

24 Heath Drive (2018/0914/P & 2018/0981/L) – Response to Consultee Comments

Consultee Comments	Response
<p>Heritage</p>	
<p><i>This proposal, to expand and extensively alter this Grade 2 Listed house, requires meticulous and detailed scrutiny...</i></p>	<p>The significance/special architectural or historic interest of the listed building is assessed – at considerable length and in great detail - in Section 2 of the Heritage Appraisal.</p> <p>The effect of the proposed scheme is assessed – again, at considerable length and in great detail – in Section 4 of the Heritage Appraisal.</p>
<p><i>No 24 is one of Charles Quennell's best buildings, a masterpiece in his iconic Arts and Crafts style, one of Hampstead's architectural landmarks.</i></p>	<p>We agree. The proposed scheme preserves its heritage significance/special architectural or historic interest as described and concluded in the Heritage Appraisal.</p>
<p><i>We are very concerned that it is proposed to construct a basement under virtually the whole house; this in itself would harm its architecture and character.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed extensions and alterations to the listed building result in the loss of many of the special architectural and historic points of interest in the building.</i></p>	<p>The proposal is not contrary to the Local Plan, and the construction of a basement does not automatically fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of a listed building. The design of the proposed basement preserves the special architectural or historic interest of 24 Heath Drive, as well as ensuring the building is maintained to ensure suitable family accommodation.</p> <p>Kyson Comment: Objector’s concerns are acknowledged. That said the basement has been designed to be subservient/ hidden beneath the existing footprint. There is no grand new stair, just a utility stair (as existing) tucked away under the existing main stair and out of sight from the hallway. The design itself is considered in keeping with classical proportions and Quennell’s formal planform when arched ceilings and heavy pillars are introduced. The overall composition seeks to strengthen</p>

	<p>the setting of the listed building which had been neglected over decades, thus preserving heritage for the generations to come.</p> <p>Note: The majority of the existing basement is infilled crawl space. Refer to 'Design Overview' within the Planning Brochure produced by Kyson.</p>
<p><i>The character and detail of much of the interior would be compromised, both by works of alteration and by the uncomfortable relationship between Quennell's original designs and the modernistic basement, especially the swimming pool area</i></p>	<p>This is not the case, as Section 4 of our Heritage Appraisal makes clear. There will be a clear visual separation between the basement and the rest of the house, not least because the basement is subterranean and not visible.</p> <p>This objection that 'the character and detail of much of the interior would be compromised' is unsupported by any evidence from the objector.</p>
<p><i>Externally, the replacement of the sensitively designed bow window by a steel (Corten) and glass box is particularly offensive, and clearly disrespectful of Quennell's architectural composition of the garden elevation. The bow window is said in the Heritage Statement to be in poor condition; this is no excuse to demolish and replace it with this incongruous feature.</i></p> <p><i>The removal of the rear bay window would appear to not be justified as it forms part of the original characteristics of the listed building and would be capable of retention and restoration</i></p>	<p>Extensions to listed buildings in a respectful contemporary style is a long established and respected way of allowing the evolution of listed buildings over time to be legible and subservient; many examples exist in Hampstead. The Heritage Appraisal makes clear that the bow (<i>sic</i>) window is not original and was probably added after WWII.</p> <p>Kyson Comment: Objector is correct in saying that the fact that the fabric is beyond repair does not necessarily justify the removal. However the choice for a contemporary replacement serves two purposes. Firstly, strengthening the status of the listed building by introducing a contrasting, subservient design. Materials are modern but tone and colour blend in with the existing colour palette. Extensions to listed buildings - in a respectful contemporary style - are a long established and respected way of allowing the evolution of listed buildings over time to be legible and subservient. Secondly the extension forms a crucial link between the house and the landscaped garden. The overall composition seeks to strengthen</p>

