

**STATEMENT IN
SUPPORT OF
PLANNING
APPLICATION**

In respect of

**87 REDINGTON
ROAD, HAMPSTEAD,
LONDON NW3**

On behalf of

**JJ PORTFOLIO
LIMITED**

CgMs Ref: 7207

Date: August 2006

CONTENTS

PAGE(S)

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|----|
| 1.0 | INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| 2.0 | DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND SURROUNDINGS | 5 |
| 3.0 | ANALYSIS OF RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY | 6 |
| 4.0 | PLANNING POLICY ASSESSMENT | 8 |
| 5.0 | CONCLUSIONS | 12 |

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report has been prepared in support of a planning application for proposed development works to 87 Redington Road known as Hill House, in Hampstead, NW3. The development scheme has been prepared by Chassay and Last Architects and comprises the following elements:

- a. The demolition of the existing summer house and garage on the east boundary of the application site to the south west of the main existing dwelling;
- b. Its replacement through the development of an enlarged garage at sub basement level to allow direct access to vehicles via the existing driveway which leads to Redington Road;
- c. A dining room at ground floor level facing onto the main garden; and,
- d. An underground extension linking the enlarged garage into the main dwelling comprising predominantly a swimming pool and changing area.

1.2 The proposed development scheme is illustrated on Chassay & Last's drawing nos. RR/PB1/01, PB1/02, PB1/03, BP2/01, PB2/02 and PB2/03, which illustrate the proposed floor plans, elevations and sections.

1.3 The purpose of the report is to provide an assessment of the proposals against relevant planning policies and other material considerations including the site's context and its planning history. Together with Chassay and Last we had a positive pre-application meeting with Charles Thuaire, the Area Planning Officer, on 9th June 2006. The comments of Mr. Thuaire have been reflected in the planning application package as explained in this report.

1.4 The statement is set out as follows:

Section 2.0: Description of Site and Surroundings;

Section 3.0: Analysis of Relevant Planning History;

Section 4.0: Planning Policy Assessment

- 1.5 Our conclusions at Section 5.0 demonstrate that the proposed development works are wholly consistent with relevant planning policies and should therefore be supported by the Council.
- 1.6 The statement should be read in conjunction with the following reports:
- a. Chassay & Last's Design and Access Statement;
 - b. Geoff Bunyan's Arboricultural Assessment;
 - c. Price & Myers' Structural Engineering Report

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 87 Redington Road, known as Hill House, is an example of modernist 1930's architecture designed by Oliver Hill. The part 3 part 4 storey dwelling is sited to the north east of the application site behind 87.5 Redington Road which faces onto the street frontage. There is an existing summerhouse/garage in the grounds to the south west of the existing dwelling. The topography of the land slopes up towards the rear boundary. The property is within a wholly residential area comprising large detached dwellings within extensive plots.
- 2.2 Adjoining the immediate southern boundary of the application site is No. 87.5 Redington Road. This comprises a single storey dwelling with a pitched tiled roof. There is a significant difference in level between the application site and the ground floor level of No. 87.5 and then the road frontage.
- 2.3 Adjacent to the site's west boundary a contemporary two storey dwelling is under construction to the rear of no. 85, known as no. 85A.
- 2.4 To the east No 89 Redington Road comprises a large imposing three storey brick built building which has been converted into a number of flats. A two storey extension is currently under construction adjacent to the boundary with no. 87.5.
- 2.5 The application site falls within the Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area. The Council have prepared a Conservation Area Assessment relatively recently within which Hill House is not identified as a positive contributor.

3.0 ANALYSIS OF RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Application site

- 3.1 Planning permission was granted by the Council on 15th February 2001 for erection of a swimming pool and associated pool house at basement and ground floor levels at No. 87, as ancillary accommodation to the main house (LPA Ref: PW9902365/R1). The above ground element of the proposed extension was located in the north west corner of the site adjacent to the boundary with No. 85A. The approved drawings are submitted for illustrative purpose as part of the planning application. Chassay & Last have prepared a series of comparative drawings to show the relationship between the 2001 scheme and their proposed development scheme.
- 3.2 Although the Council's statutory register appears to be incomplete Mr. Thuaire has confirmed this was subject to a Section 106 agreement ensuring the use of the accommodation by persons occupying the dwelling and preventing its use as a separate residential unit.

