

Architecture and Heritage Proof of Evidence

Professor Robert Tavernor, BA, DipArch, PhD, RIBA

Appeals against Refusals by Camden Council of
Planning Permission and Conservation Area Consent
for Redevelopment at 29 New End, Hampstead,
London NW3 1JD (Camden PA Refs. 2012/3089/P and
2012/3092/C)

On Behalf of Karawana Holdings Limited

Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/ X5210/A/14/2218243

October 2014

Proof of Evidence of Professor Robert Tavernor, BA, DipArch, PhD, RIBA

Contents

	Pages
1.0 Background and Experience	2
2.0 Appointment and Scope of Evidence	6
3.0 Relevant Legislation, Planning Policy and Guidance	8
4.0 The Appeal Site in its existing urban context	21
5.0 The Design of the Appeal Scheme and its visual impact	40
6.0 Response to the Council's Reasons for Refusal 1 and 5	55
7.0 Summary and Conclusions	59
Appendix RT1: Relevant Designated Heritage Assets: the extent and contribution of their setting to their heritage significance	63

Separate document

Appendix RT2: Verified Views of the Appeal Scheme

1.0 Background and Experience

- 1.1 My name is Robert William Tavernor. I am a registered architect and a member of the Royal Institute of British Architects (since 1985). I studied architecture in London (BA and Dip. Arch with Distinction, 1973-79), Rome (Scholar in Architecture at the British School at Rome, 1979-80), and at the University of Cambridge (St John's College, 1980-83, PhD awarded 1985).
- 1.2 I am Emeritus Professor of Architecture and Urban Design at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE). I have been Forbes Professor of Architecture at the University of Edinburgh (1992-5), Professor of Architecture and Head of the Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering at the University of Bath (1995-2005); and Professor and Director of the LSE Cities Programme (2005-8). I have held various visiting academic posts internationally, including Visiting Professor at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA, 1998), European Union Visiting Scholar in planning and conservation at the University of Texas A&M (2002); and Visiting Professor in Architecture and Urbanism at the University of São Paulo, Brazil (2004). I continue to lecture internationally, and I am currently a Visiting Professor of Architecture at the University of Bath and on the Faculty of the Arts at the British School at Rome (both since 2009).
- 1.3 As an architectural historian and theorist I am an expert in the foundations of Italian Renaissance architecture and the transmission of associated ideas and forms to England and America. I am the author of books on *Palladio and Palladianism* (Thames & Hudson, 1991 – subsequently translated into Italian, Chinese and Korean) and *On Alberti and the Art of Building* (Yale University Press, 1998). I am co-translator of two English translations of architectural treatises: Leon Battista Alberti's 16th century *De re aedificatoria*, as *On the Art of Building in Ten Books* (The MIT Press, 1988); and Andrea Palladio's 17th century *I quattro libri dell'architettura*, as *The Four Books on Architecture* (The MIT Press, 1997). I wrote the introduction to a new edition of Vitruvius' treatise, *On Architecture*, for Penguin Classics which was published in September 2009. Other books include *Smoot's Ear: the Measure of Humanity* (Yale UP, 2007; paperback version 2008) and I was co-editor (with G. Dodds) of *Body and Building: Essays on the changing relation of Body to Architecture* (The MIT Press, 2002; paperback edition 2005).

