

MRPP

**MARTIN ROBESON
PLANNING PRACTICE**

*Town Planning Consultants
Development Advocacy*

PLANNING STATEMENT

251 GOLDHURST TERRACE

DECEMBER 2016

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Decision-Making Framework	1
Existing Situation and Context	4
The Proposals and Assessment	7
Conclusions	12

Introduction

1. This Planning Statement is submitted in support of the application for works to 251 Goldhurst Terrace, London NW6.
2. The works involve the excavation of a basement, extension to the roof at the rear, and improvements to the rear elevational arrangement and treatment.
3. The report will set out the decision-making framework here, describe the proposals and, having assessed the scheme in light of this framework, explain why the application should therefore be approved.

Decision-Making Framework

4. Section 38(b) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 confirms that planning applications must be determined, *“in accordance with the [development] plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise”*.
5. As the proposal lies within a Conservation Area, there are also legal tests in relation to the impact of development on the heritage asset. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that, in the exercise of planning functions, *“special attention shall be paid to the desirability of presenting or enhancing the character or appearance of that area”*¹.
6. The NPPF and NPPG are important material considerations in the determination of this planning application.
7. The development plan here consists of the Camden Core Strategy 2010, Camden Development Policies 2010, and Camden Policy Guidance documents. Strategic policies are contained in the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations) 2016. Camden Policy Guidance Documents (CPGs) are also important material considerations, as they guide the interpretation and application of local policy. In addition, the South Hampstead

¹ Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy was adopted in February 2011.

8. The NPPF states that weight can also be given to relevant policies in emerging plans. Such a judgment is related to the stage of preparation, the number of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of those policies to the Framework.
9. Camden is seeking to replace its Core Strategy and Development Policies with a new Local Plan. This has been submitted for Examination, which took place in October 2016. The Inspector's report is awaited.
10. Thus, any relevant policy contained in Camden's existing development plan must be assessed in terms of its consistency with the Framework, in order to determine what level of weight should be applied. Such a test must also apply to any emerging policy, along with any outstanding objections to that policy.
11. To assist in this process, the below schedules undertake this exercise to determine what the relevant policies are to the determination of this development.

Schedule 1: Relevant Policies in Camden's Existing Development Plan

<u>Core Strategy/Development Policies</u>	<u>Consideration as to whether consistent with Framework</u>
CS14: Promoting high quality phases and seeking Camden's heritage	Consistent: Strategic policy requiring a high standard of design
DP24: Seeking high quality design (plus CPG1: Design)	Consistent: Requires consideration of character and streetscene but also encourages innovation
DP25: Conserving Camden's Heritage	Part inconsistent: Does not reflect Paragraph 129 of the Framework of the significance of the <u>existing "heritage asset"</u> (i.e. Conservation Area or Listed Building etc.)
DP26: Managing the impact of Development on Occupiers and Neighbours (and CPG6 Amenity)	Consistent: NPPF requires " <i>a good standard of amenity</i> " for existing and future occupiers (Para 17)
DP27: Basements and Lightwells (and CPG4 Basements)	Part consistent with paragraph 109 regarding development impacts on the physical environment.

Schedule 2: Relevant Policies in Camden's Emerging Local Plan

<u>Draft Local Plan Policy</u>	<u>Weight related to outstanding objections and NPPF consistency</u>
Policy A1: Managing the Impact of Development	Medium weight: Outstanding objections on methodology for measuring impacts of noise, dust etc.
Policy A3: Biodiversity	Strong weight. Additional wording proposed reflecting NPPF and woodland. Objection that wording be strengthened.
Policy A5: Basements	Limited weight. Unresolved objections based on stringent tests applied to limits of basement development and assessment thereof.
Policy D1: Design	Medium weight. Some objections; but these chiefly related to tall buildings.
Policy D2: Heritage	Medium weight. Emerging policy now reflects NPPF's requirement for assessment of significance of <u>existing asset</u> , but objections that require this to be more explicit, in line with the NPPF.

Existing Situation and Context

12. The dwelling is situated on the southern side of Goldhurst Terrace, a tree-lined avenue that runs broadly east-west. The topography is generally flat, albeit it falls away to the rear of the dwelling (i.e. to the south).
13. The dwelling consists of a substantial, brick-built, semi-detached Victorian house. The house consists of 3 storeys - a ground floor, which is set at street level, a first floor, and a second floor. The second floor is situated in the roof, however, it benefits from two period dormer windows. An image of the house can be seen at Photograph 1.