No. 87.5 Redington Road

- 3.3 There is an extant planning permission for redevelopment of the single dwelling at no. 87.5 and erection of a two storey dwelling with ancillary accommodation including swimming pool, building and garage. The proposal also involves the removal of some trees. This permission expires in December 2006. CgMs have been instructed by the owner of No. 87.5 to submit a planning application to vary the time limit for starting the development.

No. 85A Redington Road

- 3.4 Planning permission was granted for erection of a 2 storey dwelling with associated landscaping of garden and new pools and patios at 85A Redington Road in October 2000. A variation of this permission to include additional basement accommodation was approved in November 2001, with the erection of a sun room and a roof terrace at 2nd floor level was approved in November 2004.

In February 2006, permission was granted for a lap swimming pool with rear projection on sundeck at second floor level.

No. 89 Redington Road

- 3.5 There is also extensive planning history pertaining to No 89. Of note is an appeal decision of 22nd February 2005 which allowed the erection of a ground floor side extension over a replacement lower ground floor garage. The Council originally refused the planning application by virtue of its design, bulk, height which were considered to be visually obtrusive and detrimental to both the character and the appearance of the property and the wider Conservation Area (LPA ref: 2004/1319/P). The Inspector concluded that the side of the new extension would be largely screened by the steeply rising ground and tree and bushes on the boundary of No.'s 87 and 87.5 and that a two storey extension would not harm the appearance of the main building. The construction of this extension is in progress.

4.0 PLANNING POLICY ASSESSMENT

Introduction

- 4.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Any development proposals at the site will therefore have to have regard to the adopted development plans which comprise the adopted Camden UDP (2006) and the London Plan (2004). Having regard to these planning policies, the site's context and relevant planning history, the key planning issues are assessed in the following paragraphs.

Acceptability of the Proposed Above Ground Extension

- 4.2 As illustrated by Chassay & Last's comparative study, the above floor element of the proposal is similar to the above ground part of the development scheme approved in February 2001. The proposed development will enhance the existing family dwellinghouse in terms of its qualitative environment and the quantitative level of floorspace. Enhancing residential accommodation suitable for families accords with national and local policies and maintains the contribution of the site to the Borough's housing supply. The proposal would be mainly underground, therefore its impact on the surroundings would be minimal and maintain the overall density and plot ratio of the site.
- 4.3 Due to the proposed siting of the extension adjacent to the only potential amenity impact is created by the proposed relationship of the extension and the ongoing development at No. 85A. The approved plans for this development confirm there are no habitable room windows which overlook the application site. Although high level windows at No. 85a face onto the site, these do not provide principal daylight/sunlight to the respective rooms. Notwithstanding this Chassay & Last's scheme has ensured the height of the extension will fall below the ongoing development at no. 85A as suggested by Mr. Thuaire at the pre-application meeting.

- 4.4 As explained in detail in Chassay & Last's Design and Access Statement the proposed design is modernist to reflect the emerging international style inherent in Hill House. No trees will be affected by the above ground element.

Acceptability of Below Ground Element

- 4.5 Turning to the below ground development, UDP Policy B3(B) states the Council will not grant consent for excavation to create new basements which would cause harm to the appearance and setting of a building or the established character of the surrounding area. It is considered the basement would have no material effect on the integrity of the building or upon the character of the area as it will be entirely sunken and the garden will be largely restored to its existing condition. There are examples of development approved by the Council in the Frognal/Redington area which the Council considered would not have an adverse impact upon the character of parent buildings and the Conservation Area as a whole. The key material planning considerations affecting the basement are the structural acceptability of the proposal and the impact on trees, which are assessed in turn in the following paragraphs.
- 4.6 Price & Myers' Structural Engineering Report has been commissioned to examine the structural impact of the proposals. Their report recommends a series of design proposals which will ensure the successful integration of the proposed basement without causing any structural harm.
- 4.7 An earlier appeal decision for an extension at the site was refused due to the effect on the roots of trees, even though it would not have involved removal of trees. In response our client commissioned an assessment of trees within the curtilage of the application site. Together with Price & Myer's report, Geoffrey Bunyan Associates (GBA) Tree Assessment was used to inform the extent of the basement. The key observations of the tree assessment report are:
- a) The Silver Birch is of relatively poor appearance and should be removed and replaced with another birch.