	<p>the setting of the listed building which had been neglected over decades, thus preserving heritage for the generations to come.</p> <p>Note: The bay window has been established as a non-original/ post war addition by Heritage Experts and Camden’s Conservation Officer. The replacement with a contemporary design was supported in pre-application advice. Refer to ‘Design Overview’ within the Planning Brochure produced by Kyson.</p>
<p>Basement Impact Assessment</p>	
<p><i>The groundwater regime within the superficial deposits surrounding site and at site itself has not been fully understood and therefore the impact on the surrounding properties of interfering with its by damming it and diverting it has not been adequately recognised.</i></p>	<p>GGC: <u>None</u> of the six exploratory holes (three boreholes and three trial pits) found any superficial deposits. The BIA acknowledged that there remains a possibility that such deposits might be present locally, whilst noting that they “...would be expected to consist of clays or sandy clays...” (BIA paragraph 10.1.1) so no widespread highly permeable superficial deposits are likely to be present. The BIA also noted/recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The existing foundations and cellar to No.24 will already obstruct any flows of perched groundwater at shallow depth” (10.2.6) • “use of design groundwater levels at the adjacent ground level is recommended for the whole basement” (10.2.8, in accordance with British and European standards) • “In the unlikely event that the basement excavations do encounter a local deposit of more permeable soils of very limited lateral width, containing mobile groundwater which has remained undetected within the London Clay (or any Head deposits), of sufficient thickness and extent to permit significant flow, then it is possible that an engineered groundwater bypass might be required. That bypass would have to be detailed once the geometry of the permeable soil unit is known” (10.2.7). <p>Thus, all conceivable scenarios (long-term and during construction) have been covered in the BIA and no adverse impact is expected on No.24 or the surrounding properties.</p>

<p><i>Mitigation measures for engineering a solution to these problems are mentioned but not detailed. They should be as they do not form part of the detailed design, which essentially dimensions the proposals, but of the basic design, i.e the proposal itself.</i></p>	<p>As noted above, "In the unlikely event that ... an engineered groundwater bypass might be required. That bypass would have to be detailed once the geometry of the permeable soil unit is known" (10.2.7). If a bypass is required, the collection zone and the discharge zone would be installed on the rear face of the specific underpins and at appropriate levels for the permeable horizon, so until the location of that permeable horizon is known it is simply not possible to provide full details.</p>
<p><i>It is proposed that groundwater may be controlled during the excavation of the basement by the use of a well pointing system, the effect of which on neighbouring properties has not been determined and has the potential to induce settlement.</i></p>	<p>Well pointing would only be applicable if any significant horizons of permeable silts or sands are encountered in the excavations; no such horizons were found in the boreholes. Local seepages from the clays would be amenable to removal by sump pumping, as noted in BIA paragraph 10.3.1. The well points would only remove the free water from the silts/sands; they would have minimal impact on the clays because of the low permeability of the clays which would result in minimal, if any, consolidation (and any consolidation which does occur will be allowed for in our damage category assessment because the CIRIA settlement data are based on actual monitoring data from past projects, most of which were in London Clay). As the neighbouring houses, in common with No.24, are expected to be founded predominantly/wholly on clays no adverse impact is anticipated.</p>
<p><i>Groundwater levels within London Clay below the excavation should be confirmed prior to any construction works. The implications for assuming incorrect groundwater levels could be extremely serious for neighbouring properties.</i></p>	<p>This suggestion is inappropriate, because both British and European design standards require use of worst credible groundwater levels which, in sites such as this where high plasticity clays are present close to surface, means designing for groundwater at ground level. BIA paragraph 10.2.8 recommended "use of design groundwater levels at the adjacent ground level ... for the whole basement".</p>
<p><i>The likely presence of shear surfaces within the Head deposit/ weathered London Clay has implications for the stability neighbouring properties [sic] which have not been considered in the BIA.</i></p>	<p>Paragraph 10.4.2 in the BIA identified the possible presence of solifluction shear surfaces in the London Clay and gave recommendations on the precautions which should be taken, in both design and construction, to ensure that they have no adverse impact on the basement. Provided these precautions are implemented then there should be no risk/impact for the neighbouring properties.</p>

