

<b>Address:</b>	<b>14A Redington Road London NW3 7RG</b>	
<b>Application Number:</b>	2006/4977/P	<b>Officer: Bethany Arbery</b>
<b>Ward:</b>	Frognaal & Fitzjohns	
<b>Date Received:</b>	<b>01/11/2006</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b> Erection of a 3-storey and basement detached dwellinghouse following demolition of existing detached 2-storey dwellinghouse.		
<b>Drawing Numbers:</b>		
951.01.00A; 951.01.01X; 951.01.02X; 951_01.03(_); 951.01.04X; 951.01.07X; 951.01.08B; 951.01.09A; 951.01.10A; 951.01.11A; 951.01.12A; 951.01.13A; 951.01.14A; 951.02.10X; 951.02.11B; 951.02.12X; 951.03.01X; 951.03.02X; 951.03.03X; 951.03.04X; 951.03.05X; 951.03.06X; 951.03.10A; 951.03.11A; 951.03.12A; 951.03.13A; 951.03.14A; 951.03.15A; 951.06.16A; 951.03.17A; 951.03.18A; 951.03.19X; 951.03.20A; 951.03.21A; 951.03.22X; 951.03.23X; 951.03.24A; 951.03.25A; 951.03.26X; 951.03.27X; 951_04.01(_); 951_04.02(_); 951.05.50X; 951.05.51X; 951.05.52X; 951.05.53X; 951.05.54X; 951.05.55X; 951.05.56X; 951.05.57X; 951.05.98X; 951.05.59X; 951.05.60X; 951.05.61X; 951.05.62X; 951.05.63X; 951.05.64X; 951.05.65X; Lifetimes Homes Statement (Rev 00) by Webb Architects Limited dated 03.11.06; Planning Design Statement (Rev 04) by Webb Architects Limited dated 31.10.06; Arboricultural Constraints Report by The Tree Man dated 18.10.05; and Sustainability Statement by Webb Architects Limited.		
<b>RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant conditional permission.</b>		
<b>Related Application</b>	<b>Conservation Area Consent</b>	
<b>Date of Application:</b>	<b>01/11/2006</b>	
<b>Application Number:</b>	2006/4978/C	
<b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of existing detached 2-storey dwellinghouse.		
<b>Drawing Numbers:</b>		
951.01.00A; 951.01.01X; 951.01.02X; 951_01.03(_); 951.01.04X; 951.01.07X; 951.01.08B; 951.01.09A; 951.01.10A; 951.01.11A; 951.01.12A; 951.01.13A; 951.01.14A; 951.02.10X; 951.02.11B; 951.02.12X; 951.03.01X; 951.03.02X; 951.03.03X; 951.03.04X; 951.03.05X; 951.03.06X; 951.03.10A; 951.03.11A; 951.03.12A; 951.03.13A; 951.03.14A; 951.03.15A; 951.06.16A; 951.03.17A; 951.03.18A; 951.03.19X; 951.03.20A; 951.03.21A; 951.03.22X; 951.03.23X; 951.03.24A; 951.03.25A; 951.03.26X; 951.03.27X; 951_04.01(_); 951_04.02(_); 951.05.50X; 951.05.51X; 951.05.52X; 951.05.53X; 951.05.54X; 951.05.55X; 951.05.56X; 951.05.57X; 951.05.98X; 951.05.59X; 951.05.60X; 951.05.61X; 951.05.62X; 951.05.63X; 951.05.64X; 951.05.65X; Lifetimes Homes Statement (Rev 00) by Webb Architects Limited dated 03.11.06; Planning Design Statement (Rev 04) by Webb Architects Limited dated 31.10.06; Arboricultural Constraints Report by The Tree Man dated 18.10.05; and Sustainability Statement by Webb Architects Limited.		

