

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 23rd March 2009. For further information see

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	29/01/2009
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	09/02/2009
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Elizabeth Beaumont			2008/5878/P and 2009/0201/L	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
2 Heathside London NW3 1BL			Please refer to decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
<u>Planning Permission:</u> Alterations and extension to the single dwellinghouse (Class C3) including erection of a glazed infill extension at first floor level, erection of chimney pots, replacement garage door, new french doors and windows on the rear elevation, and alterations to rooflights.				
<u>Listed Building:</u> Internal and external alterations to the single dwellinghouse (Class C3) including erection of a glazed infill extension at first floor level, erection of chimney pots, replacement garage door, new french doors and windows on the rear elevation, alterations to rooflights and demolition of small lean-to shed at rear of house and internal alterations.				
Recommendation(s):	Grant Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent			
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	10	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	Site notice expired on the 09.02.2009 – no responses received					
CAAC comments:	<p><u>Hampstead CAAC</u>- we saw an incomplete version of this application on the 28th October, this is a very important and conspicuous building in the conservation area. Object strongly to the replacement of the garage door which matches no other element on the front elevation. We suggest reference to the left hand ground floor elevation. We considered the design of the new bay window on the rear elevation to be especially objectionable. It is both ugly and obtrusive.</p> <p>(Please refer to paragraphs 3 – 3.8)</p>					

Site Description

The site is located on the northwest side of Heathside, in the Hampstead Conservation Area. The property is Grade II Listed and forms part of a semi detached pair of cottages, now one single dwelling house, constructed in the late 18th/early 19th century by James Wyatt.

Relevant History

06.11.2008 – Planning application and listed building consent application withdrawn for alterations and extension to the single dwellinghouse (Class C3) including erection of a glazed infill extension at first floor level, alterations to windows and doors, erection of chimney pots and alterations to rooflights.

Relevant policies

London Borough of Camden Replacement UDP (2006)

SD6 (Amenity for occupiers and neighbours)
B1 (General design principles)
B3 (Alterations and extensions)
B6 (Listed buildings)
B7 (Conservation areas)

Camden Planning Guidance (2006)

Hampstead Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 The proposed external alterations include a glazed infill extension at first floor level, insertion of conservation style rooflights and the erection of chimney pots. It is proposed to replace the existing garage doors with a timber garage doors with sash windows. The existing lean-to shed would be demolished and french doors introduced in the rear elevation and french doors will be introduced in the east bay window.

1.2 Internally, it is proposed to rearrange the garage, kitchen and utility areas on the ground floor and a new en-suite bathroom and refitting of the existing bathroom at first floor level. It is proposed to rearrange the two-storey rear addition in order to create a double height family room.

2. Revision

2.1 The proposal has been revised to reduce the size of the opening between the new first floor study/office and balcony in the proposed glazed extension. The flat screens have been revised to be mounted on the surface of the chimney breast and not embedded within the breast. In the proposed bathrooms on the upper floor the proposal has been revised to retain the floorboards and to lay the stone floors over.

3. Design

Internal

3.1 It is considered the internal works are well conceived and involve minimal alterations to the historic fabric. In the main part of the house, original features and plan form are retained and are considered acceptable.

3.2. The proposal has been revised to change the two doors from the proposed dining room to the kitchen on the ground floor level to job doors which when closed will have little impact on the dining room, one of the principle ground floor rooms. At first floor level the proposal has been revised reducing the size of the opening between the new first floor level study and balcony in the proposed glazed extension to a window width opening. It is considered this revision ensures that the division between what was the main house and what is more utilitarian rear wing is retained.

3.3 The side wing appears to have been modified in the past at ground floor level. Whilst such later works can often be considered of historic interest in their own right, in this case they are not of any particularly special architectural and historical merit so the alterations on the first floor where the new utility room and kitchen would be located are acceptable

3.3 The rear wing is historic and is built from well weathered stock brick, however it is a subservient area to the main building and its interior is of extremely limited value. Therefore the proposed alterations are considered acceptable.

External

3.4 The glazed infill will be sloped to match the existing roofslope and will be of timber frame construction to match existing windows. It is a lightweight structure and it is considered it will still clearly define the two elements as originally being separate and would not harm the special interest of the building. The introduction of two chimney pots to the existing chimney is considered a minor alteration which would echo the design on the other chimneys.

3.5 It is proposed to replace the garage doors with timber and glass doors, similar to those at the neighbouring Heath Lodge. As the two properties are read as a symmetrical pair this design approach is considered acceptable. The garage doors are not original and probably replace coach doors, therefore the proposal maintains the character of this part of the property without giving it too much of a domestic feel and considered acceptable.

3.6 Two smaller rooflights are proposed over the stairs. It is considered these would not harm the character of the building and are considered acceptable.

3.7 The proposed introduction of french doors in the rear elevation is considered an appropriate alteration in terms of their design and size. It is considered they do not look out of place as they are seen in the context of the garden and the rear wing would still maintain its subservient appearance to the main building.

3.8 It is considered the proposed external alterations would not harm the special interest and character of the existing building or the character and appearance of the wider conservation area.

4. Amenity

4.1 It is considered the proposed alteration would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents or occupiers. The works are well contained within the site and would not result in issues of loss of privacy, outlook or sunlight or daylight and are therefore considered acceptable.

5. Recommendation: Grant planning permission and listed building consent.