- 1.4 As an architectural practitioner I received the 1992 and 1993 Environmental Design Awards for designs in the World Heritage City of Bath, I have won prizes in international architectural competitions and exhibited work internationally. I have been a juror and chair for national and international architectural design competitions. The Royal Fine Art Commission for Scotland commissioned me to report on *Masterplans in Scotland* (1994), which was developed into a book I edited, *Edinburgh* (in Rassegna, 1996: separate English and Italian editions). My recent essays focus on urban design issues in London and include: 'Composing London Visually' (a chapter in the book, *Visualising the City*, 2008) and 'Absorbing the Shock of the New' (a chapter in the book, *Kaleidoscope City*, 2014) and I guest edited a special issue on 'The London Plan 2000-2010: A Decade of Transformation' in *City, Culture and Society* (Vol. 1 Issue 2, 2011).
- 1.5 As an architectural and urban design consultant I provide – with my colleagues in the Tavernor Consultancy – architectural, heritage and urban planning advice to institutions, developers and architects. The majority of our work has related to large-scale masterplanning and building design submissions (including in London: Greenwich Peninsula, Croydon Gateway, New Wembley, Bishopsgate Goods Yard, Battersea Power Station and Earls Court) and the design of individual buildings, some tall and often located in or visible in relation to sensitive historic settings.
- 1.6 Internationally, I established the masterplanning team and provided the visual and heritage assessment principles for the Russian city of Perm (the first application of such principles in the Russian Federation), a new urban planning concept that won the Grand Prix at the Moscow Architecture Biennale 2010. My expertise in the urban development of London led to the DCMS asking me to provide evidence to the UNESCO and ICOMOS World Heritage Committee in the autumn of 2006 regarding the impact of modern architecture in the City on the Tower of London WHS. I advised the US Government in 2013 regarding a strategy for tall buildings in Washington DC.
- 1.7 I am frequently engaged by clients at the very outset of the project to advise on the architect appropriate for a specific site and design task, and to work with the design and planning team throughout the pre-application period helping to arrive at a design that is of the highest quality design, and which –

in my judgement – will have a positive relationship with existing heritage assets.

- 1.8 On occasions, as here, I act as a ‘friendly critic’, an independent architectural and urban design advisor standing between client and design/planning team advising on planning ‘risks’ and providing advice on the development of design proposals to achieve the best possible architectural and urban outcome, according to the specific constraints of the project. My judgement is being solicited and it is acknowledged by all parties concerned that the integrity underlying my judgement – my ability to speak freely and frankly about the quality and appropriateness of the design – is paramount. I therefore retain a professional and independent stance throughout the design process. When I have felt unable to contribute to the process in this manner I have chosen to resign rather than be compromised.
- 1.9 I have provided evidence in support of appellants at more than 40 planning inquiries in London, and in some of these I had no involvement in the design and planning process pre-application. I agreed to give evidence in favour of these proposals because – having studied the designs and visited the respective sites – I considered that the designs would make an appropriate and positive addition to existing built heritage and that – because of the appropriateness and suitable quality of the design – the proposals would not harm but enhance the built environment.
- 1.10 I have only once given evidence at a planning inquiry against a design proposal, and this was in the London Borough of Camden, regarding a proposal for a replacement building on the site of Athlone House, Hampstead Lane, London N6 4RU (Appeal Refs: APP/X5210/E/10/2135359 & APP/X5210/A/10/2135357). The Inquiry was held in February 2011 and I was acting on behalf of the City of London Corporation who were granted ‘Rule 6’ status. My evidence focused on the inappropriateness of the proposed replacement house. In my professional opinion, I considered the design proposals inappropriate for this particular site as they would harm the setting of Hampstead Heath and would be out of character with Highgate Village Sub area 1 of Highgate Conservation Area. The Inspector also concluded that the proposed replacement house would be inappropriate and the appeal was refused.

- 1.11 Regarding the present inquiry, I was engaged by Karawana Holdings Ltd in March 2014. I have not worked directly on the Appeal Scheme previous to this appointment. I have not worked before with the practice KSR Architects, or Mr Gordon Jefferys of KSR. I have therefore been able to review the Appeal Scheme and its earlier design evolution, as set out in KSR Architects' DAS with a fresh and open mind.
- 1.12 I visited the Appeal Site for the first time on 5 March 2014 with Mr Shraga Michelson of Karawana Holdings Ltd and Mr Gordon Jefferys of KSR. I made an extensive tour of the existing building and its grounds with them, and examined the relevant planning drawings on site.
- 1.13 Following this visit, I requested that seven accurate verified Computer Generated Images (CGIs) of the Appeal Scheme from key locations at street level be provided for my assessment to replace the two artist's views that were part of the DAS. These are included as Appendix RT2 to my proof as part of my evidence. My assessment of the existing building and the Appeal Scheme in these seven views is set out in section 5.0 below.

