

**CANNON HALL
14 CANNON PLACE
LONDON
NW3 1EJ**

Hilary Cuddy
Regeneration and Planning Development
Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND
9 July 2013

Our ref:

Your ref:

Dear Ms Cuddy

**5 Cannon Lane, London, NW3 1EL
Planning Application Reference 2013/3934/P**

I wish to write in objection to the amended proposals at no. 5 Cannon Lane.

I understand that the applicants are intending to amend the scheme which was approved on 3 June 2009 (Ref. 2008/4242/P) to enable further alterations to the approved roof design and an extension at roof level to provide additional accommodation. The application that has been submitted has been revised following the withdrawal of a previous application (Ref. 2013/2076/P) which also proposed alterations to the approved roof design and a roof extension.

I note that the application now submitted has reduced the extent of the proposed extension when compared to the previous application (Ref. 2013/2076/P). However, my objection still stands for the reasons set out below.

Background

No. 5 Cannon Lane is located in the Hampstead Conservation Area and whilst the existing building on the site was only considered to make a neutral contribution, it was recognised that the existing building had several positive qualities. These included the modest scale of the existing building which "allowed undisturbed views of a tree framed skyline towards the Heath and allows the building to be read as subsidiary to the grand listed buildings and structures in the area" (Committee Report, Application Reference 2008/4242/P).

The site is surrounded by a number of listed buildings and boundary walls (many of which are also listed) on which the impact upon the setting of these must be carefully considered. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, applications should better reveal the significance of the Conservation Area and surrounding listed buildings.

No. 14 Cannon Place (Cannon Hall) is Grade II* listed and the garden walls, gates and bollards surrounding No. 14 Cannon Place are separately listed (Grade II). Therefore any proposal which is brought forward relating to no. 5 Cannon Lane must ensure that the significance of the building and walls are better revealed by the proposals being brought forward at no. 5 Cannon Lane.

I am aware that there have been a significant number of applications to vary the original permission on this site.

Planning permission (Ref. 2009/3632/P) was granted on 12 April 2010 for amendments to the scheme to allow the creation of a second basement level.

Planning permission (2010/2557/P) was subsequently granted on 5 November 2010 for alterations including increasing the height of the rear dormer window and roof ridge, further excavation at lower garden level to create lightwells and patios with access to the garden and various changes to all elevations and boundary structures.

Planning permission (2011/6453/P) was then granted on 30 March 2012 for amendments to the approved roof design and fenestration. This amendment resulted in a more bulky roof form which is more contemporary in design.

Planning permission (2012/6658/P) was granted on 8 January 2013 to enable the creation of a new rooflight on the western elevation of the property.

I have significant concerns about the incremental nature of the proposed amendments to the originally approved scheme and the cumulative effect that these amendments will have on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

It is essential that cumulative impact of the incremental amendments to the design and quantum of accommodation that is being created on this site is considered fully.

The proposal

I understand it is proposed to increase the size of the approved roof level of the property so that it extends towards the boundary wall of Cannon Place.

It is also proposed to relocate the approved rooflights to the "new" western elevation of the property so that these are located facing the boundary of Cannon Place.

The proposal will result in the loss of approximately half of the approved area of green roof at second floor level and will also result in a significant increase in visible bulk and mass of the proposed building when viewed from the junction of Cannon Place, Cannon Lane and Squire's Mount.

The additional accommodation will accommodate a play room for the house which already includes a garden, indoor pool, gym and five bedrooms.

I set out my detailed objections to the proposed amendment to the approved scheme below.

Townscape and Heritage Considerations

As set out above, no. 5 Cannon Lane is located within the Hampstead Conservation Area and is surrounded by a number of listed buildings including the Grade II* listed, 14 Cannon Place.

Despite the fact that the proposed extension has been reduced from that proposed in the most recent application, it still represents a significant increase in terms of the size and visual impact of the property at second floor level. It is not considered that the proposed extension of the approved building at roof level will preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or will

better reveal the significance of surrounding listed buildings. Indeed the proposal will have a harmful impact on the setting of surrounding listed buildings.

It is noted that the Design and Access Statement which accompanied the original application, stated that "in siting the new roof structure, careful note has been taken of the composition of the view of the tree-framed skylines towards the Heath when approached from Squire's Mount".

It must follow therefore that extending the roof to the west will have a detrimental impact on the view towards the Heath at the junction of Cannon Place and Squire's Mount. I note that the applicant has prepared a photomontage which is useful but the application does not include any historic or townscape analysis to enable surrounding occupiers to understand fully the impact of these proposals upon views of the Heath.

The original Design and Access Statement also noted that the height of the proposed roof structure took its height reference from the modern building at no. 4 Cannon Place. However, as you move from east to west across the site, the height references change from the height of no. 4 Cannon Lane to the boundary wall along Cannon Place which is significantly lower (around one storey in height). Continuing the height reference in a continuous line across the site is not appropriate and would have a harmful impact on the significance of the Conservation Area. As originally proposed, the building stepped down towards Cannon Place which is considered to be a far more appropriate treatment for this site to ensure the proposal integrates into its surroundings.

It is recognised that the immediate surrounding area is characterised by high garden walls which enclose the properties behind. To the north, Chestnut Lodge, South Lodge and Squire's Mount are all concealed from public view behind garden walls as are the buildings in the grounds of no. 14 Cannon Place and no. 11 Cannon Lane. The original Design and Access Statement recognised the importance of these garden walls and that these developments were "careful to preserve these walls and existing features".

