

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	02/10/2006
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	13/09/2006
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Cassie Plumridge			(1) 2006/3319/P (2) 2006/3321/L		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
Lesser Wildwood 15 North End London NW3 7HR					
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	Date:	
Proposal(s)					
<p>(1) Infilling of existing basement lightwell to rear elevation and excavation of new basement to provide additional accommodation for dwellinghouse, including erection of single storey extension to link new basement to ancillary studio building, plus replacement of the existing boundary wall and gate to courtyard and street with a new brick wall and timber entrance door.</p> <p>(2) Internal and external alterations including (as above)</p>					
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional planning permission + 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	04	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:	None.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>The Hampstead CAAC did not object to the proposal, however did comment that they found the proposed colour of the door (timber oak) overwhelming. It is considered that the timber finish of the door is an acceptable finish in this location and would integrate with the street scene which has a variety of finishes.</p> <p>Thames Water provided the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>with regard to the basement and waste – request that the applicant should incorporate within their proposal, protection to the property by, for example, non-return valve or other suitable device to avoid the risk of backflow at a later date, on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions. This comment will be included as an Informative on the decision, and also advice that a further listed building application may be required to include these measures.</i><i>with regard to water infrastructure, no objection raised.</i>					

Site Description

A Grade II listed former farmhouse dating from the mid C18 and located on the western side of North End. There is an ancillary single storey studio building at the rear of the site (which according to historic Ordnance-Survey maps dates from 1952). The entire site lies within the Hampstead Conservation Area.

Relevant History

An application for Planning Permission (ref: 2006/1184/P) for *Infilling of existing lightwell to rear elevation and excavation of new basement to provide additional accommodation for dwellinghouse, including erection of single storey extension to link new basement to ancillary studio building*, was refused on 13/06/2006 on the following ground:

- The proposed stair enclosure, by virtue of its design, height and form would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property and the Hampstead Conservation Area, and is contrary to policies EN1, EN13, EN22, EN31 and EN38 of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2000 and policies B1, B3, B6 and B7 of the Proposed Modifications to the Revised Deposit Draft UDP 2004 [as approved by the Council's Executive on 11th January 2006].*

The associated application for Listed Building Consent (ref 2006/1186/L) for *Internal and external alterations including infilling of existing lightwell at rear elevation and excavation of new basement to provide additional accommodation for dwellinghouse, including erection of single storey extension to link new basement to ancillary studio building*, was also refused on 13/06/2006 and was refused on the following grounds:

- The proposed infilling of the lightwell, by virtue of its impact on the building's original layout with a basement lightwell, is considered to be harmful to the architectural integrity and setting of the listed building and is contrary to policies EN27 and EN38 of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2000 and policies B3 and B6 of the Proposed Modifications to the Revised Deposit Draft UDP 2004 [as approved by the Council's Executive on 11th January 2006]*
- The proposed stair enclosure, by virtue of its design, height and form and its position between the two host buildings at ground floor level, would erode the visual and physical separation between these two buildings and would be detrimental to the historic relationship of the main house to the ancillary studio building. This would be detrimental to the character and setting of the listed building, and is contrary to policy EN38 of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2000 and policy B6 of the Proposed Modifications to the Revised Deposit Draft UDP 2004 [as approved by the Council's Executive on 11th January 2006].*

Relevant policies

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. However it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

Replacement UDP 2006

- S1 & S2 – Strategic Policy on Sustainable Development
- SD1 – Quality of Life
- SD6 – Amenity for Occupiers & Neighbours
- B1 – General Design Principles
- B3 – Alterations and Additions
- B6 – Listed buildings
- B7 – Conservation Areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Section 2.3 – Internal Arrangements
- Section 2.7 – Alterations and Additions

Hampstead Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

PROPOSAL:

The applications seek planning permission and listed building consent for the infilling of existing lightwell to rear elevation and excavation of new basement to provide additional accommodation for dwellinghouse, including erection of single storey extension to link new basement to ancillary studio building, plus replacement of the existing boundary wall and gate to courtyard and street with a new brick wall and timber entrance door.

ASSESSMENT:

As noted previously the current scheme follows the refusal of a previous application. The current scheme differs from the previous scheme in that the stairwell has been relocated to sit adjacent to the facade of the studio, rather than along the side boundary, adjacent to Wildwood Terrace. The revised new scheme seeks to address the previous contentious issues, namely the position and size of the stair enclosure, and the loss of the rear lightwell.

The linking of the main property with the studio building is considered to be acceptable in principle, however it was considered that siting of the stair enclosure in the previous scheme (it stopped short of the rear wall of the main building by approximately 1 metre) and would have obscured views of the ground floor of the building when seen from the street which was excessive. The stair enclosure in the revised scheme has been repositioned against the face of the studio building. This will ensure that a sufficient gap (approximately 4.7 metres) is retained between the two buildings, and the stair enclosure will not encroach upon the rear elevation of the main listed house, therefore preserving its setting. It is considered that the setting of the listed building is maintained, the definition between the two structures preserved and the ancillary nature of the studio building is not eroded. Historically, the two buildings would not have been physically linked, however it is considered that the proposal is a positive addition that is not detrimental to the character of the listed building or the wider conservation area. It is considered that the contemporary design (including the use of glass and zinc), in its modified form as part of the current application is a modest addition to the street scene that would integrate well with the surrounding area.

As existing, the boundary with North End comprises a pair of metal gates located between two brick pillars and a brick wall. It is proposed to remove these gates and to extend the brick wall and install a new oak panel and door to facilitate access from the street. The proposed boundary treatment is broadly consistent with others in the vicinity. Furthermore, the existing garden wall and gate are not original; this element of the proposal is not considered to be contentious. It is noted that previously, where the stairwell was sited against the side boundary, a zinc 'lid' which formed the roof of the stair enclosure was exposed along the side boundary. A reduction in the use of this material is considered appropriate, as it will reduce the prominence of the works within the street scene and assist in integrating the new aspect with the surrounds and host building. The

design, height and form of this structure as proposed as part of this scheme will complement the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.

The second contentious element related to the infilling of the basement lightwell; this was discussed following the refusal of the previous application and previous C+UD pre-app advice had been given which stated that the infilling of the lightwell would not be harmful. This was not presented at the time of the consideration of the previous scheme and officers were not aware of previous discussions. Given this, and that the building supports a 1930s alteration at the rear which obscures its original form, on balance it is considered that the infilling is acceptable. While it is acknowledged that the infilling of the lightwell would remove access to natural light to the kitchen below, the residential unit has good access to daylight in other areas of the building, and on balance this is considered acceptable.

The utilisation of the remaining ground floor as a roof garden is considered to be acceptable in principle. The installation of three rooflights would also be acceptable, as they would not be visible from the public realm and would not cause any demonstrable harm to the character or appearance of the listed building or the conservation area.

There would be no impact on the amenities of either the adjoining or the adjacent properties in terms of daylight, sunlight or privacy.

The proposal is considered to be respectful of the character and appearance of the Listed Building, to preserve the conservation area and not detrimental to the amenity of surrounding properties. The works are considered to have appropriate regard for relevant policies of the Replacement UDP 2006 (Policies S1, S2, SD1, SD6, B1, B3, B6 and B7).

RECOMMENDATION: Approve

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