2.0 Appointment and Scope of Evidence

- 2.1 I appear at this Inquiry in support of the Appeal Scheme (APP/X5210/A/14/2218243), which I understand from reviewing the relevant documents was carefully developed and negotiated by the Appellants over a lengthy period with the Council's design officers. It is evident that they concluded that the new building would not only preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area but also enhance it; and furthermore that the setting of existing listed buildings will not be harmed.
- 2.2 Having reviewed the relevant documents and having assessed the Appeal Scheme myself in relation to the sensitive heritage considerations of the Appeal Site, I have concluded that the professional judgment of the Council's design officers was correct, and that they were justified in reaching their own reasoned conclusions.
- 2.3 Five reasons were given for refusal by the Council. The first Reason for Refusal is relevant to my expertise and will provide the focus of my evidence.

Reason for Refusal 1

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its design, bulk and massing, would detract from the character of the streetscene and townscape and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

- 2.4 In relation to this Reason for Refusal my evidence will describe the existing building, its scale, mass and character in its specific sensitive heritage context from an independent perspective, but which inevitably draws from the Design and Access Statement (DAS) provided by KSR. Based on my experience of the Appeal Site and its context and the available documentation and my own assessment of relevant heritage assets (Hampstead Conservation Area, listed buildings and structures) I will consider:
- the design evolution of KSR's design proposals, and the principal changes that were made to its external appearance (scale, massing, window sizes, and materials);

- the visual impact of the bulk and massing of the existing building on Site and the Appeal Scheme (scale, massing, window sizes, and materials); and
- the visual impact of the Appeal Scheme on adjacent listed buildings and this part of the Conservation Area.

2.5 I will also make reference to **Reason for Refusal 5**:

The proposed development and its associated excavation works would result in the removal of a number of trees on the site which are considered to have a high amenity value in the townscape, which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene and conservation area, contrary to policy CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity) of London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

2.6 Mr Adam Hollis, Registered Consultant and Fellow of the Arboricultural Association and a Chartered Environmentalist, Forester and Surveyor, has responded directly to this Reason for Refusal in his proof written on behalf of the Appellant. I will respond to it through my assessment of the selected key views, set out in Appendix RT2, which illustrate the visual effect of the stepped elevations of the Appeal Scheme, with their landscaped terraces and the new planting layout on this part of the conservation area and adjacent listed buildings.

2.7 The evidence that I have prepared and provide for this Appeal is true and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institution (RIBA). I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

3.0 Relevant Legislation, Planning Policy and Guidance

- 3.1 The relevant planning policies are considered in detail in the evidence of Mr Nick Sharpe, Partner at Montagu Evans, who gives evidence on Planning Policy. The key pieces of legislation and policies that have informed my evidence are listed below and will be referred to in relation to the Appeal Scheme in the concluding sections of my proof.

LEGISLATION

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

- 3.2 With regard to applications for planning permission which may affect the setting of a statutory listed building or its setting, section 66(1) of the Act requires that:

“In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

- 3.3 With regard to applications for planning permission for development within conservation areas, the section 72(1) of the Act requires that:

“special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”

- 3.4 It is pertinent that during 2014 a Court of Appeal decision has emphasised the statutory duty of decision-makers in relation to section 66(1) of the Act. Lord Justice Sullivan concluded in *The Barnwell Manor* case (February 2014) that:

"the statutory duty imposed by section 66(1) [...] requires considerable weight to be given by decision-makers to the desirability of preserving the setting of all listed buildings, including Grade II listed buildings. That general duty applies with particular force if harm would be caused to the setting of a Grade I listed building, a designated heritage asset of the highest significance. If the harm to the setting of a Grade I listed building would be less than substantial that will plainly lessen the strength of the presumption against the grant of planning permission (so that a grant of permission would no longer have to be

“wholly exceptional”), but it does not follow that the “strong presumption” against the grant of planning permission has been entirely removed.”

