

**DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2009. For further information see

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

<b>Delegated Report</b> (MEMBERS BRIEFING)		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>18/11/2009</b>
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>28/10/09</b>
<b>Officer</b>		<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Katrina Christoforou		2009/4012/P, 4022/L		
<b>Application Address</b>		<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
33 Pond Street London NW3 2PN		See decision notice		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
PP: Replacement of the existing rear ground floor extension to single dwelling house by a new basement and ground floor rear extension and other external alterations.  LBC: Alterations in association with a new rear basement extension, replacement of the existing rear ground floor extension and the removal of the existing basement level conservatory plus internal alterations to single dwelling house.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant planning permission and listed building consent		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission & listed building consent		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	08	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. electronic	01		
Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice was erected on the 02/10/09 and 8 neighbours were individually consulted. One neighbour from adjoining number 31 objected to the proposals:  - Disturbance to the root system of the two protected trees through further basement digging. The presented arboricultural report being inadequate. - Lack of information about ground water and possible subsidence. - Not clear whether the parapet of the proposed extension would be of a similar height along the boundary. - Number 31 is represented incorrectly in the drawings.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	Hampstead CAAC- no objection.					

### **Site Description**

The property forms part of a pair with number 35 built in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century with later studio extension (number 35a) built for graphic designer Frederick Henrion with later rear extension by Richard Rogers. The buildings are grade II listed, within the Hampstead Conservation Area, are covered by an Article 4 Direction and are within the South End Archaeological Priority Area. The residential dwelling house comprises three storeys plus a basement and is located on the north side of the street opposite the Royal Free Hospital.

### **Relevant History**

9500185R2 & 9570030R2: Erection of a conservatory at rear of house. Granted 24/05/1996.

LW9802180R1 & PW9802181R1: Erection of basement level conservatory and ground floor extension at rear. Granted 17/07/1998.

2007/6183/P & 2007/6184/L: Alterations in association with the creation of a new rear basement extension to provide additional accommodation for the dwelling house. Withdrawn 14/03/2008.

Pre-application advice was given on the current scheme under the reference CA\2009\ENQ\01566.

### **Relevant policies**

Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD1- Quality of life

SD6- Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1- General design principles

B3- Alterations and extensions

B6- Listed buildings

B7- Conservation Areas

B8- Archaeological sites and monuments

N5- Biodiversity

N8- Ancient woodland and trees

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

## Assessment

1.1 The proposal is for works to the rear of the property including the demolition of the existing brick ground floor extension, the excavation of a basement below and then construction of a new glazed ground floor extension to the same dimensions as the existing. The existing basement level conservatory is to be removed and internal alterations are proposed at basement and ground floor level.

### External works

2.1 The rear of the building has been subject to various additions over time. There is a closet wing extension which appears to be quite modern (it is not clear if it is a rebuild of an earlier structure), a partial width brick-built ground floor extension, permitted in the 1990's and an infill conservatory extension at basement level, also permitted in the 90's. The proposals would see the conservatory removed and the ground floor extension replaced with an additional basement area below. The conservatory and ground floor extensions are modern structures and are of no value to the special interest of the listed building. Their removal is therefore considered to be acceptable. The conservatory opening would be bricked up to match the rest of the rear elevation and french doors would be inserted. This is considered to be in keeping with the original building but it is recommended that a sample of the bricks to be used be provided to ensure a seamless finish with the original fabric of the building.

2.2 There is an existing basement level store room under part of the ground floor extension (4.6m wide x 1.9m deep x 1.6m high) as well as basement habitable accommodation under the main house. This area would be extended under the area of the ground floor extension to 4.6m wide x 6.7m deep x 2.2m high. The basement would extend beyond the rear wall of the ground floor addition in depth to allow for 0.9m deep frosted glass rooflights being added, flush with the garden level, to provide additional light to the basement area. The side of the extension would include sliding/folding glazed doors that would open out onto the new patio area created by the removal of the existing conservatory. The basement excavations would be almost entirely outside the envelope of the original building and therefore would have a limited impact on the fabric of the building. The new floor area would be read as external to the main building and would be accessed through a "pinch point" where the proposed laundry area is. The actual volume of excavation is relatively fairly minor and would be in the raised garden area rather than beneath the main house. The level of the new basement room would be only a few centimetres deeper than the original basement of the house. It is not therefore considered that there would be a significant affect on the hydrology of the site or the surrounding area.

