



**Date: 23/10/2017**  
**Our ref: 2017/4719/PRE**  
**Contact: Kristina Smith**  
**Direct line: 020 7974 4986**  
**Email: Kristina.smith@camden.gov.uk**

**Planning Solutions Team**  
**Planning and Regeneration**  
 Culture & Environment  
 Directorate  
 London Borough of Camden  
 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
 5 Pancras Square  
 London  
 N1C 4AG

Turley  
 The Charlotte Building  
 17 Gresse Street  
 London  
 W1T 1QL  
 By email

[www.camden.gov.uk/planning](http://www.camden.gov.uk/planning)

Dear Laurence Brooker,

**Re: 30 Glenilla Road, London, NW3 4AN**

Thank you for submitting a follow up pre-planning application enquiry for the above property which was received on 18/08/2017 together with the required fee of £1,800.00. A site visit was carried out on Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> September.

This is a follow up to a previous pre-application enquiry and so the following advice note should be read in conjunction with the former advice report. Since the previous submission, the LDF has been superseded by the Camden Local Plan 2017 and so areas where policy has changed shall be flagged. The primary focus of this advice shall be on design and conservation considerations.

## 1. Proposal

The proposal comprises the following:

- Erection of three storey single dwelling house (plus basement) following demolition of existing two storey property
- Erection of garden outbuilding
- Hard and soft landscaping works

## 2. Site description

The application site is a two storey 1920/30s detached house located in the Belsize conservation area. It is not identified in the appraisal as a building that makes a positive contribution to the streetscape so therefore makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The wider area is generally consistent in character, being of late Victorian/early Edwardian construction; however the Conservation Area Statement (CAS) describes Glenilla Road, as "*less consistent in character, having a variety of buildings of different ages, materials, styles and heights, along its southern boundaries. Sussex House is an overbearing flat block significantly larger than the other buildings in the street*". A characteristic of the southwest frontage of this streetscape is the juxtaposition of the large and the small, with an erratic variation of rooflines, setbacks, footprints and styles.

### 3. Relevant planning history

The key relevant planning history is as follows:

- **TP/76674/1410** – The erection of two, three-storey, semi-detached houses with ancillary lock-up garages and the formation of means of access to the highway on the site between Nos. 28 and 30, Glenilla Road, Hampstead. – Granted – 12 July 1956.
- **8500516** – Erection of a roof extension and first floor rear extension as shown on drawings No.BL0330.12 13 14 15 16a 17a and 18a.. – Granted – 03 July 1985.
- **PW9802136R1** – Erection of a ground and first floor rear extension As shown on drawing No 0267/01B. – Granted – 24 September 1998.

32 Glenilla Road (neighbouring property)

- **2016/6712/P** - Erection of 2 x 3-bedroom 3-storey plus basement dwellinghouses (Use Class C3) with hard and soft landscaping following demolition of existing single storey church (Use Class D1). **Pending Determination**

28 Glenilla Road

- **2006/2129/P** - Demolition of existing dwelling house and rear wing and erection of a new 3 storey plus basement and attic dwelling house including rear garden wing and forecourt parking and new boundary treatment. **Granted 29/11/2006**

### 4. Relevant policies and guidance

**National Planning Policy Framework 2012**

**The London Plan March 2016**

**The Camden Local Plan 2017**

Since the previous pre-application enquiry, the Camden Local Plan 2017 has been adopted and

fully supersedes the LDF. The policies relevant to the proposals are:

H1 – Maximising housing supply;  
 H6 – Housing choice and mix;  
 H7 – Large and small homes;

A1 – Managing the impact of development;  
 A3 – Biodiversity;  
 A4 - Noise and vibration  
 A5 – Basements and Lightwells;

D1 – Design;  
 D2 – Heritage;

CC1 – Climate change mitigation;  
 CC3 – Water and flooding;  
 CC5 – Waste;

T1 – Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport;  
 T2 – Parking and Car-free development.

The following documents also provide relevant guidance for this proposal:

CPG1 – Design  
 CPG2 – Housing  
 CPG3 – Sustainability  
 CPG4 – Basements and lightwells  
 CPG6 – Amenity  
 CPG7 - Transport  
 CPG8 - Planning Obligations

## 5. **Assessment**

The planning considerations material to the determination of this application are as follows:

- Principle of Redevelopment;
- Design and Conservation;
- Standard of residential accommodation;
- Basement Excavation;
- Amenity;
- Transport;
- Sustainability;
- Trees; and
- CIL.

As outlined at the beginning of the report, this advice request follows directly on from another pre-application advice request in relation to a similar proposal. Much of the assessment for this previous scheme remains the same for the amended scheme and as such further comment will only be made where the previous advice has altered as a result of the new scheme/policy changes. This report should therefore be read in conjunction with the previous report.

## **Principle of Redevelopment**

The principle of demolition and rebuild has already been considered under the previous pre-application. The unit size proposed is a 6-bed unit, which is a dwelling size regarded as lower priority under Policy H7; however, this is the same dwelling priority as the existing 5-bed unit and so the size is considered acceptable.

