

**DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT FOR 8 INVERFORTH CLOSE NW3 SUBMITTED AS PART OF A PLANNING APPLICATION**

**FORMAT OF THIS STATEMENT IS RELATED TO THE PRE-APPLICATION REPORT PREPARED BY JOHN DIVER CAMDEN PLANNING OFFICER**

**1. Proposal**

1.1. proposal comprises a garage extension on the eastern flank of this detached property as a replacement of the existing car port. The garage would have an area of 20.8sqm, with a depth of 6.65m and a maximum width of 3.3m (the flank wall tapers towards to rear to follow the plot of the property). It would be brick built with crown tiled roof featuring an eaves height of 2.65m and a maximum height of 4.6m.

**2. Site description**

2.1. The application site relates to a detached, single family dwelling house located within Inverforth Close; a private cul-de-sac with restricted access off North End Way. The close is immediately adjacent to the Hampstead Heath and the entirety of the close remains designated as Metropolitan Open Land. The property conveys an arts and crafts architectural vernacular, however its original asymmetrical form has been lost via the development granted in 2006 (see below) and now maintains strong symmetry across its principle elevation.

2.2. To the south east of the site lies Inverforth House, a large listed mansion of c.1906 with its landscaped hill gardens and pergola (listed structure). Due to the siting of the application property within the close and the positioning of adjacent properties, it is not considered to be within the immediate setting of any listed building or structure.

2.3. The application property itself is also not listed, but the site is located within the Hampstead Conservation Area. The Hampstead Conservation Area Statement (2001) does not make special mention of the property or consider that it makes a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area, although it does state that properties as a group within the Close form the backdrop to the adjacent designated Private Open Space and Garden of Special Historic Interest (Hill Gardens); listed structure (Inverforth Pergola) and Metropolitan Open Land (Hampstead Heath).

**3. Relevant planning history**

3.1. The planning history for the site can be summarised as follows:

2006/1079/P – Planning permission was granted on the 08 May 2006 for the ‘Removal of chimney stack and erection of a new dormer window to the front roof slope of the single-family dwelling house’.

**4. Relevant policies and guidance**

4.1. The relevant policies that apply to this proposal are taken from the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework (Core Strategy and Development Policy documents) as adopted on 8th November 2010, The London Plan 2016 and the NPPF (2012): -

- National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF)
- London Plan (2016)

- Local Development Framework
- Core Strategy (2011)
  - o CS4 - Areas of more limited change
  - o CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development
  - o CS6 – Providing quality homes
  - o CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
  - o CS15 - Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces & encouraging biodiversity
- Development Policies (2011)
  - o DP18 - Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking
  - o DP24 – Securing high quality design
  - o DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage
  - o DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours
  - o DP31 Provision of, and improvements to, public open space and outdoor sport and recreation facilities
- Supplementary Guidance
  - o CPG 1 – Design
  - o CPG 2 – Housing
  - o CPG 6 – Amenity
- Hampstead Conservation Area Statement (2001)

## 5. **Commentary**

5.1. The issues addressed in this case are as follows:

- Principle of extensions within Metropolitan Open Land;
- Principle of proposed garage;
- Design and heritage;
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;
- Trees
- Other matters

### **Principle of extensions within Metropolitan Open Land**

5.2. Land designated as Metropolitan Open land is afforded the same protected status under planning assessments as that designated as 'Green Belt' land. Policy 7.17 of the London Plan states that "The strongest protection should be given to London's Metropolitan Open Land and inappropriate development refused, except in very special circumstances, giving the same level of protection as in the Green Belt". As such the guidance of paragraphs 79-92 of the NPPF on Green Belts applies equally to Metropolitan Open Land (MOL).

5.3. By reference to Paragraph 89 of the NPPF the proposed garage extension to a property within MOL land is appropriate and "does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building".

5.4. Although there is no legislative definition it is considered that the extension is a proportionate addition.

5.5. The siting, layout and size of the proposed extension is moderate and appropriate. It replaces an existing large car port with a poor-quality pergola over. This provides no protection to vehicles parked there and has a somewhat untidy and dilapidated appearance. The proposed brick structure with tiled roof over uses material and details to match existing. Furthermore, this structure will not impact on the openness of MOL land. The extension is a proportionate addition.

5.6. The existing foot print of the property (134sqm) would be increased by approximately 15.5% (20.8sqm) because of the development. This figure is within a range of proposed increases that have been previously considered proportionate in similar previous cases within the Borough. Whilst this may be considered a crude measurement, our initial consultation with London Borough of Camden suggested that an increase of this level would likely not result in a disproportionate addition.

5.7. We consider that the openness of the MOL land would not be adversely impacted by the extension. On the contrary we believe that the extension is more in keeping with the existing house and would in fact enhance its appearance

### **Principle of proposed garage**

5.8. The proposal complies with Development policy DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking).

5.9. Although the application site features difficult access, with a Public Transport Accessibility rating of 1b (low), the site is not within a Controlled Parking Zone and the area of the development is a private driveway which is currently used for parking. As such the proposed garage, will not lead to an increase in numbers of available parking spaces or to exacerbate any local parking or traffic issues.