<p><i>The assessment of potential damage has not used site specific data and is thus of unconfirmed validity.</i></p>	<p>The building geometries, the excavation geometries and the soil parameters used for the PDISP analyses were all site-specific. The only aspect of the damage category assessments which was not site-specific was the CIRIA monitoring data, use of which is now the industry-standard approach.</p>
<p><i>Impact on Residential Amenity</i></p>	
<p>1) Kyson Comment: There was an objection about the windows to the side of the 1st floor extension causing overlooking issue. Please check</p> <p>2) <i>New first floor [rear] window [from bathroom] will result in increased overlooking of the garden and rear ground floor bay window.</i></p> <p>3) Kyson Comment: There was an objection about the side extension being too close and this was causing loss of light. Please check</p>	<p>Kyson Comments:</p> <p>1) Windows to the side of the 1st floor extension can be changed to obscure glazing.</p> <p>Note: Smaller side windows at No. 23 are within bathrooms/ en-suites, the large window serves the staircase.</p> <p>2) The small bathroom window is set back approx. 1.8m from the existing rear wall. The view is not different from the view that can already be enjoyed from the larger window in the Master Bedroom.</p> <p>3) A daylight & sunlight study has been carried out at No.23. Please refer to the report by Point 2 Surveyors.</p> <p>Note: Smaller side windows at No. 23 are within bathrooms/ en-suites, the large window serves the staircase.</p>
<p><i>Loss of Trees</i></p>	
<p><i>Lack of justification for the loss of tree within a Conservation Area.</i></p>	<p>The Arboricultural Impact Assessment has assessed the loss and retention of all of the trees on the site. When discussion the two large Yew trees to</p>

the rear it is concluded that they *“outgrown its positions and will need to be removed to allow improvement to the landscaped area”*.

The current garden is in a state of disrepair and the vegetation has generally been recently unmanaged. It is considered appropriate to remove those trees of low value, which will allow better management of the higher value trees to be retained and to allow the garden to be restored to better management into the future. This includes the removal of a group of trees that are generally self-sown and with misshapen crowns due to their proximity to larger trees. Works are also recommended to some of the larger trees to be retained, to improve the condition and general management of these trees as well the existing garden area.

It is also considered that Tree 15 Yew and Tree 16 Yew have outgrown their position and are causing damage to hard landscaping within the garden. It is considered that these trees should be removed to allow improvement to the landscaped garden area. The removal of these trees may be mitigated with suitable replacement planting within the garden, utilising species more appropriate for the garden and less competitive to existing larger trees to be retained. It is recommended that such replacement planting is native species and chosen for the benefits of improved biodiversity.

This mitigation is provided through the detailed landscaping proposals submitted as part of the application for planning permission and Listed Building Consent.

In addition, the detailed Ecology Survey concluded that the Site has negligible potential in terms of bat roosts and not further surveys are proposed.

	<p>Additional comments for consideration:</p> <p>Unfortunately some of the trees are not salvageable due to rot (e.g. the cherry tree) or they cause damage to other species by overshadowing (yew trees). The new landscape design seeks to plant a great number of new native trees, shrubs and hedges which will provide screening, enhance the local micro-climate and provide a great habitat for flora and fauna.</p> <p>Note: Refer to comparison sheet showing existing and proposed planting for better overview.</p>
<p>Plant Noise</p>	
<p><i>Increased noise as a result of plant associated with the heating, cooling and swimming pool. Noise Impact Assessment has not taken account the noise that would be experienced in neighbouring gardens from the proposed plant.</i></p>	<p>Kyson Comment:</p> <p>An updated Noise Impact Assessment was commissioned collecting data from the rear of No. 23. Please refer to the Noise Impact Assessment by Clement Acoustics. Although the detail was already robust in the original report, the acoustic enclosure has been swapped with the shed opposite in order to give the objecting neighbour additional peace of mind.</p> <p>Note: 1 No condenser is proposed within the rear garden. The enclosure will be designed to a high standard to mitigate noise and protect the amenity of all residents. This is in the very interest of our client as she is very sensitive to noise herself.</p>