<b>RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant conditional conservation area consent</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b> Mrs J. Sokel 14 Redington Road London NW3 7RG	<b>Agent:</b> Webb Architects Ltd 115 Clifford Gardens Kensal Rise LONDON NW10 5JG

## ANALYSIS INFORMATION

<b>Land Use Details:</b>		
	Use Class	Floorspace
Existing	1 x Single-Family Dwellinghouse (Class C3)	171.8m <sup>2</sup>
Proposed	1 x Single-Family Dwellinghouse (Class C3)	474.0m <sup>2</sup>

<b>Residential Use Details:</b>										
	Residential Type	No. of Habitable Rooms per Unit								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+
Existing	House						1			
Proposed	House								1	

<b>Parking Details:</b>		
	Parking Spaces (General)	Parking Spaces (Disabled)
Existing	1	0
Proposed	1	0

## OFFICERS' REPORT

**Reason for Referral to Committee: Clause 3 (v), which calls for all development involving total or substantial demolition of any building in a conservation area to be referred to committee.**

### 1. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 1.1 The application site is located on the north-east side of Redington Road close to its junction with Chesterfield Gardens. The existing property is a two-storey detached house, with single-storey garage, built in 1959 in a post-war contemporary style. The house has painted brickwork and a flat roof set behind a raised parapet. The building is positioned on a sunken site with less than 4.0m of the built structure above pavement level. It is set back 7.5m from the pavement and is heavily screened by vegetation. The building is not listed, but is located within the Redington/Froggnal Conservation Area. The property is not identified in the Conservation Area Statement as a building that makes a positive contribution to the area.

- 1.2 East of the site is no.14 Redington Road; a two-storey dwellinghouse dating from the 1960s. There are outstanding permissions both for substantial remodelling of the existing house and demolition and redevelopment of the site to provide a two-storey plus attic and basement dwellinghouse. West of the site is n. 16 Redington Road; a Grade II listed building designed by Arthur H Mackmurdo in 1889. Wings and a separate studio were added in 1927 by Maxwell Ayrton. No. 16 has a plain six bay front with tall sash windows below a mansard roof. The building is set to the rear of the plot on higher ground, some 19m behind the existing front building line of no. 14A Redington Road. The site is enclosed by a high brick wall and fence.
- 1.3 This part of the conservation area is characterised by predominantly large detached and semi-detached dwellings set within generous gardens, providing good examples of high quality Victorian and Edwardian architecture. These are interspersed with contemporary developments which themselves provide excellent examples of innovative and modern architecture. The area is also noted for its mature trees and dense vegetation forming avenues and gardens between houses.

## **2. THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 Conservation area consent is sought to demolish the existing two-storey dwellinghouse. Planning permission is sought to erect a building comprising basement, ground, first and part second floor level. The proposed building is modern in style, and utilises a palette of materials which include brick, render, timber and glazing. Sustainable construction techniques and energy efficiency have also strongly influenced the design. The property is to incorporate green roofs and other sustainability measures. The building is to be used as a 4-bedroom single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3). There is an integral garage to the north-west of the site.

## **3. RELEVANT HISTORY**

### **3.1 14A Redington Road**

#### **2005/4500/P & 2005/4502/C**

Conservation area consent and planning permission were refused on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2006 for demolition of existing detached 2-storey dwellinghouse and the erection of a 2-storey plus attic and basement detached dwellinghouse with garage. An appeal was lodged and was dismissed on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2006.

#### **2006/2323/P & 2006/2326/C**

Applications for conservation area consent and planning permission were submitted on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2006 for demolition of the existing detached 2-storey dwellinghouse and the erection of a 2-storey plus attic and basement detached dwellinghouse with garage. The applications were withdrawn on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2006 following dismissal of the above appeal.

### **3.2 14 Redington Road**

#### **2005/0367/P & 2005/0368/C**

Planning Permission and conservation area consent were granted on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2005 for the substantial remodelling of existing dwellinghouse, involving erection of extensions to front, rear and side at lower ground, ground and first floor level plus new raised roof with dormer windows to the front, side and rear roofslopes.

#### **2006/1565/P & 2006/1567/C**

Planning permission and conservation area consent were granted on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2006 for the erection of a two-storey plus attic and basement dwellinghouse, following demolition of the existing building.