Photograph 1: 251 Goldhurst Terrace from front

14. The design and appearance of this house mirrors that of its neighbours (specifically, 197 to 229, 247 to 257 and 142 to 192 Goldhurst Terrace). These houses are semi-detached, imposing residences, dating from late in the Victorian era. The only break in the character occurs at 231 to 245 Goldhurst Terrace, where there is some later, lower-built infill, that is nonetheless, still pleasingly designed.

15. The dwellings are arranged symmetrically in their respective pairs, with large bays over the ground and first floor on the inside of each pair, the entrance being set between this and a smaller, square bay on the ground floor only on the outside of each pair.



Photograph 2: Looking towards 251 Goldhurst Terrace from East



Photograph 3: Looking along north side of Goldhurst Terrace from West

16. Number 251 currently suffers from a tired appearance. The rear of the property has, in common with others in the area, suffered from the addition of a poorly-designed rear extension, and a dated, and neglected raised decked area.



Photograph 4: Rear of 251 Goldhurst Terrace

17. There is, accordingly, an opportunity to improve the appearance of this imposing dwelling and make this house function effectively as an attractive family home fit for the 21st century.

The Proposals and Assessment

18. Once renovated, and extended, the applicant intends to live in the property with his family. The desire therefore is make 251 Goldhurst Terrace into an imposing and attractive period home suitable for modern living.
19. There are a number of components of the proposed which come together in concert to achieve the realisation of a family home here. Furthermore, these are then assessed accordingly to their performance against policies considered up-to-date and relevant.

Basement and Lightwell

20. Beneath the ground floor, a basement level would be excavated. This would include a lightwell under the bay window to the front of the property.
21. This basement extension would be mainly under the footprint of the existing house and would not extend further than the existing raised detached terrace in the rear garden. The area proposed has already been subject to excavation, in the form of a vault, which runs the width and depth of the house and rear terrace. The basement would be created by deepening the head-height. Hence, the amount of material to be excavated would be relatively limited.
22. To the front, the basement would be barely perceptible. An un-intrusive lightwell would be excavated surrounding the existing bay window to enable the ingress of light. This is similar to the approach taken elsewhere in the locality and is in line with Camden's policy and guidance.
23. To the rear, where the basement interfaces with the rear garden, a contemporary lightwell, including a sunken terrace would be created. This would benefit from attractive features such as glass balustrades and bi-fold doors to the basement elevation. Elevational materials, including brick, that match the existing rear elevation would be employed to harmonise the terrace and lightwell with the existing house.

24. The basement accords with existing policy DP27, as supported by CPG4. The basement would be almost entirely under the footprint of the existing dwelling. This means a large area of the rear garden (well over 50%) remains unexcavated. A wide margin has been left between the rear boundary and the basement excavation, supporting the growth of trees, shrubs and plants. The provision of light to the basement, in the form of a lightwell rather than a skylight, conforms to the requirements in CPG4 which discourages the use of skylights for this purpose.
25. The basement excavation is supported by a robust Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) which accords with the requirements set out in DP27 and CPG4.
26. As noted it has been considered that very limited weight can be attributed to Camden's emerging Policy A5, owing to the fact that it has not been examined and there are a number of outstanding objections to it.
27. Notwithstanding the current status of this policy, the design of the basement is considered to accord to the objectives of Draft Policy A5, namely, to avoid *"harm to the amenity of neighbours affect the stability of buildings cause drainage or flooding problems or change the character of areas of the natural environment"*.
28. The proposed basement also accords with all the design criteria set out at points f) and m) of Draft Policy A5. The basement is not; more than one storey deep; not built under an existing basement; it does not extend into the garden more than 50% of the depth of the host property or exceed 1.5 times the footprint of the host building; it is set back from the boundary of no.253 in so far as it allows planting to grow, and it does not involve the loss of trees of townscape or amenity value. Thus, while only limited weight can currently be applied to emerging policy in this regard, the proposed basement nonetheless accords with its provisions.

