



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

Date: 02/02/2018
Our ref: 2017/6267/PRE
Contact: John Diver
Direct line: 020 7974 6368
Email: john.diver@camden.gov.uk

Mr Keith Tillman
[REDACTED]

By email

www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Dear Keith,

Re: Flat D, 20 East Heath Road, London, NW3 1AJ

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry for the above property which was received together with the required fee of £426.00. These notes were informed by a site visit by planning and conservation officers completed on the 08 December 2017. Following this meeting it was requested that a revised scheme could be submitted for comment. It was later confirmed that no such plans would be forthcoming following your client's preference. Advice has therefore been issued based upon the initial pack submitted as requested.

1. Drawings and documents

- 1.1. The following documentation was submitted in support of the pre-application request:
- Covering Letter produced by Guard Tillman Pollack Ltd
 - Existing site plan and photos (4282.PR.APP.01)
 - Existing plans, side (East) and front (North) elevation drawings (@1:100)
 - Proposed plans, side (East) and front (North) elevation drawings (@1:100)

2. Proposal

- 2.1. Advice is requested in relation to the alterations to the top floor maisonette flat (Flat D) within the host property. The development would include the following proposed elements:
- Installation of a dormer window and no.4 roof lights to the Eastern side roof slope
 - A further 2 rooflights to the back slope of the East facing gable
 - Repositioning of the external terrace to the west side of the building and enlargement of the existing side dormer window to this side
 - Addition of a round window to the front elevation at 3rd floor level
 - Replacement of existing railings and doors to the front elevation at 3rd floor level
- 2.2. The works would not result in any changes of use or increase to the number of residential units within the property. During the site visit, it was noted that any formal application could potentially include the replacement of the existing uPVC windows to the Eastern side elevation of the property. Comment will therefore also be provided regarding this.

3. Site description

- 3.1. The application site relates to a 3 storey (plus lower ground floor and loft) detached former mansion house on the South side of East Heath Road, NW3. The property has been subject

to subdivision as well as various alterations and as a result is host to four self-contained residential flats. This advice relates to the top floor mezzanine apartment (Flat D).

- 3.2. The application site is located within the Hampstead Conservation Area (sub area two) although the property is not statutorily listed. The Hampstead Conservation Area Statement (adopted 2001) classifies the application property as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.

4. **Relevant planning history**

- 4.1. The following planning history is relevant to this site:

No.20 (Application Site)

8400627: Planning permission was granted on the 23/07/1984 for the '*Construction of a new roof dormer and terrace to the side elevation*'

D7/5/3/36970: Planning permission was granted on the 21/11/1983 for the '*Formation of a new side entrance and window at ground floor level*'

D7/5/3/33226R2: Planning permission was granted on the 11/05/1982 for the '*External alterations to upper maisonette*'

P9603244: Certificate of lawfulness (existing) was granted on the 05/12/1996 for the '*Use of the upper ground floor as a self contained three bedroom flat*'

D7/5/3/955: Planning permission was granted on the 16/05/1958 for the '*Erection of four prefabricated lock-up garages at the rear of No. 20*'

D7/5/3/8273: Planning permission was granted on the 09/09/1957 for '*The erection of four lock-up garages at the rear of No. 20*'

5. **Relevant policies and guidance**

- 5.1. The following policies would be relevant in the determination of the proposed works:

- [National Planning Policy Framework \(2012\)](#)
- [London Plan \(2016\)](#)
- [LB Camden Local Plan \(2017\)](#)
 - A1 Managing the impact of development
 - A4 Noise and vibration
 - D1 Design
 - D2 Heritage
- [Supplementary Guidance](#)
 - CPG 1 – Design
 - CPG 6 – Amenity
 - Hampstead Conservation Area Design Guide
- Hampstead [Conservation Area Statement \(2001\)](#)

5.2. It should also be noted that at the time of writing the Council was undergoing public consultation for the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan. The plan is currently undergoing a public examination process. Following formal adoption (expected towards the end of February) this plan will be afforded substantial weight in planning decisions. A copy of the draft submission version of the plan can be found [here](#).

5.3. The relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies would be as follows:

- Policy DH1: Design
- Policy DH2: Conservation areas and listed buildings

6. Assessment

6.1. The main issues to consider in this case are as follows:

- Design and conservation;
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;

Design and Conservation

Policy context:

6.2. Policy D1 (Design) states that the Council will seek to secure high quality design in all cases. This policy states that in order to demonstrate high quality, developments should meet several criteria including: respecting local context and character; be sustainable and durable; comprise details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character. It continues to state that the Council will resist development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. Policy D2 (Heritage) states that with Conservation Areas the Council will require that developments preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area.