#### **4. CONSULTATIONS**

##### **4.1 Statutory Consultees**

###### **English Heritage**

No comment. These applications should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

###### **English Heritage (archaeology)**

Although the site lies within an archaeological priority area, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant impact upon the archaeological heritage. Consequently, it is considered unnecessary in this instance to attach an archaeological condition to the permission (if granted).

##### **4.2 Amenity Groups**

###### **Redington/Frognaal CAAC**

Despite the wealth of supporting materials supplied we find it difficult to appreciate how this house would appear if built. The elevational drawings are inadequate and the perspective incomprehensible.

###### **Heath and Hampstead Society**

No reply to date.

##### **4.3 Adjoining Occupiers**

###### **Original**

<i>Number of Letters Sent</i>	44
<i>Number of responses Received</i>	2
<i>Number in Support</i>	0
<i>Number of Objections</i>	2

The occupiers of Flat 1, 12 Redington Road and 16 Redington Road have raised objection to the proposal on the following grounds:

###### **Amenity Issues**

- Loss of light to 12 Redington Road;
- Loss of privacy to 12 Redington Road;

###### **Design Issues**

- The height and mass of the building dwarfs the listed building at no. 16 and the studio which is set within its grounds;
- This is a critical point in the road and the development will adversely affect the setting of the listed building at no. 16;

###### **Other Issues**

- Loss of trees and vegetation; and
- Noise, dirt and disruption during construction.

#### 4.4 **Thames Water**

Have requested that the applicant incorporate within their proposal protection to the property by, for example, non-return valve or other suitable device to avoid the risk of backflow at a later date, on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions. With regard to sewerage and water infrastructure they have no objection to the application.

### 5. **POLICIES**

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. However, it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

#### 5.1 **Camden Unitary Development Plan (2006)**

S1/S2 Sustainable development  
SD1 Quality of life  
SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours  
SD7 Light, noise and vibration pollution  
SD9 Resources and energy  
H1 New housing  
H3 Protection of existing housing  
H7 Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing  
B1 General design principles  
B6 Listed buildings  
B7 Conservation areas  
B8 Archaeological sites and monuments  
B9 Views  
N8 Ancient woodland and trees  
T3 Pedestrians and cycling  
T9 Impact of parking

#### 5.2 **Camden Planning Guidance (2006)**

#### 5.3 **Redington/Frogna Conservation Area Statement**

### 6. **ASSESSMENT**

6.1 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

#### 6.2 **Land Use**

The existing building is used as a single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3). The proposal is to demolish this and erect a new building which is also to be used as a single-family dwellinghouse. The proposal will not result in the net loss of any residential units (Class C3) and thus complies with Policy H3 of the Unitary Development Plan. The proposal will result in an increase of 302.2m<sup>2</sup> (171.8m<sup>2</sup> to 474m<sup>2</sup>) residential floorspace on the site. This is supported by Policy H1 of the Unitary Development Plan, which states that planning permission will be granted for development that increases the amount of floorspace in residential use.

#### 6.3 **Design and Conservation**

The current application follows refusal of planning permission and the dismissal at appeal of a proposal which sought to erect a traditionally designed four-storey building in the Queen

Anne Style. The appeal was dismissed by the Inspector on the grounds of the building's uninspired design and the adverse impact of the mass, height and dominant roof on the street scene and the setting of the adjacent listed building.

The principle of demolition of the existing two-storey building was not contested by the Council or the Inspector at the appeal. It was considered that the existing building was not of any particular architectural merit or historical interest and did not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. There has been no change in circumstance or policy since the appeal and therefore it is considered that the proposed demolition of the existing building continues to be acceptable in design and conservation area terms.

The conservation area statement describes Redington Road as having no consistent architectural style, but that red brickwork, clay tiles, dormer and sash windows are common elements to the Arts & Crafts, Queen Anne, Edwardian and Neo-Georgian houses alike. These traditional buildings are interspersed with contemporary designs, such as those at nos. 6, 27A, 87½ and 50 Redington Road. The appeal scheme was a pastiche development similar to that approved at no. 14 Redington Road in 2006. The Inspector described the appeal scheme as *'uninspired and banal, a house of a type which could be found in any expensive suburb anywhere in the country'*. In dismissing the appeal the Inspector, having given consideration to the character and appearance of the conservation area, offered advice on the style of building which she considered might be more appropriate were the site to be redeveloped.

