

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on ----- (date to be inserted). 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 PANEL		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	19/12/2007
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	-
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Joanna Ecclestone			2007/4892/L		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
Flat 1, The Tower 55 Fitzjohns Avenue London NW3 6PH			Refer to decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Internal alterations including modifications to partitioning at lower ground floor level.					
Recommendation(s):		Grant listed building consent			
Application Type:		Listed Building Consent			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	N/a					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	Heath and Hampstead Society – <i>‘it would appear that windows may be affected; in which case much more detail is needed. More information, or refuse’.</i>					

Site Description

No. 55 is a detached house dating to 1880-1, with late C20th additions on the west side of Fitzjohn's Avenue. Of red brick with stone dressings, in a gothic baronial style, three storeys with semi-basement and attic. Listed at grade II and falls within the Fitzjohn's/Netherhall CA. Flat 1 is in the basement in the south east corner of the building.

Relevant History

Two consents were granted in 1979 for conversion of the building into 10 and 11 self contained units with one and two storey side extensions (no history files available).

Relevant policies

B6 – listed buildings

Assessment

The proposal is to remove non-original partitions internally, erection of a new partition and widening a non-original opening in a historic wall.

The house has been substantially altered internally with the subdivision into several flats. The basement is only partially subterranean, and is well lit by a 3 light transom and mullioned bay window and a set of French windows.

The new partition will abut into one of the mullions of the bay window, and this is the basis of the Heath and Hampstead's objection (see above). This partition creates two spaces of better proportions than previously, when a partition ran on a similar line but with a dog leg close to the window to abut the wall adjacent to it. Whilst the relationship with the window is not ideal, a partition of some sort is inevitable in this space as a result of it having been subdivided into a single unit. The partition will not impact on the exterior appearance of the listed building due to the lower position and screening by garden vegetation. It does not harm the historic fabric due to minimal fixings (inspected on site as works have already been carried out), and the partition sits comfortably within the width of the inner face of the mullion. It will be easily reversible. I therefore consider that it does not detrimentally harm the special interest of the listed building and is acceptable.

The widened opening in the wall is to create access to an ensuite bathroom from the bedroom. This is a minor alteration that has minimal impact on the fabric, and already much altered plan form, and I consider it acceptable therefore.

The applicant discussed removing the fireplace – whilst it appears overdecorative for a basement space, it could be original to the building, and I advised that it was unjustified to remove it. It is therefore to remain in situ.

The space under the front entrance space had been subjected to recent chemical damp proof injection and cementitious tanking at the time of site visit, to deal with water ingress. This could cause deterioration in the brickwork on either side of the stone steps in the long term, but would now be likely to cause harm in its removal and so difficult to remedy. An informative should be added stating that this approach is not supported for historic brickwork would not be acceptable in other locations of the building.

Recommend approval.