6.3. Further to the above, Policy DH2 (Conservation) of the draft Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan states that new development should take advantage of opportunities to enhance the Conservation Areas (CA) by protecting and, where appropriate, restoring original architectural features, including walls, windows, doors, etc., that would make a positive contribution to the CA.

6.4. With regard to roof alterations, Chapter 5 of CPG1 (Design) sets out the Council's expectations in terms of design. For roof dormers, CPG1 states that such extensions should be sensitive changes which maintain the overall structure of the existing roof form. It advises that dormer windows should meet a number of criteria including: being proportionately scaled and sited to sit within their roofslope, set away from all edges by a minimum of 0.5m; relate to the façade below and the surface area of the roofslope; should remain subordinate additions; and should utilise materials that complement the surrounding townscape. Similarly, with regard to the addition of rooflights, CPG1 states that roof lights should be proportioned to be significantly subordinate both in size and number and should be fitted flush with the roof surface.

Assessment

6.5. The application property is a large, red brick, late Victorian villa that sits within a short row of three similar properties (Nos.18-20) on the South side of the street and opposes the Heath. These properties all feature a high level of detailing, prominent and decorative roofs and are all considered to positively contribute to the CA. As aforementioned, the property has historically been altered in a number of ways including roof extensions to the Western slope, replacement fenestration throughout as well as the addition of a side entrance for access to

the upper floor flats. Notwithstanding this, the property still broadly exhibits its original character and appearance.

- 6.6. Planning and conservation officers consider that the proposed alterations would both cumulatively as well as individually undermine the character and appearance of the host property and would thus be unlikely to be supported in their current form. As full elevations or section drawings were not submitted, only limited comment can be given in terms of the design of these proposed elements, however, the following advice is offered based upon the information presented.

Roof alterations

- 6.7. To the Eastern roof slope, the proposed additional dormer window would have a ridge height and be positioned in such a way that it would conflict with the original East facing gable and would disrupt how this architectural element is read in public views. To this same roof slope, the proposed no.4 rooflights would appear excessive and would begin to dominate this roof slope. Whilst the proposed positioning of this dormer is understood to have been informed by the location of the existing stair, this would not overcome the perceived harm to the characteristic roofscape of the property and would not be supported.
- 6.8. Officers are of the view that there may be scope for a smaller dormer, positioned more centrally in the roof slope (away from the Eastern gable and if possible in line with the windows to the main stair on the side façade below). A smaller dormer more appropriately positioned would be expected to be clad in a material such as black zinc to complement the original pan tiled roof. Should such a scheme be possible, a reduced number of rooflights might be acceptable if appropriately positioned to balance this dormer. It is noted that the feasibility of such a revision would clearly depend upon the practicalities of the relocation of the internal stair.
- 6.9. To the rear slope of the East-facing gable, officers consider that the addition of a rooflight would be acceptable considering its more concealed siting. It is however advised that the number proposed to this slope is reduced to one, with the higher rooflight adjacent to the ridge line being omitted to preserve the integrity of this roof slope.
- 6.10. To the Western roof slope, the existing roof alterations are insensitive in terms of their scale and design and as such, any alteration that might exacerbate this impact would be strongly discouraged. The proposed widening of the existing dormer to align with the front chimney stack would significantly increase the visual impact of this element, would fail to read as a subordinate addition within the side roof slope and would be considered to severely undermine the character of the property. Although it is noted that this side of the property is less prominent in public views, public views are still afforded from East Heath road and the roof is also visible in a number of private views from surrounding properties.
- 6.11. Similarly to the above, officers maintain the view that there may be some possibility to improve the existing situation and even possibly enlarge the existing dormer slightly by incorporating the existing external terrace, however the impacts formed by such enlargements would be expected to be balanced by improvements to the existing situation. For instance, if the dormer were to be set in from the Western eaves and re-clad in a more sympathetic and durable material this might help alleviate the visual impact of a slight increase in width. Any enlargements would however be expected to sit away from the front chimneystack. The provision of the rear terrace is less objectionable considering the existing dormer structure.