- 3.5 Following this, Mr Justice Lindblom concluded in the Forge Field case (June 2014) that:

"As the Court of Appeal has made absolutely clear in its recent decision in Barnwell, the duties in sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a local planning authority to treat the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit. If there was any doubt about this before the decision in Barnwell it has now been firmly dispelled. When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight. [...] a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one. It is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. But an authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering."

- 3.6 In summary, the Barnwell Manor decision has led to more clarity being required in Committee reports and decision letters. Mr Justice Lindblom follows the Barnwell Manor decision but uses a slightly stronger tone of language. Essentially, in both cases, I understand that the interpretation of ‘harm’ is the same as that already established by the early 1990s case, *South Lakeland DC v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1992] 2 AC 141 (House of Lords), namely that:

3.6.1. the concept of ‘preserving’ in the section 72 duty does not mean ‘positively preserving’; it merely means doing no harm;

3.6.2. and if there is harm, development should only be permitted if the decision-maker concludes that it carries benefit (frequently referred to as public benefit) which outweighs the harm; and

- 3.6.3 the decision-maker must give 'considerable importance and weight' to a finding of harm – and, if follows, to preservation and enhancement.
- 3.7 I will consider sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act in light of these decisions and my summary above when determining whether any harm should be attributed to the Appeal Scheme if built, and – if necessary – whether the proposed benefits would outweigh the harm that may be caused by it.
- 3.8 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF) at paragraphs 132-135 sets out the policy on heritage decision making, which I will now turn to.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (CD-C1)

- 3.9 The NPPF provides a full statement of the Government's planning policies. It replaces almost all Planning Policy Statements and Guidance. It identifies three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental (paragraph 7). It notes the key role of planning in the creation of sustainable communities: communities that will stand the test of time, where people want to live, and which will enable people to meet their aspirations and potential. It identifies "*a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking*" (paragraph 14). This presumption entails "*seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality of life*" (paragraph 9). Planning policies should promote high quality inclusive design in the layout of new developments and individual buildings in terms of function and impact, not just for the short term but also over the lifetime of the development.
- 3.10 Policy and guidance relating to conservation and enhancement of the historic environment is set out in Chapter 12 of the NPPF. It condenses, and is broadly consistent with, the policies in Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5) which it replaces. The Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (March 2010 – CD D2), issued with PPS5, is still in force and contains guidance on the application of these policies which remains generally relevant to the NPPF.
- 3.11 The NPPF sets out the Government's overarching planning policies put in place to conserve the historic environment and its heritage assets so that they may be enjoyed by future generations. It gives guidance relating to designated

heritage assets - listed buildings, conservation areas, World Heritage Sites and Registered Parks and Gardens - and undesignated heritage assets, buildings positively identified as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration during the planning process.

- 3.12 In order to assess the nature and degree of potential effects on the significance of heritage assets when determining applications, the NPPF requires *"an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance"* (paragraph 128).
- 3.13 As the Glossary (Annex 2 to the NPPF) defines it, 'significance' in terms of heritage policy is *"the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting"* (p. 56). More detailed advice in relation to these special interests is given in the publication *Conservation Principles* (English Heritage, 2008) (CD-D3) and in the DCMS *Principles of Selection for Listing Buildings* (March 2010) (CD-D4). The significance of relevant heritage assets is described in Section 4 below.
- 3.14 When determining applications, the NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to take account of:
- *"the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
 - *The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
 - *The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness."* (paragraph 131, CD-C1).
- 3.15 Paragraph 132 states that: *"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting*

[...]. *Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*"

3.16 It should be noted here that the term 'harm' is not defined in the NPPF or elsewhere. It therefore remains a matter of professional judgment, and experience, whether or not a proposed design will cause harm and, if so, the degree of harm that will be caused.

3.17 Paragraph 133 refers to a balance between substantial harm and public benefit, stating that: "*Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:*

- *the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- *no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- *conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- *the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use."*

3.18 Paragraph 134 states that: "*Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use*".

3.19 Paragraph 135 states that: "*The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having*

regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset."

