

FAO Laura Hazelton and Collette Hatton
Planning and Conservation Department
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE

Our ref: 8292 - SK

4 November 2020

Dear Laura and Collette

Application under Section 73 for variation to Condition 2 of 2019/0319/P and for Listed Building Consent at 24 Heath Drive, London, NW3 7SB

Planning Portal Reference: PP-09221922

We write further to our recent meetings and correspondence on the above applications for alterations to the above planning applications. Thank you for taking the time to discuss the plans with the Applicant's project team.

This letter is supported by the following documents:

- Additional Heritage Statement prepared by Purcell;
- Revised Planning Brochure with visualisations by Kyson Architects.

Background

We met with you both virtually on 30 July 2020 to discuss the initial comments on the applications about previous planning applications ref. 2020/1619/P and 2020/1646/L. During discussions we resolved the following:

- That the proposed changes to the first-floor store cupboards would be made;
- That on the layout plans we would propose only moveable furniture, so as not to cover up fireplaces;
- That where Crittal is proposed, we would change all doors to be timber instead with glazed panels; and
- That on the rear elevation the window position was adjusted to be central, where previously it was not.

We met again on 10 August 2020 to discuss two outstanding issues. Firstly, we discussed options for the subdivision of first floor bedroom en-suite into a dressing room and en-suite bathroom and we agreed to retain the room as a single en-suite bathroom, removing the proposed partition from the applications.

Secondly, having circulated sketches of a potential single storey rear extension, we discussed the benefits of a revised extension rather than proposing the remove the wall in the kitchen. We welcomed the opportunity to review this element of the plans and to accommodate the kitchen in the extension rather than removing part of an originally external wall. Your comments was that the use of Corten is preferred, in a lightweight construction with glazing. We discussed whether the side elevation with the door should be set in from the original stepped rear elevation or whether it should extend that line. The conclusion of the discussion was that the revised extension should project



from that line, to maintain plan layout, and harmonise better with the existing built form. The rear elevation can still be read well due to the different materials and lightweight appearance of the extension.

Following the meeting we reissued a sketch of the proposed revised single storey rear extension, with a written comment feedback that the frame should be more lightweight. Subsequently, the seams of Corten between the windows have been designed at its thinnest, although the depth is restricted due to the required depths of the frame as a whole to match the required wall thickness of the rear extension.

The proposals that are subject of this application for Planning and Listed Building Consent relate to the revised design of a single storey rear extension to provide for the relocation of the kitchen. The other internal alterations are subject of a non-material amendment application made under S96a and associated application for Listed Building Consent. This approach was agreed in writing on 8 October 2020. Our intention is that application ref. 2020/1619/P will be converted to the NMA and continue with the application ref. 2020/1646/L with revised plans to reflect our discussions and changes set out above.

In terms of design and access, the main change to the external appearance of the building is the revised single storey rear extension. This will alter the overall layout and appearance from the rear but is insignificant in the overall view of the site compared to approved applications. The materials proposed for the proposed rear extension are similar to that previously approved and we were in agreement on the use of Corten for the main external material. There will be no significant changes to landscaping and no impact on access to the site as a result of these revisions.

With regard to heritage, this is being assessed by David Hills at Purcell and a written assessment forms part of this submission.

We trust you find the above to be helpful. Should you require further assistance please do not hesitate to contact the writer.

Yours sincerely
BELL CORNWELL LLP

Sarah Kasparian
Principal Planner
skasparian@bell-cornwell.co.uk
020 3960 1531