



Date: 26/10/2017
Our ref: 2017/4569/PRE
Contact: Fiona Davies
Direct line: 020 7974 [4034]
Email: Fiona.davies@camden.gov.uk

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

Simon Judd
 Judd Architecture
 10 Tonbridge Road
 Barming
 Maidstone
 Kent
 ME16]

www.camden.gov.uk/planning

By email

Dear Simon Judd

Re: Netley Cottage, 10 Lower Terrace

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry for the above property.

1. Drawings and documents reviewed

- Pre-application document
- Plans, elevations – existing and proposed
- Photographs, illustration and historic article

2. Proposal

2.1 Construction of a two storey annex extension to the side of Netley Cottage (Class C3).

2.2 Site description

The application site is a Grade II Listed detached house. The garden wall is also included in the listing. It lies within the Hampstead Conservation Area. This part of the Conservation Area is characterised by winding lanes, small open green spaces and high brick walls with abundant foliage, giving a very rural feel. The building dates from c.1779 and was probably formerly a farmhouse. Its southwest extension was added c.1910. The building contains stucco with hipped tiled roofs.

3. Relevant planning history

2013/0480/P and 2013/0495/L - Excavation of part of the garden area to incorporate a swimming pool with associated facilities to residential dwelling. (Class C3) – Refused on 14/06/2013

LWX0002938 - Alterations to existing boundary wall including increase in height by 1 metre, as shown by drawing numbers – Granted LB consent with conditions on 16/01/2001.

PWX0002939 - Alterations to existing boundary wall including increase in height by 1 metre – Granted conditional planning permission on 16/01/2001.

HB1554 - The erection of a single storey extension, cladding of part of first floor with weatherboarding, and carrying out of internal works – Conditional planning permission granted on 24/05/1977

4. Relevant policies and guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan 2016

LB Camden Local Plan 2017

A1 Managing the impact of development

A3 Protection, enhancement and management of biodiversity

A4 Noise and vibration

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 (Design) 2015

CPG2 (Housing) 2016

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011

Hampstead Conservation Area Statement, October 2002

5. Assessment

Following our recent site visit accompanied by Senior Conservation Officer Alfie Stroud, please see here our assessment of the proposals:

Proposed design

The proposed structure would relate to the existing complex of eighteenth-century cottage and extensions in an irregular manner, having a rectangular appearance typical of a garden outbuilding and which sets it apart from the oddly shaped ground-floor extension of the late twentieth century. However, sitting so close to the main building complex, the structure would not have the verdant setting typical of a garden building and would still contribute to the overall mass of the main house complex.

The proposed pavilion would visually associate itself with the original cottage and extensions by adopting a traditional architectural style. While the uninterrupted hipped roof and flat eaves, multi-pane sash windows and other details would in this way defer to the main cottage, this traditional approach reduces opportunities to more honestly expose the site's development and opportunities to identify the original sections of the building.

Impact on significance

There are two routes of approaching the cottage: one from the principal gateway on the corner of the garden opposite the house, and another in the southernmost outer corner of the plot, which is today the main arrival view. The proposal would terminate this latter view entirely with a new flat elevation, reducing one means of appreciating the significance of the historic site; and it would appear as a significant foreground feature as one approaches the

cottage from the principal gateway too, likely giving an exaggerated impression of the total amount of development, due to the irregular plot boundary.

While in the absolute height of its eaves the proposed pavilion would sit below the main house and historic two-storey extension, in its position forward of the building lines and the accentuation of its mass and volume by its separation from the main building complex, the proposal would fail to remain subservient to the most significant part of the listed building.

The original eighteenth-century cottage already only barely enjoys visual and architectural precedence over its early and later twentieth-century extensions, and this is thanks to its position in the garden plot and the sophistication of its fenestration and roof form. The addition of another hipped roof, and the elaboration of the building's footprint into a still more elongated and irregular form would further erode the predominance of the original cottage.

Connection into an extension through or by modification of the existing rooms of the twentieth century extensions may be acceptable, since the plan-form of these rooms is of limited historic significance.

Alternative approaches

It is only practically possible to connect a new structure into the corner of the house shared by the twentieth-century extensions. Not being very historic, the fabric is of limited significance at this end of the house, and a larger amount could be acceptably altered to make connection into a new extension.

An architectural approach which integrated a new structure more closely with the existing fabric could provide internal floor space of an area comparable to that proposed with less overall additional mass. A new structure may be able to make use of the space which currently serves as a bin store, although the boundary wall in this area does have significance for its historic appearance and as evidence of historic layout.

An extension over one or two floors attached to this end of the building should take care to minimise its bulk and height, remaining subservient in style and massing. Two strategies which could help to achieve this are: using a flat-roof which could tuck under the eaves of the two-storey extension; and using an irregular form which could soften the new form, reduce its prominence, and help to visually distinguish it. Such moves would seem to encourage the use of a non-traditional style.

Removing the proposed independent garden room to reduce the overall size of the extension, and some limited excavation, could both help to further reduce the impact of the proposed structure on the historic host building, which the proposals as submitted threaten to overdevelop.

7. Amenity

As noted, the proposal in its current form would introduce an overly bulky and dominant extension. Nevertheless, due to the configuration of the site we consider that a subservient add-on extension to the existing twentieth century addition, if carefully set beneath the eaves of the existing extension as advised, would not introduce any concerns with regard to detrimental harm to residential amenity of the surrounding properties, these being Grove Lodge adjacent to the south and Grove End adjacent to the north.

In the case of Grove End, due to the step down in the application site and existing different height levels, any modestly scaled extension would not raise any concerns with regard to detrimental harm to residential amenity of this neighbouring property.

6. Conclusion

In the main we feel that the current proposal would cause harm to the setting of the listed building and obscure important views to it. Thus we consider that at present the proposal would be unlikely to be supported at application stage.

Furthermore with its current proposed location and prominence the annex would not be a coherent addition to the listed property and would cause some problematic access and site configuration and add unwanted bulk. Its dominance would detract from the original dwelling house. Any alternative proposal must seek to preserve the qualities that define this listed building and its setting by taking a more subservient approach.

7. Planning application information

8.1 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 – Householder application
- An ordnance survey based location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red.
- Existing and proposed plans, sections and elevations
- Design and access statement
- Heritage statement
- The appropriate fee of £172]
- Please see [supporting information for planning applications](#) for more information.

8.2 We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would include the application in our application e-alert summary, put up a notice on or near the site and, advertise in a local newspaper. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.

8.3 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 Fiona Davies on 0207 974 4034.

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

Yours sincerely,

Fiona Davies
Planning Officer
Planning Solutions Team