

REVISED PLANNING HERITAGE DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

34a Rosslyn Hill, London NW3

Page | 1 Introduction

1. This statement is submitted in support of a planning application for rear extensions to the existing office accommodation at the above property, in substitution of the original PHDAS, following amendments to the scheme to address the Case Officer's concerns.
2. The northeast side of Rosslyn Hill, namely Nos. 28-36 (evens) is characterised by 4 storey buildings topped with pitched roofs. To the rear, the prevailing development is that of 2 storey closet wing extensions, rising up to first floor level.
3. The site falls within the Hampstead Conservation Area. The terrace has been identified as a positive contributor in the Conservation Area but is not listed. The photographs below provides a view of the rear of the terrace (from Downshire Hill) as well as the rear of 32 and 34 Rosslyn Hill.





4. The site is a 5 minute walk from Hampstead underground station and 10 minute walk from Belsize Park station. There is also a bus service from Rosslyn Hill, which goes to the under/overground stations.

Relevant LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance 2011 CPG1 Design; CPG6 Amenity

Hampstead Conservation Area Statement (2006)

London Plan 2011

NPPF 2012

Proposal

5. It is proposed to extend the property at 1st and 2nd floor at the rear to provide additional office space.

33 Bassein Park Road, London W12 9RW

Tel: 020 8749 9001 / 020 8811 8088 Fax: 020 8749 5090

Partners: George M. Vasdekys BA DIP TP MRTPI – Myra C. Barnes BA DIP TP MRTPI

Email: george@salisburyjones.com – myra@salisburyjones.com - website: www.salisburyjones.com

6. The main issues for consideration are:
 - The impact of the proposal upon the character or appearance of the host building and the surrounding conservation area and;
 - The impact that the proposal may have upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

Impact on the host building and surrounding area

7. The property is occupied as a restaurant on the ground floor with office accommodation above. It is intended that all work will enhance the character of the building and Conservation Area when completed. The proposal seeks to extend existing offices to provide additional floor space and a reorganisation of the internal layout.
8. At its highest part the proposed extension would be significantly lower than the existing roof ridge and well below the eaves. Overall it is considered that the proposed extension would be subordinate to the host building and it is noted that an extension of similar height was approved to the rear of No. 32 Rosslyn Hill in 2015.
9. The current proposal would have no effect on the principal front elevation; the extension would be visible but, in our submission, well designed and of the right proportions to ensure it will appear subordinate to the existing building.
10. It is noted that Policies DP24 and CPG1 (design) advocate a general presumption towards resisting extensions that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions.
11. The proposal however, represents an opportunity to improve the appearance of part of the rear façade of the “terrace” which would have a beneficial effect on this part of the Hampstead CA.

Summary of Changes and Factors in Favour of Permission

12. Following initial evaluation of the original scheme, including a site visit, the Case Officer advised of various concerns regarding the size of the proposed extension and the proposed detailed treatment.
13. The size and design of the proposed two storey extension were reviewed and the following changes made:
 - Reduction in the width and depth of the proposed extension as per discussion with the Case Officer
 - New windows to be in wood and painted white
 - The reduced width extension to incorporate one new window only on each floor

14. The design of the proposed privacy screen was queried and additional information requested. The revised drawings indicate the style, form and appearance of the privacy screen which it is considered offers the most appropriate design solution.
15. The height of the extension was questioned and part of the reason for the differential in height with No. 32 is due to the natural levels of the street. Be that as it may, we reviewed the height of the proposed extension and by reducing the internal height of each floor from 2.5m to 2.3m we reduced the overall height by approximately 0.5m.
16. We have also, further to the Case Officer's additional recommendations/requests, amended the scheme further by
 - Removing the 1st floor balcony, balustrade and glazed screen
 - Retaining the existing window on the rear main wall at 2nd floor level
 - Amending the drawings to show No. 32 as it exists rather than as it has been approved to be extended (though we still consider the grant of permission at No. 32 to be an important material consideration)

Residential Amenity

17. It is considered the proposal would not materially harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of a loss of sunlight/daylight or outlook than the existing arrangements. The Daylight Assessment submitted in support of the application confirms this to be the case.
18. There are a number of existing windows in the rear façades of the terrace already and it is considered the proposal would be of no greater detriment to the levels of privacy enjoyed by the occupiers of the surrounding properties than the buildings existing arrangement.
19. A number of objections have been received which we have considered carefully. Having read through these and considered the distance of the application site and proposed extension from the objectors' properties we believe there is little substance to the alleged loss of residential amenity claimed.
20. Self-evidently the objectors are entitled to their views, with which we respectfully disagree, regarding the impact of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Design and impact on the building and surrounding Conservation Area

21. The northeast side of Rosslyn Hill, namely Nos. 28-36 (evens) is characterised by 4 storey buildings topped with pitched roofs. To the rear, the prevailing development is that of 2 storey closet wing extensions, rising up to first floor level.
22. The adjacent property of No.32 has been granted permission for a two storey rear extension and in our submission it is evident that our proposal would be of a similar scale, design and facing materials to this approved addition.

23. The first and second floor levels would be stock brick, with a single window on the rear elevation maintaining the footprint of the existing stock brick extension below.
24. In consideration of Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design), rear extensions should be designed to:

- *be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;*

Proposal complies

- *respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;*

Proposal complies

- *respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies or chimney stacks;*

Not Applicable

respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space;

Not Applicable

- *not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure;*

Proposal complies

25. A separate Daylight Assessment has been supplied which concludes the proposed extension would not have a material impact on the properties either side.
26. The submitted plans do not indicate windows along the flank walls of the rear extension.
27. The only new windows are to be located on the rear elevation, hence the proposal would not directly face neighbouring windows and therefore no overlooking would occur. Accordingly the proposal would comply with Policy DP26.

Noise and disturbance

28. No new plant is proposed nor indeed any relocation of existing plant. Accordingly there will be no additional noise generated as a result of the proposed extensions.

Conclusions

29. The proposed rear extension would have no effect on the principal front elevation; the extension would be visible but, in our submission, well designed and of the right proportions to ensure it will appear subordinate to the existing building.
30. The overall appearance of the building has been designed to be in keeping with the Hampstead Conservation Area and the development will be sympathetic to the existing building both in terms of detailing and materials.

31. This would result in a building which would blend into the local streetscape and reinforce the wider townscape and result in an improvement to the existing rear facade.
32. The proposals would not have any material impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the two houses on either side.
33. The scheme would result in a modest but useful increase in office floor space in one of the Borough's Commercial/District Centres which adds some weight in support of the proposal.
34. The scheme has been amended to address all relevant matters raised by the Case Officer and in our submission complies with the requirements of Local Planning Policy and well as the NPPF in terms of Heritage considerations.
35. The design as proposed now, will deliver a good quality of development as well as a modest increase in employment creating floor space and merits the grant of conditional permission.
36. Consideration was given to the Case Officer's comment regarding the effect of the proposal on the setting of 2a Pilgrim's Lane (Listed Building). In our submission, the proposal will not impact materially on the setting of this listed building due to its location, orientation and distance from the application building.
37. In summary, the extensions and alterations proposed have been designed with careful regard to the relevant Policies of the adopted Development Plan and the relevant Design Guidance and, in our submission, comply with the applicable criteria set out in a preceding section to this Statement as well as the NPPF in terms of Heritage considerations.

SJP/22/12/2017