## **Design and Conservation**

The building heights along the street demonstrate variation, with larger buildings evident at Sussex House as well as no's 28, 36 and 40 Glenilla Road. The proposed height is considered to tie in comfortably with its neighbour at no.32 (although still subject to determination) and the wider street, and whilst it will begin to dwarf the two modern properties immediately to the west, this is considered acceptable given the established height of the wider streetscene. Although four storeys high, the building appears as three storeys by designing out height, achieved by third floor level side dormers instead of windows on the front or rear elevations.

The revised building design has a far more comfortable relationship with its plot. Rather than swelling to its boundaries, it is angled away from no.32 on the east boundary with the massing narrowing towards the top, preventing the building from having an overbearing presence. It also seeks to improve the existing situation by setting the massing further back within the plot in respect of the front building line that nearby properties have established. While great variety in building lines is evident along the south side of the street, as the architectural form and style becomes more consistent to the east and north this variety is reduced, and the proposed deference to the more consistent arrangement is appropriate at this point in the street.

The building handles its massing through layering different elements. Whilst this form is understood and supported to some extent, the porch addition is excessive, appearing as a bulky front extension. Because of its bulk, this has the undesired effect of weakening the building line that the new building seeks to restore. The street does include some single-storey street-side structures of varied forms towards the west, but, as at Belsize Studios, these elements are shaped and kept subordinate by pitched roofs, boundary treatments and topography. It is recommended this element is reconsidered and substantially reduced. Rather than a projecting element, the porch could be wholly or partially inset within the main building mass.

Better integrating the porch could also help give the brick facade greater depth and sense of functionality. The brick portion of the façade appears too much like cladding rather than a substantive part of the building – borne out by comparison with the mass of the brick element to the rear. This risks adding to the sense of bulk in the slated portion. It also appears incongruous in the context, where richly articulated red-brick elevations dominate the streetscape and, as on the Glenloch and Glenmore Road houses, use canted bays, strings and pilasters to generate a sense of depth or volume in elevation. This helps visually support the steep, mansard slate roofs above. The proposal's relative lack of a sense of mass in the brick of its front elevation might be generated by the consistency in fenestration across the brick and slate portions. Officers feel that the proposal would benefit from architectural measures to give its brick body more integrity in its form and its role in the overall massing.

Much of the building's massing has been located to the rear which although less prominent in the streetscene and conservation area, does appear bulky, particularly at first floor level where it substantially extends beyond the existing rear building line and the main rear

elevation of the neighbouring property at no.28b. It is therefore recommended that the depth of the brickwork portion is reduced. A single storey ground floor element with an irregular pitched roof is also proposed. Whilst the form is generally thought to be acceptable, the height appears excessive and dominates the rear elevation, encroaching on the first-floor level windows. It is advised that the heights of ground floor extensions nearby are used as reference points.

In terms of materiality, the reference point for the use of brickwork is clear, and the pattern detail is well received. The use of grey slates for the largest part of the body of the property is less evidently supported by the immediate context and officers would welcome further justification for this choice of material – noting particularly the dominance it would have in views of the flank of the proposed house from the south-east, and the strong contrast implied with the palette of brickwork.

The proposals provide an opportunity for an enhancement of the boundary treatment. Part-soft landscaping the front garden, and the inclusion of a dwarf brick wall, consistent with the best treatments of comparable houses in the context would be welcomed by the Council.

#### Garden building

It is proposed to build a garden building in the rear part of the garden. The principle of this is considered acceptable, subject to further details on the size and materiality. Other garden buildings are evident in the rear gardens of nearby properties on this side of Glenilla Road and so the structure would not disturb a 'green ribbon' of rear gardens.

#### **Standard of residential accommodation**

From the submitted plans, the proposed floorspace is 482sq m. This far exceeds the 138sq m required for a 6b8p property. The size of all habitable rooms also comply with the standards.

The proposed development would provide a high standard of amenity with aspect in three directions and a good amount of daylight and sunlight received through large windows. The dwelling would also benefit from amenity space in the form of a private rear garden.

The only concern is the guest room at basement level which is unlikely to receive an adequate amount of daylight (1% ADF for bedrooms in new dwellings). Given the constraints to provide more light at this level, it is advised that this room is a non-habitable room.

The Council will require new-build self-contained homes to be accessible and adaptable in accordance with Building Regulation M4(2) which will be secured by condition if a planning application were to be submitted.

#### **Basement excavation**

Policy A5 has altered the Council's requirements in terms of basement size and scale. Basement development should:

- not comprise of more than one storey;
- not be built under an existing basement;
- not exceed 50% of each garden within the property;
- be less than 1.5 times the footprint of the host building in area;

- extend into the garden no further than 50% of the depth of the host building measured from the principal rear elevation;
- not extend into or underneath the garden further than 50% of the depth of the garden;
- be set back from neighbouring property boundaries where it extends beyond the footprint of the host building; and
- avoid the loss of garden space or trees of townscape or amenity value.