- b) The Cypress and Eucalyptus are of relatively poor form and are proposed for removal;
- c) Early proposals to include a new retaining wall behind the existing one were dismissed due to the perceived harm to the roots of the ash. GBA's report notes a method statement should be prepared in respect of the site work in the vicinity of the retained trees

The report concludes that the proposed development will have no material harm to the retained trees.

Heritage Impact of Proposals

- 4.8 Having regard to the site's heritage context there are two related issues that need consideration: i) will the proposals negatively affect the character and appearance of the conservation area? ii) will the proposal affect the setting of nearby listed buildings?
- 4.9 **Will the proposals negatively affect the character and appearance of the conservation area?** In accordance with PPG15 and the Council's UDP, there is a desirability for new development to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area. Special regard should be had for such matters as scale, height, form, massing, respect for the traditional pattern of frontages, vertical or horizontal emphasis, and detailed design (e.g. the scale and spacing of window openings, and the nature and quality of materials). As detailed in Chassay & Last's Design and Access Statement the proposed design approach is in keeping with the main building
- 4.10 The Council's Conservation Area Character Statement determines the house does not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The character of the site, and of this part of the conservation area, differs considerably from the road fronting properties with modern and recent development to the rear of 85 Redington Road having little regard to the materials, form and style predominant on the area.

- 4.11 Although development within gardens is generally considered to be unacceptable within the conservation area (Policy RF1 of the Character Statement, *Supplementary Planning Guidance*), the sunken nature of the proposals will have little or no adverse impact on the conservation area as a whole, beyond the mews of the views of the south elevation of the extension from Redington Road. Chassay & Last's drawing no. RR/PA2/01 demonstrates that the element of the extension visible from Redington Road will be predominantly glazing which is considered to have an acceptable impact. This was the preferred design approach indicated by Mr. Thuaire at our pre-application meeting.
- 4.12 The proposals will maintain the openness of the garden of No. 87 and there will be limited impact on the tree cover as will be discussed below.
- 4.13 **Will the proposal affect the setting of nearby listed buildings?** There is a need to protect the setting of listed buildings and whilst 54 & 56 Redington Road are some way from the site, their setting may be considered relevant here. The existing proposals will be largely masked from all nearby listed buildings and are not therefore should not be considered to affect their setting.

The Need for Planning Controls Over Use of Extension

- 4.14 At our pre-application meeting Mr. Thuaire suggested a Section 106 agreement may be needed to ensure the extension is not used as a separate planning unit. This approach was adopted with the 2001 proposal, however Chassay & Last's proposals include a basement link from the main dwelling to the proposed extension. It is inconceivable that the proposed extension could at any point be used separately from the main dwelling. It is therefore considered there is no planning reason for a Section 106 agreement.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The principle of the extension of an existing family dwelling house is supported by national, regional and local planning policies. The above ground element of the proposal is broadly the same as the previous approval. The development will enhance the contribution of this single family dwelling house to Camden's housing supply. A modernist design is proposed to reflect the emerging international style inherent in Hill House.
- 5.2 The detailed plans, sections and elevations illustrate the relationship between the proposed development and 85A Redington Road is acceptable and no adverse amenity issues will arise. As recommended by Mr. Thuaire the proposed extension is lower in height than the ongoing development at no. 85a and steps down in height as it moves closer to the Redington Road frontage creating an acceptable relationship. As a result, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area will not be compromised.
- 5.3 As the majority of the development is underground a Structural Suitability Report has been prepared which proposes various design solutions and conclude there will be no adverse structural impact. Geoffrey Bunyan's Tree Report supports the removal of the Cypress and eucalyptus trees and recommends the replacement of the existing silver birch. It concludes the development will have no adverse impact on the retained trees.
- 5.4 The proposed extension will be utilised as part of the main dwelling house with a basement linking the two above ground elements. A Section 106 agreement is therefore not necessary to ensure the proposed extension works are used only in association with the main dwelling house, and not as a separate self contained flat.
- 5.5 It is therefore considered the proposals are wholly consistent with relevant national, regional and local planning policies.