*'The quality of this conservation area is such that any new interventions should contribute to that architectural distinctiveness and heritage. It seems to me that this part of the conservation area is undergoing a period of critical change with a number of permission having been granted for the demolition and redevelopment of existing dwellings or infill development. Some of the new development is traditional in design and some is strikingly modern. I feel that there is a danger that the history of architectural innovation in the area would be lost if too many buildings were permitted which sought merely to replicate the designs and ideas of the past.'*

The appeal decision and the Inspector's report are material considerations that need to be given substantial weight in the assessment of the current application. The report suggests that any proposed redevelopment should take a contemporary form to reflect the architectural flair and innovation of the area.

In addition to this, the Inspector also emphasised that any redevelopment of this site whilst being innovative and modern should not harm the setting, or compete with, the adjacent listed building. The key to achieving this would be to reduce the height, bulk and mass of the development.

*'The appeal site lies as a critical point in the road ... any building on the appeal site is particularly important in the street scene, its side and front elevations being visible from the road...Any building on this site should acknowledge its critical location on the road, the architecture of No. 16 and the relationship between the two buildings.'*

The current proposal seeks to respond to the Inspector's comments and suggestions outlined above.

The replacement building is to be a streamlined contemporary design, which utilises large areas of minimally framed glazing in conjunction with brickwork and render. It comprises three-storeys above ground plus a basement, which will not be visible to the front of the property. Nearly half (211m<sup>2</sup>) of the total floorspace is set below ground level. The upper

two storeys are not full width, being stepped away from the north-western edge of the site. The overall height of the building above ground level is less than 9m at its highest point. The roof of (part) second floor is 1m less than that of the entire roof of appeal scheme. The roof of the first floor is more than 3.5m below the height of the refused scheme. The stepped design of the structure significantly minimises the overall bulk and massing of the building.

The site sits on a curve in the road so any building on the site has to be carefully considered to avoid it becoming more dominant in the street scene than its neighbours. The stepped effect will aid in this regard, as whilst the building will have quite a dramatic impact as you approach from the south-east its presence and dominance diminishes quickly as you turn the corner and the building reduces in height. The proposed building's impact is minimised just as the listed building at no. 16 Redington Road comes into view. Because it is set to the rear of the site the listed building is not visible until one passes the curve in the road even with the existing building in place at no. 14A. The visual presence of the proposed development as viewed from the north end of the street will be lessened by the more extensive use of glass on this façade, which gives it a lighter, less dominant appearance. Additionally, the proposed green roof will also soften its appearance. This will ensure that the grandeur and dominance of the listed building which is immediately visible when approached from this direction is not overshadowed.

The proposed modern design is far removed from the pastiche development previously considered by the Council and condemned by the Inspectorate. The proposal is considered to be an innovative and well-designed structure, which represents a good response to the suggestions and comments raised by the Inspector at the appeal. The proposal is for a high quality building that will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and not adversely impact on the setting of no. 16 Redington Road.

#### 6.4 **Amenity**

Policy SD6 states that planning permission should not be granted for development which would have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. In this respect it suggests that loss of light, outlook and privacy should be given consideration.

##### **Daylight, Sunlight and Sense of Enclosure**

Policy SD6 seeks to ensure that the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties is protected. It states that planning permission will not be granted for development that causes harm to the amenity of occupiers and neighbours in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight and outlook.

In the close urban environment where a proposal brings a wall or building close to an affected party, there may be two related, but different potential impacts; firstly there may be a loss of view of the sky, with the resultant reduction of daylight and in some cases sunlight; but secondly, the very presence of the solid structure in close proximity creates an uncomfortable enclosed feeling. Both issues require consideration in respect of this application.