- 3.20 When considering proposals for development within a Conservation Area, World Heritage Site or setting of a heritage asset, Local Planning Authorities are required to seek opportunities for enhancement and to treat favourably proposals which "*preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset*" (paragraph 137).
- 3.21 Paragraph 138 notes that not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Where the loss of a building or element which makes a positive contribution to significance is proposed, it should be treated as either; substantial harm (as stated under paragraph 133), or less than substantial harm under (paragraph 134). This judgement should be based on taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole. Where there is less than substantial harm, the public benefit must outweigh it. Where there is substantial harm, the NPPF lists a number of tests it will need to pass, or the alternative single criterion is met that the harm is necessary in order to deliver those particular benefits.
- 3.22 It follows that where preservation or enhancement is afforded very considerable weight and importance should be given to this conclusion in the planning balance.
- 3.23 In relation to these paragraphs in the NPPF, Mr Kevin Murphy (of KM Heritage) provided the Historic Environment Assessment in May 2012 in support of the Appeal Scheme. I will consider Mr Murphy's assessment in detail in my proof below in relation to my own independent assessment of the relevant historic environment. Suffice it to state here that Mr Murphy concluded in his report (pp. 27-29) that in his professional judgment the Appeal Scheme would not harm its heritage context, and would preserve and enhance the environment for which it has been specifically designed:

"In respect of Paragraph 131 of the NPPF, the revised scheme can certainly be described as 'sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation'. It preserves and enhances the 'positive contribution' that the heritage context of 29 New End makes to the conservation area, and the overall scheme

contributes to sustainable communities by reinvigorating a moribund site in the heart of Hampstead, and thus enhancing the economic vitality of the conservation area.

The proposed development complies with Paragraph 133 of the NPPF. It does not lead to 'substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset'. It also complies with Paragraph 134 for the reasons given in detail earlier. Any 'less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset' - i.e. the conservation area or nearby listed buildings - that can be ascribed to the scheme is greatly outweighed by the benefits generated by the scheme - economic, architectural and heritage-related.

The scheme will help economic development, will be an excellent piece of modern architecture and will preserve both listed buildings and listed buildings in its context. Thus, in satisfying Paragraph 134, the revised scheme also satisfies Paragraph 135 regarding non-designated heritage assets.

The revised scheme very definitely strikes the balance suggested by Paragraph 138 of the NPPF - it responds to the site in a manner commensurate to its significance, its contribution to the conservation area and its contribution to the setting of the listed building opposite."

- 3.24 I note too that in their Report to Committee the professional judgment of the Council's own planning and design officers was that the Appeal Scheme would preserve and enhance, and would not harm its sensitive heritage context: *"Demolition of the existing neutral building is acceptable. The replacement building is considered appropriate in terms of bulk, height, footprint, layout and design and it will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area [...]"* Similarly, English Heritage commented in relation to the withdrawn application of 31 October 2011 that they have: *"no objection to demolition of existing building which has neutral contribution to conservation area" [...]* (reported as item '4. Further amendments to report', in the Supplementary Agenda for DCC 28.11.13, as a correction of the original Report to Committee).

DCLG, National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (March 2014) (CD-C2)

- 3.25 The NPPG, recently launched by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), is an online resource providing guidance on implementing the policies of the NPPF (CD-C1). The web resource replaces various guidance documents, including By Design (2000) and the Circular on the Protection of World Heritage Sites (Circular 07/2009). There are two sections of the NPPG that are of particular relevance to this assessment:
- Design; and
 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
- 3.26 The NPPG on Design, which supports section 7 of the NPPF, states that local planning authorities are required to take design into consideration and should give great weight to outstanding or innovative designs which help to raise the standard of design more generally in the area: *“Planning permission should not be refused for buildings and infrastructure that promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with an existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design (unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset and the impact would cause material harm to the asset or its setting which is not outweighed by the proposal’s economic, social and environmental benefits”* (Ref 1-3, para 004).
- 3.27 The guidance states (para 015) that new or changing places should have the following qualities commonly exhibited by successful, well-designed places:
- be functional;
 - support mixed uses and tenures;
 - include successful public spaces;
 - be adaptable and resilient;
 - have a distinctive character;
 - be attractive; and
 - encourage ease of movement.
- 3.28 The NPPG on ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment’ supports Section 12 of the NPPF. Heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset, and the

contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential effect and acceptability of development proposals. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting therefore a thorough assessment of the effect on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

