Stocks BEng MRIBuild Alistair Burrows BEng Fiona Cobb MEng MRIBuild
Lois Plaistow MEng MRIBuild Michael Wilford BEng MRIBuild David Lockett MEng MRIBuild Paul Longdin BEng MRIBuild Jonathan McIverna BEng MRIBuild Helen Rogers MEng Mark Tyler MA MEng MRIBuild
Peter Dash BEng MRIBuild Tim Wainwright BEng MRIBuild Mark Mawby BEng MRIBuild Tim Marcot BEng MRIBuild Andrew Tweedie BEng MSc MRIBuild Head of Sustainability: Hadi Mozaffari BSc MRIBuild
Consultants: Sam Price MA FRING FICE FRIBuild HovFRISA Robert Myers BSc DIC MCE HovFRISA

LONDON NOTTINGHAM OXFORD

Price & Myers LLP is a Limited Liability Partnership registered in England and Wales No. OC300869
Registered Office 30 Newman Street London W1T 1LT