Elevation alterations

- 6.12. Further to the above, a number of external elevational alterations are proposed including the replacement of 3rd floor front doors and window (above projecting bays); the raising of the metal railing to form a balcony as well as the installation of a round window to the front gable.
- 6.13. At present, the existing front uPVC windows and doors at 3rd floor level significantly detract from the character of the property. Their replacement with more sympathetically designed, timber-framed alternatives would therefore be welcomed. It is noted that the glazing pattern to the proposed window reflects those seen at the adjacent property, which are believed to be true to their original form. It is recommended that a similar approach is also taken to the proposed replacement French doors to further unify the appearance of the building. Although the application of metal railings are not generally supported on principal elevations, as the railings are in situ and the increased required would be very minor, on balance this alteration would not be objectionable. These railings should remain traditional in form and should be painted black.
- 6.14. Although it is noted that the adjacent property (no.19) has been altered to include an round window to the front gable, officers advise against this proposed element. To the front of the existing gable, the original red brickwork and vent detailing are retained and are highly characteristic. In line with policy DH2 of the emerging Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan, there is a requirement for the retention or even replacement of architectural features of character/interest within the CA, particularly for positive contributors. In this case, the loss of further original detailing would thus be objectionable and it is recommended that this element is omitted.
- 6.15. Finally, during the site visit discussions were held as to the potential for a formal application to include works to replace the insensitive fenestration that has been applied across the property with windows more aligned with their original form and glazing pattern. Officers agree that the variety and non-traditional form of replacement windows added across the property act to partially undermined its character. Were proposals to incorporate wholesale replacement with more sympathetic, traditional and characterful fenestrations, officers considered that their might be potential to significantly enhance the character of the property. Such works would likely be considered to represent a 'heritage gain' for the positive contributor in the planning balance assessment of any formal application and as such would be welcomed. Were these works to be pursued, officers would however recommend that further research is taken place to confirm the original design of windows and for any replacements to be informed by this research.

Neighbouring Amenity

- 6.16. Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) confirms that the Council will not grant permission for developments that would result in harm to the quality of life for surrounding occupiers and neighbours. For a development of this kind, the main considerations outlined by this policy would be impacts in terms of privacy, outlook, natural light, and noise.
- 6.17. Considering the siting of the proposed roof alterations relative to neighbouring properties, it is not considered that the works proposed would result in any loss of outlook or natural light to any neighbouring resident. Considering the position of the existing terrace, it is also not considered that the works would cause any loss of privacy. It should be noted though that there may be a requirement to install obscure glazing to the East facing proposed dormer depending on its final siting, relative to facing windows at no.19 in order to protect privacy. This would need to be considered based upon revised plans. As the works would not result in any increase to the number of units, officers do not consider that the works would result in any issues of noise or disturbances.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1. At present, the proposed scheme is considered to result in detrimental harm to the character and appearance of the host building, which is listed as forming a positive contribution to the Hampstead Conservation Area. The works proposed would result in an improved and enlarged unit for the applicants, but would not deliver any public benefits. The scheme would thus be contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan as well as policy DH2 of the emerging Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan. Officers would therefore not support the scheme in its current form and would discourage a formal application.
- 7.2. Officers do however feel that there may be scope to address the concerns outlined above via a more sympathetic approach. If an amended / reduced scheme were proposed which incorporated heritage benefits to the host building, the above conclusion could potentially be altered however, this remains to be seen.

8. Consultation

- 8.1. Should you choose to further pursue the proposed works, you are encouraged to engage with neighbouring occupiers, the Hampstead Conservation Area Advisory Committee and the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum at an early stage in the process, given the heritage sensitivities of the site. Although adjoining occupiers as well as local stakeholders will be notified of any application by us, initial consultation is strongly encouraged before any application is submitted.

- 8.2. The CAAC's contact details are as follows:

John Malet-Bates (Chair)



- 8.3. The Neighbourhood Forum's contact details are as follows:

Janine Griffis (Chair)



9. Planning application information

- 9.1. If you 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 permission]
 - 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'
 - Design and access statement
 - Sample photographs/manufacturer details of proposed cladding materials
 - The appropriate fee [£207 (alterations to Flat D only) / £407 (more than one flat)]
 - Please see [supporting information for planning applications](#) for more information.
- 9.2. We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would notify neighbours by sending out e-alerts, putting up notices on or near

the site and advertising in a local newspaper. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.

- 9.3. It is likely that that a proposal of this size would be 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 me direct.

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

Yours sincerely,

John Diver
Senior Planning Officer
Regeneration and Planning
Supporting Communities
London Borough of Camden
Telephone: 02079746368
Web: camden.gov.uk