- 3.29 In considering assessment of substantial harm, paragraph 017 of the guidance states: *"In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset's significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting. While the impact of total destruction is obvious, partial destruction is likely to have a considerable impact but, depending on the circumstances, it may still be less than substantial harm or conceivably not harmful at all, for example, when removing later inappropriate additions to historic buildings which harm their significance. Similarly, works that are moderate or minor in scale are likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all. However, even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm."*
- 3.30 Considering potential harm in relation to conservation areas, paragraph 018 of the guidance states: *"An unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to a conservation area is individually of lesser importance than a listed building (paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework). If the building is important or integral to the character or appearance of the conservation area then its demolition is more likely to amount to substantial harm to the conservation area, engaging the tests in paragraph 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, the justification for its demolition will still be proportionate to the relative significance of the building and its contribution to the significance of the conservation area as a whole."*

NATIONAL PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT GUIDANCE

- 3.31 The sensitivity of a view is determined by a range of factors identified in detail in English Heritage's guidance, *Seeing the History in the View* (May 2011) (CD-D5) and *The Setting of Heritage Assets* (October 2011) (CD-D6), which may be summarised as follows:
- the degree of heritage significance of the structures and spaces in view (both how important they are and how much they contribute to the view);
 - the nature of the significance of the structures and spaces in view (for example the robustness of their character, their degree of visibility and/or the importance of retaining a clear sky backdrop in order to enable their recognition and appreciation);
 - the degree of importance attached to the view (whether of local or strategic importance or within the setting of a designated heritage asset and/or whether potential for enhancement has been identified); and
 - the nature of the view (whether it is glimpsed, kinetic, formally composed).
- 3.32 My evidence will consider potential impacts on the significance of designated heritage assets in the locality of the Site and in relation to the views in Appendix RT2 which arise as a result of the nature and sensitivity of existing conditions and the design of the Appeal Scheme.

REGIONAL PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

The London Plan (July 2011) (CD-A1)

- 3.33 Policies of The London Plan relevant to the design of the Appeal Scheme include: 7.4, local character; 7.6, architecture; and 7.8, heritage assets and archaeology.
- 3.34 The strategic aim of Policy 7.6 (architecture) is that "*Architecture should make a positive contribution to a coherent public realm, streetscape and wider cityscape. It should incorporate the highest quality materials and design appropriate to its context*" (p.216).

- 3.35 The strategic aim of Policy 7.8 (heritage assets and archaeology), is that *"London's heritage assets and historic environment, including listed buildings, registered historic parks and gardens and other natural and historic landscapes, conservation areas, World Heritage Sites, registered battlefields, scheduled monuments, archaeological remains and memorials should be identified, so that the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and of utilising their positive role in place shaping can be taken into account"* (p.219).

LOCAL PLANNING POLICY

London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies Document (November 2010) (CD-B3)

- 3.36 The following policy is cited in Reason for Refusal 1 with respect to the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy: CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage).
- 3.37 The following policies are cited in Reason for Refusal 1 with respect to the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies: DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage).
- 3.38 In relation to these local policies, Mr Kevin Murphy (of KM Heritage), who provided the Historic Environment Assessment in May 2012 in support of the Appeal Scheme, concluded in his report (pp. 27-29) in relation to LBC's Local Development Framework that:

"For the reasons given in respect of the NPPF, the proposed scheme is also consistent with Camden's Local Development Framework in respect of design and the built heritage.

The proposed development will certainly be 'of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character' as required by Policy CS14, and it will undoubtedly preserve and enhance 'Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings [...]'.

In respect of Policy DP25, the scheme clearly 'preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area' and does not involve demolition of an 'unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or

appearance of a conservation area'. Similarly, the scheme would not 'cause harm to the setting of a listed building'. The character and appearance of the conservation area and setting of nearby buildings are enhanced by the replacement of a poor quality building with a new, well-designed development that is consistent with the Council's land-use policies.