Extension to the Roof at the Rear

29. The existing roof to the dwelling consists of a mansard-style roof to both the front and rear elevations, with a pitched roof above this. The front elevation is adorned with two original period dormer windows. The rear mansard, not visible from the street has two small dormer windows within it.
30. The proposal includes the insertion of two sets of recessed glazed doors within the pitched portion of the roof at a newly-created third-floor level. The doors would serve a master bedroom suite at this level. The doors, while of a contemporary design, would rise no higher than the existing ridge height, and one set to the right of the rear elevation, adjacent to the ridge of neighbouring 253, Goldhurst Terrace. This maintains a degree of symmetry on the rear elevation.
31. The South Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal assesses the front elevations. Paragraph 128 of the Framework is clear that any impacts on existing heritage assets have to be assessed in height of the contribution currently made by the building or structure. Such an assessment is currently missing from Camden's Policy DP25, but is more readily reflected in emerging Draft Policy D2. While Draft Policy D2 has yet to be examined, it is considered that this can be afforded some weight due to relatively insignificant objections to that policy and its general consistency with the Framework.
32. Design Guidance relating to roof extensions is also set out in Camden Policy Guidance note CPG1. The main tenet of the guidance in relation to roofs (Paragraph 5.11) relates to the "*wider townscape*". Given that the roof extension would be imperceptible from the streetscene it is considered to be in line with this policy driver. Notwithstanding this, the design of the roof extension has also been considered in relation to recommendations in guidance.
33. The extension conforms to most of the guidance set out. It is no higher than the current ridge height. The materials used (slate) would match those used

on the existing pitched roof. While the windows are positioned towards the centre of the semi-detached pair, this has been undertaken to maintain a degree of symmetry in the rear elevation. This would avoid cutting into the roof slope, at variance with guidance. These windows are also subordinate to those that also serve main bedrooms (i.e. those two storeys below).

34. Thus the improvements to the roof conform to the requirements of Paragraph 128 of the Framework and emerging Camden's Policy in this regard. Furthermore, the use of rear dormer chimneys with the approach of Camden's Policy DP24, and guidance in CPG1 in not affecting the townscape or streetscene and being a well-designed addition to the rear of the property.
35. These proposals would therefore further enhance the contribution that the dwelling makes to the Conservation Area, with regard to the assessment as detailed at Paragraph 128 of the NPPF.
36. Accordingly, this work further complies with the requirements of relevant design and conservation policy (specifically CS14, DP24, DP25 (where consistent with the Framework), and emerging Policy D1 and D2).

Alterations to rear elevation

37. The proposal includes the replacement of unsightly French windows at the rear ground- floor level, with attractive and contemporary bi-fold doors. These would enable the kitchen and dining room to open out onto a new terrace, enabling it to be properly utilised and enjoyed. The existing, unattractive and dated decking area, would be transformed into an attractive raised terrace with a glass balustrade, with steps leading down to the sunken basement terrace.
38. The proposal adopts a contemporary, yet harmonious solution to the treatment of the rear elevation, addressing the inconsistencies caused by unsympathetic extensions and alterations in the intervening years.

39. The approach has been taken having regard to the justification in support of policy DP24, vis:
- “The Council seeks to encourage outstanding architecture and design, both in contemporary and more traditional styles. Innovative design can greatly enhance the built environment and, unless a scheme is within an area of homogenous architectural style that is important to retain, high quality contemporary design will be welcomed.”*
40. The two portions of existing rear ground floor extension would be adjusted in height to match each other, and the height of the existing rear extension at no. 253. On the roof of these extensions, terraces would be created to serve the bedrooms at first floor level. The terrace would be adorned with an attractive, contemporary timber balustrade. Given the position, screening and lack of overlooking into neighbouring habitable rooms, it is considered that this roof terrace would not compromise neighbouring amenity. As such it would comply with the requirements of Policy DP26, emerging Policy A1 and guidance within CPG6, specifically Paragraph 7.4.
41. The first floor rear windows would be replaced with contemporary French-windows, allowing, as is the case at no. 253 adjacent, the rear bedrooms to access and enjoy the terrace.
42. Given the improvements made in design terms, and the lack of any contribution made by the rear to the setting of the Conservation Area, it is considered this proposal chimes with the requirements of Policies CS14, DP24 (plus CPG1), and DP25, and emerging Policies D1 and D2.

Conclusion

43. The law states that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations dictate otherwise.
44. The proposed development has been assessed against the policies of the development plan where these are considered relevant and up-to-date, and other material considerations.
45. There has also been consideration of the proposal against emerging policies where these can be apportioned significant weight in decision-making.
46. The proposed basement is supported by a robust Basement Impact Assessment, in line with adopted policy. The basement would sit almost entirely within the footprint of the existing dwelling. The vast majority of the rear garden, comprising the trees and soft landscaping, would remain un-excavated. The basement therefore accords with adopted policy and the aspiration of the emerging basement policy.
47. The extension to the roof at the rear, and the alterations to the rear elevation, use innovative and contemporary design to correct the deficiencies caused by recent additions. They are well-designed and create symmetry, and vastly improve the character and appearance of the rear compared to the existing situation.
48. All facets of the proposed development are therefore in accordance with the policies set out in the decision-making framework, and the application should therefore be supported.