

Ms Kate Phillips
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND

86 Calbourne Road
London
SW12 8LR
Tel 020 7585 1793
jonathan@drewplanning.com

26 April 2016

Dear Ms Phillips

Town & Country Planning Act 1990
47 Doughty Street, London WC1N 2LW (Application Reference 2016/1027/P)

Thank you for your email of 19 April 2016 identifying a number of areas for us to respond to. This letter provides our client's response to your comments which I set out below.

"1. The proposed rear basement extension continues to be excessively large, taking up the entirety of the rear garden footprint other than the small lightwell area immediately behind the main house. (The 2010 consent for No. 57 is no longer a planning precedent, due to more recently adopted policy and guidance on basements). A basement extension of this size is disproportionate to the size of the host building and its hierarchy. We are not against the principle of a modestly-sized basement extension in keeping with the existing house.

2. At basement level it is proposed to reconfigure the shape of the internal bathroom in the rear room. Although, there are no issues with retaining a bathroom in this space, it is not acceptable to increase the width of this enclosure so that its southern wall coincides with the chimney breast in this room. It is advised, therefore, that the bathroom enclosure is retained in its current form.

3. Some concerns regarding the one-storey element of the rear extension. At pre-application stage we expressed concerns that despite the existence of the 1990s one-

storey pergola-style extension, this would not be a precedent for a full-width solid extension. Although the current extension is spaced away from main rear wall of the house due to the existence of the lightwell, it takes on the appearance of a full-width extension by projecting beyond the rear building line of the proposed closet wing. As such it visually 'engulfing' the closet wing so that it almost 'floats', something we were against at pre-application stage. The closet wing should read as the more dominant feature, with any one-storey extension(s) subordinate. It may therefore be necessary to break up the extension into a rear and side element to the closet wing to avoid this 'floating' impact."

The Applicant's Response

1. Size of Proposed Basement

The Council raises two issues in relation to the size of the basement. Firstly that it is overly large in respect of the dimensions of the rear garden and secondly in relation to the hierarchy of spaces in the host building. These matters are each considered below.

Size relative to the garden

The rear garden to this property is relatively small comprising a small paved area. Developing below the whole garden is therefore relatively modest and necessary in order to create a reasonable space.

As the building is listed any basement development would be restricted to the garden space. In doing so the application has accords with planning policy DP27 and CPG4 on basement development. While there are restrictions on front garden development there are none on rear garden development so long as the amenity is protected.

The amenity is protected as there is no increase in hard surfaced area, no roof lights, the flood risk has been assessed and the structural impact has been assessed with no amenity issues found to exist.

Therefore we feel that although the basement does include the whole of the back garden this complies with the Council's basement policies.

Hierarchy of spaces

As the building is listed we have given careful consideration on the hierarchy of spaces. Developing below a listed building is generally discouraged because of the potential impact on the historic fabric and on the hierarchy and inter-relationship of spaces.

Separating the the basement from the original host building is an established means of respecting the original hierarchy and interrelationship of spaces. None of the original spaces, neither floorspace nor floor to ceiling heights are affected by this.

The only way in which to perceive the relationship of proposed spaces is through a section plan. This though only serves to confirm that the spaces are separated and that basements are already part of the original layout of the buildings. Adding a basement area below the garden and separated from the existing basement has minimal impact on the relationship of the historic layout.

The proposed basement space is physically separate and is not competing with the original house. The proposed basement is potentially reversible without impacting on the historic fabric or hierarchy of the original/ host building. For these reasons we believe this should be supported.

2. Basement Bathroom Enclosure

We acknowledge this comment but the chimney breast and fireplace has been previously substantially altered to form a large cupboard which may not be evident from the drawings. The photo below shows the existing configuration.



Photo of existing rear basement room former fireplace

Given that the original fabric has been removed and the existing non original enclosure that forms the bathroom we feel that making the bathroom larger would have no greater impact on the original fabric or layout of the listed building than currently exists. It is merely an alternative location for a dividing wall that already exists. If the fireplace was in place and had not been altered we would fully agree with the Council's comments and would not have proposed the layout we have. We hope the photograph helps explains our design rationale.

3. Full Width Rear Extension

This part of the proposal benefits from an extant planning permission (2014/1345/P) which itself was a renewal of a scheme previously approved in 2010.



Extract of 2014 approved ground floorplan (2014/1345/P)

The proposed layout has been altered to reflect comments made in the pre-application advice in respect of including the existing lightwell.

The Council's pre-app comments made stated:

"You are advised to follow the approach that was taken previously (i.e. create some form of separation between the original building and the new ground floor rear extension). Alternatively, the rear elevation of the ground floor element should be stepped back to give sense of the original shape of the building."

Given the pre-application advice and that the scale and design of what has been approved is almost identical to what is approved we feel that what is proposed remains acceptable.

I hope the further explanations meet with your approval. We would be happy to discuss any remaining concerns with you.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading 'Jonathan Drew', is displayed on a light blue background.

Jonathan Drew

Director | Drew Planning & Development Ltd

Direct 020 7585 1793 | **Mobile** 07545 574 967

Email Jonathan@drewplanning.com | **Web** www.drewplanning.com