Guidance

The proposed development is exactly what BS 7913:1998 'Guide to the principles of the conservation of historic buildings' seeks - it would be 'designed for a long life and soundly constructed of durable materials chosen to suit their context'. The careful scaling of the building and the composition of its elevations demonstrates how the proposed scheme will have 'due regard to [its] site and surroundings using materials that will weather and age well and settle into [its] place in the townscape'.

The proposed scheme is also consistent with the spirit and detailed guidance of 'By Design'. In its design it will be seen to be visibly 'responding to and reinforcing locally distinctive patterns of development, landscape and culture'. It will promote the continuity of street frontages and the enclosure of space by development which clearly defines private and public areas'. It will 'promote legibility through development that provides recognisable routes, intersections and landmarks to help people find their way around'.

Finally, the proposed scheme exemplifies all that 'Building in Context' seeks to achieve. The scheme will undoubtedly 'sit happily in the pattern of existing development and routes through and around it' and 'respect the scale of neighbouring buildings'. It will certainly 'use materials and building methods which are as high in quality as those used in existing buildings'. It will also 'create new views and juxtapositions that add to the variety and texture of the setting'.

- 3.39 I note too that in their Report to Committee (para 7.1) the professional judgment of the Council's own planning and design officers was that the Appeal Scheme would satisfy the relevant London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework policies and preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area: *"Demolition of the existing neutral building is acceptable. The replacement building is considered appropriate in terms of bulk, height, footprint, layout and design and it will preserve and*

enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The scheme will retain existing private open space and valuable trees and will provide an adequate amount of soft landscaping and green roofs. The new building will not seriously harm neighbour amenity in terms of outlook, light, privacy or noise subject to appropriate safeguards. The scheme with its basement car park and new entrance should not, on balance, harm overall transport and parking conditions in the area."

4.0 The Appeal Site in its existing urban context

Introduction

- 4.1 In this section, I will provide a brief physical and visual account of the area around the Site in order to contextualise the following description of the significance of designated heritage assets in the area which should be considered in relation to the Appeal Scheme.
- 4.2 A map (Fig. 1) that identifies the locations of each of the heritage assets is provided in Appendix RT1 at the end of my proof. I will describe the relevant heritage assets in this section in order to identify their physical character and significance, and this information is tabulated in Appendix RT1 where the setting of the Listed Buildings is also identified in relation to the map of relevant heritage assets.

History of the Site and surrounding area

- 4.3 The Appeal Site is situated at the northern end of Hampstead Village. Hampstead is located on London's 'Northern Heights', a geological band of sand and pebble-capped hills formed during the last ice-age that extends from West Hampstead to Highgate. The elevated position of Hampstead offered natural advantages to early settlers with Palaeolithic remains being found in the southern part of the area and West Heath has been identified as an important Mesolithic site. There may also have been a Roman Road across the area. Hampstead, derived from the Anglo-Saxon for 'Homestead' is present in the Domesday Book as a farmstead, with manor house, on land that belonged to a monastery. By the middle ages a village with a parish church had developed around the manor. The land passed into private ownership following the dissolution of the monasteries.
- 4.4 The wealthy of London began to settle in the Hampstead area from the beginning of the 17th century, due to the advantages of its elevated position, closeness to the Heath and the fresh air and water. Many also fled to Hampstead to escape the Great Plague when there was a tradition of lawyers holding court under the trees, which became known as Judges' Walk.
- 4.5 The development of a spa complex known as Hampstead Wells at the beginning of the 18th century allowed much development to take place in the

form of villas and boarding houses. It was at this time that the first Pump Room and Assembly Room were also constructed to service the spa which was for a short while famous for its chalybeate (iron rich) waters. A drinking fountain and memorial (dating from 1882) are located opposite the original spa building on Well Walk. Though the spa began to decline toward the middle of the century the village of Hampstead continued to grow. The street pattern from this period is still recognisable, in the northern part of the village, with many 18th century buildings remaining. By 1746 the population of the village was 1,400 compared to just 600 a century before.