### **Design and heritage**

5.10. The proposal complies with policy DP24 as regards the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the quality of materials to be used. As such the proposal also complies with Policy DP25, 'Conserving Camden's Heritage' states that within conservation areas, in that the development 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.

5.11. The existing flank of the host property is particularly prominent when entering the Close, as well as from within the adjacent open space. The site currently features a timber car port in this location which is not of architectural merit. Hence the proposal will soften the prominence of the flank wall and therefore the side extension would improve the existing situation.

5.12. The garage extension appears as a subordinate addition to the main dwelling. It is set back from the principle elevation so as to empathise the subsidiarity of this relationship. The roof form has been informed by that of the main dwelling, and that the height of the extension is derived from the pitch of the adjacent cat slide roof.

5.13. The proposed design has been informed by the specific characteristics of the dwelling as well as the character of the local area, and that the proposed design would result in a sympathetic addition to the dwelling. The replacement of the existing timber car port with a garage of high quality would result in an enhancement to the character of the conservation area. The proposed design is thus considered to be in accordance with the Council's policies DP24 and DP25.

5.14. The chosen brick, mortar pointing and roof tiles will all match the host dwelling. The pitch of the roof will also reflect that of the existing building. The design of the proposed garage door can be conditioned so that samples of an appropriate product and finish can be obtained for approval.

### **Residential Amenity**

5.15. The proposal complies with Policy DP26 in that does not cause harm to amenity, including sunlight, daylight, artificial light levels, outlook and visual privacy and overlooking.

5.16. The siting and design of the proposed garage, will not impact adversely on any adjoining occupier in terms of light or privacy/overlooking. The distance from the nearest window in no.3 Inverforth Close is 10 metres. We do not consider that the proposal will have any adverse impact in terms of outlook, particularly as the pitched roof rises from the brickwork enclosure. We are aware that No.3 has applied for a first-floor extension with accommodation and a window overlooking No 8. There will be no intrusion or loss of privacy arising from the proposed garage extension.

5.17. The construction period is anticipated at 8-10 weeks. A strategy for the delivery of construction materials and removal of waste as well as parking arrangements for contractor will be prepared and notified to all. The details of a strategy for such arrangements will be submitted after discussion with the appointed contractor.

### **Trees**

5.18. The substructure involving excavations for foundations is currently envisaged as a reinforced concrete ground slab with power floated finish approximately 350mm thick with edge thickening supported on piles. The latter to be sunk once location of roots to adjacent tree have been identified.

5.19. The Arboriculture Survey (BS5837:2012): Impact Assessment Report & Tree Protection Plan dated 12th December 2016 has been prepared by Marcus Foster and forms part of this planning application and is attached.

### **Other matters**

5.20. Nick Levison the applicant and owner of the property is very mindful of the impacts likely to be caused to neighbouring amenity during the construction process if due care is not taken. It is understood that the site's access is via a single width private road and serves all residents within the Close. He has notified his neighbours and sent the proposed plans through to them.

5.21. The plans have been submitted to the Hampstead Conservation Area Advisory Committee. This is the response received from the Chairman John Malet Bates on 9<sup>th</sup> January 2017: -

*Good morning Peter and apologies.*

*No chance to cover at our last meeting but I will circulate for the next. My own look suggests no problem although the details of the proposed railings would be necessary to confirm. Ensure garage doesn't impinge on tree roots areas.*

*More later.*

*Best regards,*

*John*

## **6. Conclusion**

6.1. The footprint of the existing building is 134m<sup>2</sup>. The footprint of the garage extension is 20.8 m<sup>2</sup>. The volume of the new extension is 74m<sup>3</sup>. The size layout and appearance of the extension is proportionate to the existing building and causes no harm to the existing property, the immediate neighbourhood or the quality and openness of the Metropolitan Open Land

6.2. It would be appropriate to condition the materials so that these can be submitted for approval once consent has been granted. This includes bricks, clay roof tiles and garage door.

6.3. Construction Management Plan should similarly be conditioned as part of any consent. This is to include details of construction deliveries etc. This to be prepared with the assistance of a Building Contractor

6.4. Implementation of the project would be in accordance with the requirements set out in the Arboriculture Survey, Impact Assessment Report & Tree Protection Plan prepared by Marcus Foster.

## **7. Planning application information**

7.1. The planning application which addresses the various issues is submitted through the Planning Portal and consists of the following:

- Completed form – [Householder]
- An ordnance survey location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red.
- Floor plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Roof plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Elevation drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Section drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'proposed'
- Design and access statement –
- Arboriculture Method Statement
- The appropriate fee [£172.00]