The front building line of the proposed building is 2.0m closer to the public highway than existing. The road in this location is not unusually narrow and it is therefore considered that there remains sufficient distance between the application site and those properties on the south side of the street, nos. 29 and 31 Redington Road, to prevent any adverse impact on daylight and outlook.

No. 16 Redington Road is located north of the application site. No. 16 is set to the rear of its plot. The studio which is ancillary to the main house abuts the boundary to no. 14A Redington Road. The existing building at the application site abuts the boundary with no. 16 Redington Road; there is 6.5m and 14.0m (at its closest point) between the existing building

and the studio and main house respectively. The proposed building maintains the same distances from both the main house and the studio. The increased height and bulk to this building is generally confined to the south side of the site. It is considered that whilst the view from no. 16 will inevitably be altered by the proposal, given the distance there will be no adverse impact on the property in terms of daylight, sunlight and outlook.

There are no properties directly abutting the rear garden of the site and the nearest property in this northerly direction is Marlett Lodge, located some 65m away.

South-east of the site is no. 14 Redington Road. Both the existing and approved buildings (not including the garage) at no. 14 are 8.0m from the south-eastern elevation of the proposed development; this is 0.5m less than existing. The overall increase in height on this elevation is less than 5m. The existing building at no. 14 has no habitable windows in the side elevation facing the proposed development which could be affected by the development. The replacement house approved at no. 14 has a small bedroom window on the west elevation at first floor level and a small dormer window at roof level. Both these windows were conditioned to be obscure glazed. Given the position of these windows on the elevation, their distance from the proposed development, and that they are to be obscure glazed it is considered that there will be no adverse impact on them in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight or outlook.

### **Overlooking**

The BRE guidelines recommend distances of 18-35m between residential windows which directly face each other, to ensure privacy is maintained. Such distances are generally unachievable in a central urban location such as this. However, Policy SD6 of the UDP does seek to ensure that privacy is maintained and overlooking is not of an unacceptable level.

The proposed development includes windows on the north-west elevation of the proposed development; these are 18m from windows at the main house and 8.5m from the studio at no. 16 Redington Road. In terms of any impact on the main house this distance is considered to be sufficient to prevent overlooking. The impact on the studio is less of a concern given that it is only an ancillary building and not a separate dwelling, the extent of overlooking between the studio and the proposed development is only marginally worse than existing. However, the applicant has advised that all windows in the north-west elevation are all to be obscure glazed, this will allow improved privacy to no. 16 and also the occupiers of the proposed development. The south-east elevation of the proposed development has minimal glazing. All either serve non-habitable rooms and thus are obscure glazed, or are positioned at clerestory level. Given that there are no windows on the flank elevation of no. 14, and only obscure windows on the flank elevation of the approved scheme on the site it is not considered necessary to condition that only obscure glazing be used on the south-east elevation of the proposed development.

It should be noted that the appeal scheme, which was significantly higher and more bulky than the current proposal, was considered to be acceptable by the Council and the Inspector on amenity grounds.

### **6.5 Trees and Landscaping**

The proposal involves the removal of a number of trees in front of the existing building. These include a Bay Laurel, Leyland Cypress, Laburnum and Magnolia. Also to be removed is a group of Leyland Cypress close to the rear of the building on the boundary with no. 14. The applicant has submitted an Arboricultural Report as part of their application which provides justification for their removal. The Council's Arboricultural Officer has been asked to verify this report. He has advised that the removal of these trees is considered to be acceptable. None of them individually or for their group value make a significant contribution to the character of the area. Whilst there would be some loss to the tree canopy on the



frontage it would be possible to carry out a replacement scheme which provides a more significant contribution to the site and the character of the area in the longer term. The applicant has suggested the provision of silver birch, new flowering cherry and shrubs in the front garden and a copper beech hedge to the boundary with the road. It is recommended that a condition be attached requiring the submission of full details of hard and soft landscaping including the size and location of the species to be planted.

