

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	13/10/2011
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	22/09/2011
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Neil McDonald			2011/4165/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
All Hallows Church Savernake Road London NW3 2DL			Please see draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
The erection of a single storey extension to the south elevation of the church; landscaping works to western frontage including new hardstanding with vehicular crossover from Savernake Road and re-levelling at south-west corner with steps up from Shirlock Road to the existing church (Class D1).				
Recommendation(s):		Refuse		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	02	No. of responses	04	No. of objections	03
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Site notice 26/08/11 – 16/09/2011, press advertisement 01/09/11 – 22/09/11</p> <p>The adjoining neighbour at No 56 Shirlock Road has objected on grounds of likely impact on daylight and sunlight reaching their flank wall kitchen window. They also refer to a discrepancy in the drawings where a proposed door in the east elevation of the extension leading to Corthorpe Street and stepped access to it is shown on the ground floor plan but not on the elevation. They would oppose such an entrance as it would afford potential intruders a foothold to access the rear flat roof and garden of No. 56 compromising their security (this aspect has since been omitted from the plan). Regarding other matters they express concerns about parking and level of noise if the church increases its concert and performance venue activities as a result of these proposals.</p> <p>The occupiers of 51, 52 and 54 Shirlock Road also commented/objected referring to the security matters, increased parking, noise and comings and goings from events as referred to by the objector above. One of these suggests conditions be imposed limiting frequency and hours of use.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>Mansfield CAAC object to the works affecting this Grade II* listed building and consider the application perhaps the most important in the CA to have been considered in the last 10 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The CAAC consider the alterations are a totally inadequate and unpleasant response to this historical building and must be fundamentally different if to be granted in any form. The quality of the pastiche stone side extension with novelty unhistoric arch and curved roof would deface this central building within the CA. A high quality design solution might be acceptable if necessary to serve needed functions of the church.- Any extension should be set back from the front wall of the church on Shirlock Road, be clearly different in fabric and should be far more respectful of the historic building. The totally inappropriate use of an arch form of non-authentic design is an insult.- Also insulting is the mocking and alterations to the war memorial in order to provide an off-street parking space. There is easily scope for disabled parking to be provided on the roads.					

Site Description

The site comprises a Grade II* listed church constructed in 1889-1901 by James Brooks with later alterations in 1913 by Sir Giles Gilbert Scott. It is located on the south side of Savernake Road between the junctions with Courthorpe Road and Shirlock Road having frontage onto each. It forms part of the Mansfield Conservation Area within which it is considered to be a “focal building”.

Relevant History

There is no recent planning history of any relevance, although at some point since its original construction a two-storey church hall was added to the south side of the church on the Courthorpe Road frontage.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 – managing impact of growth, CS10 – supporting community facilities and services, CS14 – high quality places and conserving heritage, CS15 – parks, open spaces and biodiversity, CS17 – Making Camden a safer place, DP15 – community and leisure uses, DP16 – the transport implications of development, DP18 – parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking, DP19 – Managing the impact of parking, DP23 – water, DP24 – high quality design, DP25 – conserving Camden’s heritage, DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours, DP29 – improving access

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

Mansfield Conservation Area Appraisal, December 2008.

Assessment

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey extension to the south elevation of the church together with landscaping works to the western frontage providing for a disabled car parking space and re-levelling and paving to improve access and circulation between the various existing and proposed entrances to the church.

The need for the works arises from the poor access currently attained to the toilet and kitchen facilities which can only be approached via winding stone steps to the basement. The proposed extension would house disabled and other toilets, a new parish meeting room, kitchenette and a vestry.

Listed Building and Conservation Area considerations

All Hallows Church is a Grade II* listed building and considered to be a “focal building” within the Mansfield Conservation Area. The interior is also of exceptional value.

The listed church enjoys ecclesiastical exemption from the need for Listed Building consent, but works requiring planning permission can be considered in terms of their impact on the listed building.

It is accepted that the provision of accessible toilets is a reasonable alteration which would best be accommodated in an extension since this could not be readily accommodated without causing harm to the interior of the church.

However the extension as proposed would truncate the buttresses which are an important and robust feature of the church and would erode the gap between the church and Shirlock Road. The size and extent of the proposed structure is therefore considered unacceptable. For an extension in this location to be considered acceptable it would need to be set well back from the frontage to maintain the perception of the gap in longer, more oblique views and leave at least the first couple of buttresses exposed.

The design detail appears a watered down version of the church. Whilst an arched entrance is found on the entrance doors and windows, these are grand features on the church. It is inappropriate to transpose scaled down features of the original church in this way and instead the design of the extension should be completely subservient. This could be done either in the form of a more traditional design using matching materials, or a contemporary and honest design –but in a way that would be completely subservient. In its current form the proposal is neither acceptable in terms of its scale and form, or its detailed design and would have a detrimental effect on the special interest of this listed church and the character and appearance of the Mansfield Conservation Area.

The proposed car parking space would necessitate harmful alterations to the existing low retaining wall to this part of the boundary and the appearance of the car(s) so close to the building would harm its setting. The harm from this aspect of the proposals would be further exacerbated by the need arising in this connection to relocate the existing memorial so that it is crammed up against the side of the building.

Landscape

It appears that an Ash tree on the corner of Savernake Road and Shirlock Road would need to be removed to make way for the parking space. Despite its nearness to a London Plane, this ash tree is considered to provide a high level of visual amenity and should be retained. The proposals also increase the areas of hard standing around the church to provide for improved access and ease of circulation generally between the various entrances. This would have the potential effect of increasing water run-off and loss of opportunities for planting and solutions such as permeable paving and increased planting areas should be explored through submission of further details/revisions in the context of an otherwise acceptable scheme. The proposed re-levelling works, 'ragstone' containing wall and access steps are not in themselves considered harmful in any way.

Transport

The Crossover to access this car park would necessitate a crossover from Savernake Road. This is unacceptable so close to the junction with Shirlock Road due to road safety issues. Vehicles exiting the proposed parking space would not be clearly visible to vehicles on Shirlock Road wishing to turn right. Likewise a vehicle in the proposed parking space would not have a clear view of vehicles in Shirlock Road which may be about to turn right into their path particularly since there is no room to turn around in the space, so vehicles would have to either reverse into the space from the road, or reverse out of it onto the road.

As an alternative option the possibility of allocating a disabled bay on-street could be explored with LBC Traffic Management Team but this would need to be subject to consultation, could not be given exclusive use to the Church and the Church would have to pay for the Council's costs involved in the procedural issues around this.

Impacts on neighbours

The proposed extension would be far lesser in height than the main church building and would not cause any additional impact on sunlight and daylight reaching neighbouring residential properties. Despite its close proximity to the windows (serving the kitchen) in the flank northern elevation of 56 Shirlock Road the proposal would not breach the existing line of vision between these windows and the visible sky above the church. The proposed development would incorporate a 1 metre wide lightwell to maintain existing light and ventilation to these windows, and due to the close proximity and imposing presence of the existing church the sense of enclosure to/outlook from the affected kitchen would not be materially worsened.

Concerns about security caused by a proposed secondary entrance door to the vestry and associated access steps have been addressed by the removal of these features from the proposals.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444