

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		22/03/2007	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		05/03/2007	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Mary Samuel				2006/5551/P and 2006/5553/L			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Flat 8 Kendalls Hall New End London NW3 1DD				Site Location Plan; A800; 830; 831; 832; Detail 10; 20; 30.			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
The erection of a front entrance gate, the enlargement of three windows at basement level on the front elevation, the replacement of all windows with double glazed timber windows of the same design and the erection of a glazed roof covering between the rear elevation of the building and the facade wall at ground floor level.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission and Listed Building consent					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	13	No. of responses	06	No. of objections	06
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		Objections are on grounds that the proposed alterations, with the exception of the erection of a hidden roof cover at the rear, would be detrimental to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		Hampstead CAAC: Objected to the front gate. (The comments are unclear) (27/2/07)					

Site Description

3 storey terraced dwellinghouse, listed grade II, on the south side of New End and within the Hampstead conservation area.

Relevant History

None

Relevant policies

RUDP: S1, S2, B1, B3, B6, B7.

PPG15

Hampstead CAS: Advice on alterations to buildings within the conservation area

Assessment

The proposal involves the installation of a front gate with railings to match the railings around the front light wells of the building, the enlargement of 3 windows at front basement level, the replacement of all windows with double glazed windows of the same design and the installation of a glass roof between the rear elevation of the building and a parallel arched “façade wall” at ground floor level, at a distance of 1.2m.

Main issues: Impact of the proposed alterations on the appearance of the building, the character and appearance of the conservation area and the status of the building as a listed building,

Assessment: The building forms part of a Grade II listed former workhouse and later hospital in the Hampstead Conservation Area, dating from 1849 arranged into a symmetrical, palace-fronted composition in red brick with stucco dressings, and cast iron area railings to front with steps and bridge to raised ground floor level entrance doors (with the exception of the property the subject of this application which has its entrance level with the pavement). The hospital was converted into residential use in the late 1990s.

The proposed alterations are discussed under separate headings:

Introducing a gate to the front entrance

The existing front area railings leave gaps where the entrance staircases / bridges are positioned. It is proposed to install a gate within this gap, in order to provide enhanced security. Such a gate would represent an alien feature, which interrupts the rhythm of the railings on the front of the terrace, to the detriment of the appearance and architectural integrity of the building and the appearance of the street scene and wider Conservation Area. Such a gate is entirely untypical of the terrace and is not considered to be acceptable.

Replacing the front basement level windows with taller windows

The front basement level windows are very short, as befits the status of this level of the building. It is proposed to install new, taller windows, which would see the sills dropped, and the window head of the central window raised. This is considered to be unacceptable in principle for a number of reasons. Firstly, the windows are consistent with the others in the terrace, and should remain so as the regularity of the various architectural components is a strong part of the building's special interest. Installing tall windows will detract from the appearance of the front elevation of the building. The alteration is also inconsistent with the status of the basement level – the hierarchy of the building is such that one expects to see smaller fenestration at basement and top floors, as importance in floor levels diminishes. This too would detract from the architectural and historic integrity of the building. Finally, the design of the replacement windows – 6-pane casements - is considered to be unsympathetic to the style and appearance of the building.

The applicant states that the reason for enlarging the windows is to improve daylight in the basement.

This is questionable as the front light well is very narrow and the new lower part of the windows is unlikely to receive any light. The middle window in particular also has the pavement to its front entrance over it, which would further obscure daylight. It is therefore an alteration, which will not achieve the desired results but undermine the status of the listed building for the reasons given above.

Replacing all windows with double glazing

This is unacceptable in principle. It is not clear whether the existing single glazed sash windows are original, but certainly they are entirely in keeping with the age and style of the building. Double-glazing would result in thicker glazing bars and frames, which would not match the adjacent windows, has higher reflective qualities than single glazing, and the seal between the two panes would be visible. These visual qualities would result in the windows appearing out of keeping with the others, to the detriment of the appearance of the building as a whole. Furthermore, the introduction of double-glazing raises issues of architectural integrity; this is not historically accurate, and indeed PPG 15 advises that windows in historic building should be replaced 'like for like' (annexe C, Para 40).

Glazing over light well at rear

It is proposed to install a frameless glass 'lid' over the light well to the rear of the building. This is not considered to be contentious in principle as it is concealed within the light well and as such will not have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the building.

Refusal is recommended

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613