Other trees on or adjacent to the site to be retained can be provided with adequate protection during the construction process. The proposal will have a potential impact on a Sycamore with a TPO on the boundary with no. 16 with the creation of a paved surface on the frontage. However, the surface could be laid using methods available which would limit root damage. This aspect can be adequately dealt with by condition.

#### **6.6 Car and cycle parking**

The proposed development includes the provision of a garage (1 car parking space) integral to the main house. Given that there is an existing off-street car parking space it is not possible for us to insist that the new development be car free. The proposed provision of 1 off-street car parking space is in accordance with Policy T7 of the Unitary Development Plan.

The Council requires the provision of secure cycle parking. The adopted UDP requires the provision of 1 cycle storage space per residential dwelling. Given that there is no increase in the number of residential units on site it is not possible to require the provision of a cycle parking space. However, it is considered that there is adequate space on site to provide suitable storage for bicycles.

#### **6.7 Standard of Accommodation**

All new residential development should provide accommodation which is of an adequate standard; of particular importance is the provision of outdoor amenity space, adequate internal floorspace, privacy, refuse and recycling facilities. The proposed dwelling has an adequate amount of floorspace; rooms are appropriately proportioned and have good access to natural light and ventilation. The occupants will have the benefit of a generous rear garden. The proposed development includes obscure glazing where necessary to ensure that the privacy of the occupants is maintained. Adequate provision has been made for the storage of refuse and recycling on site.

#### **6.8 Lifetime Homes**

The proposal is for the erection of a new residential dwelling; therefore it is subject to Approved Document M of the Building Regulations and Policy H7 of the adopted Unitary Development which encourages all new housing developments to be accessible to all. All new housing is to be built to lifetime homes standards. The applicant has provided a detailed access statement in support of their application which indicates that all 16 lifetime homes standards are to be met.

Car parking is to be provided at the front of the house and there is level access from this to the entrance. The entrance is to be adequately lit and sheltered. Doors and hallways are appropriate widths and there is adequate circulation space for wheelchair turning. Provision has been made for sleeping (if required) and WC facilities at ground floor level. The accommodation has been designed so that a stair lift could be installed.

Compliance with these standards will add comfort and convenience to the home and support the changing needs of the occupants throughout the life cycle.

#### **6.9 Sustainability**

With all new major developments applicants are required to demonstrate the energy demand of their proposals and how 10% of the sites electricity and heating needs will be provided by

renewables. Unfortunately, this scheme does not fall within the category specified in the UDP and the Council can only encourage energy efficiency and use of renewable energy. Although not a requirement on the applicant the proposed development has been designed with sustainable building and energy efficiency in mind.

The concept of reduce, re-use and recycle has been applied to this project. It is intended to reuse salvaged material from the demolition for the new development. New materials are to be sourced locally and where possible timber from sustainable managed sources will be chosen. Bricks made using a process that uses recycled glass will be used if it has come to commercial production by the time that the building (if permission is granted) is constructed, these use less energy than clay bricks to manufacture.

A number of measures are to be taken to improve energy efficiency, for example: Heat loss is to be minimised by insulation in excess of required standards and the use of argon double glazing. Hot water is to be provided by solar panels (evacuated tubes) which are to be located on the roof of the building. The 9m<sup>2</sup> of panels proposed would achieve a 10% carbon reduction.

A lime render is to be applied rather than a hard cement based render this allows the walls to breathe out water which penetrates them. The manufacturing of this product uses less energy and it reabsorbs carbon dioxide as it sets. They are made from recyclable material, cost less to transport and are also more durable than other products. The proposed green roofs will increase insulation, reduce overheating and reduce the extent of rainwater to be drained away. A rainwater storage system is planned and the water is to be used for landscape irrigation and the flushing of WCs. The applicant is also looking at the use of greywater for similar purposes.

The proposed development provides is an excellent example of sustainable development that the Unitary Development Plan seeks to encourage.

## **7. CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 The proposal is in accordance with adopted Council policy and supplementary planning guidance and it is therefore recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions.

## **8. LEGAL COMMENTS**

- 8.1 Members are referred to the note from the Legal Division at the start of the Agenda.

### **Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613***