The proposal will result in a detrimental increase in height of the western part of the building close to the boundary with the historic garden wall of no. 5 Cannon Place. The building will be highly visible above this wall which is considered entirely inappropriate in townscape and heritage terms. The purpose, function and character of the garden walls which are such an important feature of this part of the Conservation Area will be lost by a significant breach in height of the building behind at this important and historic junction.

The proposal does not therefore, comply with Policy DP25 of the Camden Development Policies Document 2010 which states that "the Council will only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area".

Paragraph 25.3 states that "the character and appearance of a conservation area can be eroded through the loss of traditional architectural details such as characteristic rooftops, garden settings and boundary treatments".

It is considered that the proposed amendment to the approved scheme will lead to the further erosion of character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area through creation of a significant increase in accommodation above a historic boundary wall, that will be highly visible from surrounding streets.

Height, mass and bulk

It is considered that the proposed increase in height, mass and bulk on the western side of the site is inappropriate in design terms.

The original building on the site only had a presence and relationship with the street from Cannon Lane (adjacent to no. 4 Cannon Lane) and there was no accommodation visible behind the single storey wall around the junction with Cannon Lane and Cannon Place. The original proposal increased the height of the garden wall at this junction.

The approved scheme and its various amendments have resulted in a significant increase in visible bulk and mass on the site and this proposed amendment will exacerbate this further creating a significant increase in height and bulk facing both Cannon Lane and Cannon Place leading to an unacceptable increase in density across this site. This is not considered to be an appropriate scale for the narrow, "mews" style nature of Cannon Lane and will create an adverse sense of enclosure and adversely impact upon the outlook surrounding the property when looking east towards the Heath and west towards Cannon Place.

This proposed amendment will result in a building which is out of proportion with its location and create an inappropriate increase in height, mass and bulk on the site when viewed from a number of locations from the street and clearly represents an unacceptable degree of overdevelopment on the site.

The proposal will be contrary to the provisions of Policy DP24 which relates to securing high quality design.

It is not considered that the proposed amendment to the scheme has considered the character, setting, context and particularly the form and scale of neighbouring buildings and structures.

Paragraph 24.7 states that development should consider the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development and the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value

Paragraph 24.11 refers to the importance of features of local distinctiveness and consideration of context is needed to achieve development which integrates into its surroundings.

It is clear that the proposed roof extension will have an adverse impact on the prevailing pattern and scale of surrounding development and does not integrate into its surroundings.

Amenity

The proposal will result in the two approved rooflights being relocated closer to the boundary with Cannon Lane. This will result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking into the garden of no. 14 Cannon Place which is currently not overlooked.

This will result in an unacceptable harm on the amenity and enjoyment of the property at no. 14 Cannon Place which is contrary to the provisions of Policy DP26.

This proposal will impact on the visual privacy and outlook enjoyed by the existing occupiers of no. 14 Cannon Place which is also contrary to Policy DP26.

Insufficient evidence has been submitted with this application to demonstrate that the amenity of surrounding residential properties has been carefully considered and worked into the design.

It is not characteristic of properties in this area to have windows in their flank elevations which overlook other properties and these should be removed from the proposal.

It is therefore considered that the proposed roof extension is unacceptable from an amenity point of view.

Sustainability

We note that the proposal will result in a reduction in approximately half of the area of green roof which was approved as part of the original scheme.

Condition 3 attached to the original permission states that the green roof shall be fully provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation.

There does not appear to be any justification for the significant reduction in the quantum of green roof proposed and this should be provided to enable the Council's sustainability officers to consider the appropriateness of the proposal in sustainability and biodiversity terms.

This alteration is likely to result in a reduction in the biodiversity features across the site from that which was originally proposed with no justification provided for this.

It is considered that the areas of flat green roof which were originally approved were an important part of the overall design of the scheme ensuring not only that the proposal made a contribution to sustainability and biodiversity but that it was able to integrate into the surrounding area in townscape terms.

The proposal is therefore also contrary to Policy DP22 which states that schemes must incorporate green or brown roofs and green walls wherever suitable.

The approved scheme clearly demonstrated how green roofs could be incorporated as part of the proposals and this proposed amendment to the scheme removes this element which is not considered appropriate.

In summary, the incremental additions to the original proposal through a number of smaller applications has led to the creation of a far larger dwelling which has increasingly greater impacts upon the surrounding area both visually and in terms of impact on amenity and has resulted in a downgrading of the original proposal. I consider that the applications made to date to increase the scale of this property have resulted in an unacceptable increase in density and overdevelopment on this site and this additional application, despite the reduction in scale of the proposed extension from the previous application, still results in exacerbating an already harmful situation in heritage and conservation terms. This incremental approach that is being adopted by the applicants to secure additional accommodation on the site is not considered appropriate for a site in a sensitive location in an important part of this Conservation Area.

A holistic approach to the design of the proposed replacement building would have enabled the impacts upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area to be fully considered.

I trust that my comments will be taken on board and I urge the Council to refuse this proposed alteration to the approved scheme which despite amendments is still considered to be unacceptable and inappropriate for this location. It will lead to a harmful impact upon the surrounding area and represents inappropriate overdevelopment on this site.