2.3 At ground floor level the existing extension would be replaced by a much more modern and glazed structure of the same footprint and height. Even in its current guise as a more traditionally detailed structure (constructed from brick with timber doors), it is still clearly seen as modern by virtue of its form, massing and positioning on the main building (the slim closet wing is a much more historically accurate extension to the building). Consequently there is no objection in principle to its replacement with a more contemporary design. New folding double doors would be inserted into the rear elevation providing access to the garden.

2.4 More detailed drawings have been submitted by the architect showing the detailing of the extension. Brick will be partly used on this extension which provides a link and connection with the parent building. A more contemporary approach has been introduced with the use of glazing and copper mesh. Such an approach creates a better link between the garden and the house and the copper would have a similar reddish tone to the red brick of the main house and surrounding area. The larger scale section submitted show that the detailing would be very clean and create a high quality finish. Structural support would be

provided by hollow steel sections would have a minimal impact to the lightweight appearance of the glazing.

2.5 Overall it is considered that the proposed works would be proportional and complementary to the host property, thereby it is considered that the special interest of the listed building would be unharmed and the overall character and appearance of the listed building and the conservation area would be preserved, in line with policies B1, B3, B6 and B7 of the UDP.

#### Internal works

3.1 At basement level there have been numerous alterations in the past and as such there is little historic fabric surviving. Only small sections of wall are proposed to be removed and a new shower room added but this is not considered to harm the perception of what the original floor plan would have been.

3.2 At ground floor level it was originally proposed to remove the spine wall between the front and rear room. It is not clear whether this is original fabric or whether it is a modern replacement wall as it appears slightly out of position. Certainly the detailing is correct and the panelling and cornice matches that found on the ground floor. It is considered to contribute to the special interest of the listed building by virtue of its detailing and the role it plays in separating the front and back rooms (this floor would not have had a through-room). It is now proposed to insert a double jib-door in this wall which when closed would maintain the appearance and character of two separate rooms on this level and is therefore considered acceptable.

#### Other listed building issues

4.1 It is noted from the design and access statement that it is intended to clean the brickwork at the rear of property and it is possible that this could require an application for listed building consent depending on the method chosen (C.18 of PPG15). This is unlikely to be acceptable as the building forms a pair with its neighbour and the brickwork appears to be consistently weathered on both, therefore cleaning could unbalance this composition. An informative should be added to any permission explaining that any cleaning works to the façade do not form part of the current assessment.

#### Archaeology

As the site is within an archaeological priority area, English Heritage (GLAAS) were consulted on the application. GLAAS advised that they were satisfied that the extension would not impact upon the archaeological heritage.

#### Amenity

5.1 The proposed replacement ground floor extension would be virtually identical to the existing in terms of dimensions and the basement level would be contained beneath the ground floor addition. The works would not therefore have any affect on the on neighbouring residents in terms of daylight/sunlight. The extension would be set away from the main rear elevation of the terrace and would not therefore result in light pollution to the neighbouring residential windows. The doors and windows added to the side and rear of the extension would not directly overlook any neighbouring windows or gardens. The proposals are therefore considered to be in line with policy SD6.

### Trees and landscaping

6.1 The Plum and Laurel in the neighbouring property (No 31) are the subject of a TPO (Ref: C 809 2008).

6.2 The arboricultural impact statement shows that there will be a limited incursion by the basement excavations into the root protection zones of both trees; however the degree of incursion is not considered to be problematic. The laying of the patio could potentially affect the Plum. It is unclear the degree to which this tree overhangs the property and whether some reduction will be required on the side of No 33. Any planning permission should be conditional on the submission and approval of a method statement for the protection of these trees during the construction period including details of the construction of the patio to limit damage to the Plum.

6.3 A green roof has been proposed for the extension and a green wall to the lower ground wall patio area. These additions are welcomed in line with policy N5 on enhancing biodiversity. Details of these should be provided as part of the submission of hard and soft landscape details.

6.4 The proposals are considered to be compliant with policies N5 and N8.

### **Recommendation:**

Grant planning permission and listed building consent.