From the submitted information, it appears that the basement is compliant.

The previous pre-application advice should be referred to for advice on the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) that would need to be submitted with an application, as well as the BIA audit process.

### **Amenity of surrounding occupiers**

From the submitted information, it is difficult to assess how the long, full-height window and the dormer window of the building would align with those on the proposed building at no.32 Glenilla Road. There is little distance between the two buildings and therefore if the window positions do align, the impact is likely to be unacceptable in terms of loss of privacy. If realignment of the window is not possible, obscure glazing may need to be considered.

The massing at first floor level appears to have an overbearing impact on no.28b, particularly to the conservatory. A daylight and sunlight assessment should be submitted to ensure that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the light received to existing occupiers. Daylight and sunlight considerations aside, the depth of this element could still have an unneighbourly impact on the property and this should be considered and possibly revised to address this concern.

### **Transport and Parking considerations**

- Cycle Parking

The revised proposal comprises 2 cycle spaces in the entrance hall/ porch area which is compliant with policy requirements for a 6-bed property.

- Car-parking

For redevelopments, Policy T2 states that the Council will consider retaining or re-providing existing parking provision where it can be demonstrated that the existing occupiers are to return to the address when the development is completed. If a development would be sold to new occupiers, it would be required to be car-free that would be secured by a section 106 legal agreement. There would also be a requirement to re-instate the footpath that would also require a fee.

- Construction Management Plan

Please refer to previous advice but note that the implementation support contribution has increased from £1,140 to £3,136 for small-scale development.

- Highways Contribution

Please refer to previous advice.

## **Sustainability**

The substantive requirements previously outlined by policy DP22 have been carried over within the adopted Local Plan. Policy CC1 states that the Council will require development to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures. All developments are expected to reduce their carbon dioxide emissions by following the steps in the energy hierarchy (be lean, be clean and be green) to reduce energy consumption. All minor residential developments (over 1+ unit) are expected to submit a sustainability statement - the detail of which to be commensurate with the scale of the development showing how the development will:

- Implement the sustainable design principles as noted in policy CC1
- Demonstrate that the development is capable of achieving a maximum internal water use of 105 litres per day (plus an additional 5 litres for external water use).

Further information regarding the Council's requirements regarding Climate Change mitigation measures are outlined within CPG3 (Sustainability). Guidance relating to the design of living walls and roofs will be issued alongside these notes.

## **Arboriculture**

The revised proposal shows the outbuilding has been repositioned so it would not require the removal of trees. It is recommended that an arboricultural report is still submitted to ensure that both on-site and off-site trees will be satisfactorily protected during the demolition, excavation and construction works.

Where possible it is encouraged that developments incorporate additional trees and vegetation. This would be welcomed on the front boundary in particular.

## **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

You are advised that this proposal will be liable for the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Camden CIL as the additional floorspace exceeds 100sqm GIA or one unit of residential accommodation. Based on the Mayor's CIL charging schedule the CIL charge is £50 per additional sqm and for Camden CIL the site is within Zone C (£500 per sqm for residential). This will be collected by Camden after the scheme is implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, submit a commencement notice and late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index. More information can be found [here](#).

Both CIL's will be collected by Camden after the scheme has started and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability or submit a commencement notice PRIOR to commencement and/or for late payment. We will issue a formal liability notice once the liable party has been established. CIL payments will also be subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index.

## **Conclusion**

The outstanding concerns relate to design and massing issues. The revised design has evidently taken architectural cues from the immediate context, including the proposed building at no.32 Glenilla Road as well as the traditional buildings to the east and the modern buildings to the west. Officers are broadly supportive of the form and on the whole feel like the building could be a high-quality and responsive addition to the eclectic streetscene. It is recommended that some elements of the massing and bulk are redistributed or reduced,

namely the porch and the ground and first floor massing to the rear. It is also advised to explore how more functionality can be introduced to the brick element to the front.

## 6. Planning application information

Should you choose to submit a planning application which addresses the outstanding issue detailed in this report satisfactorily, I would advise you to submit the following for a valid planning application:

- Completed form – Full Planning Application
- An Ordnance Survey based 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 'existing' and 'proposed'
- The appropriate fee
- Planning Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Daylight and Sunlight Assessment
- Basement Impact Assessment
- Arboricultural Report
- CIL Liability Form
- Sustainability Statement
- Please see [supporting information for planning applications](#) for more information.

We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received. You are strongly advised to contact surrounding occupiers as well as the Belsize Conservation Area Advisory Committee to discuss the proposals.

Non-major applications are typically determined under delegated powers, however, if more than 3 objections from neighbours or an objection from a local amenity group is received the application will be referred to the Members Briefing Panel should it be recommended for approval by officers. For more details click [here](#).

**This document represents an initial informal officer view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage and would not be binding upon the Council, nor prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.**

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact Kristina Smith on **020 7974 4986**

Thank you for using Camden's pre-application advice service.

Yours sincerely,

Kristina Smith

**Planning Officer  
Planning Solutions Team**