- 4.6 During the 19th century the village expanded downhill towards London, merging with other surrounding villages and hamlets notably North End and Vale of Heath: the population had already swelled to 4,300 by 1801. The development was principally in the Italianate style in the form of villas and short terraces, many of which still survive. This scale of development threatened to encroach upon the open space of Hampstead Heath, which became a focus of a wider campaign to protect the commons around London. Legal battles and campaigns continued until the 1870s when the owners of the Heath eventually gave up their manorial rights and restrictions were placed over the land preventing its future development.
- 4.7 London was also expanding rapidly during the 19th century and eventually engulfed Hampstead by the middle of the century, when in 1860 the Hampstead Junction Railway was opened. Slum clearance occurred in the late 1800s, removing much of the warren of narrow alleys and tenements and allowed for a great deal of late Victorian architecture to be built. The new streets were lined with four storey red brick shops, Model Dwellings and a number of Victorian municipal buildings, transforming the centre of Hampstead, though many regretted the loss of the picturesque old village.
- 4.8 During the 20th century a number of Arts and Crafts style houses were built to the west of the village centre, which changed to neo-Georgian as the century progressed. Post-war development was mostly sensitive to the existing built fabric of Hampstead.

The physical character of the Appeal Site and its context

- 4.9 The Appeal Site is located on the north side of New End, on land sloping steeply upwards away from the road, on the west side of Christchurch

Passage, a pedestrian alleyway that connects New End with Christchurch Hill. The Appeal Site is bounded by Christ Church to the north and by properties facing Elm Row, Hampstead Square and New End to the west.

- 4.10 The existing building on the Appeal Site, the former Nurses' Home at 29 New End, is a T-shaped building built in the 1950s. Its tallest elevation 5 storeys tall provides the front southern elevation on New End, and as the land rises to the north this reduces to 4 storeys to the rear, and the northern elevation overlooks a level open space – formerly a garden – which has the south side elevation of Christ Church beyond.
- 4.11 The front entrance level is located above the street level of New End and is reached by a dog-leg flight of steps. Internally, there is a reception hall and communal spaces, off which corridors run to stairs and 75 single bedrooms clustered around bathrooms and kitchens. The interiors are spare and functional and – as the building has not been occupied since 2005 – there is an air of abandonment internally. However, I understand that a caretaker has been living on the site throughout this period, to ensure essential maintenance is undertaken and for security.
- 4.12 Externally, the former Nurses' Home is in a reasonable state of repair considering the long period that it has remained largely empty. Architecturally, it is not a distinguished building. It has the character of a very large plain brick house, but the many regular sized windows (neo-Georgian in style) are expressive of its repetitive room layout and institutional role. Its main elevation has been tempered to some extent by the raised terraces and wrought iron balustrades at its southern entrance end, which the main entry stair climbs, and planting – particularly a mature Horse Chestnut tree.
- 4.13 Set high above the street datum and neighbouring properties (except Lawn House and Christ Church) distances the building from the street scene of New End – such that it is reasonable to describe it as looming over the street. The severity of its box-like form with its regular punched windows is only relieved by the marked horizontality of the attic storey, defined by a brick cornice below and the roof eaves above, and the strong vertical thrust of the chimney stack at its east end extending from base to roof, and two roof top chimney stacks arranged symmetrically around the centre of its main elevation. A curved stair tower at the NE corner of its T-plan is the only other distinguishing feature visible from the public realm (there's a similar curved stair on the western

elevation hidden from view), and with the main chimney stack the eastern elevation is perhaps the building's best when viewed up the steps of Christchurch Passage as they rise from New End. Still, the otherwise sheer and unmodulated walls of the building, and its aloof almost monumental setting in relation to the street, provides it with an overbearing character that the architecture fails to mitigate.

Relevant Heritage Assets: Hampstead Conservation Area

4.14 The Appeal Site is located in the heart of the Hampstead Conservation Area, on New End. The Hampstead Conservation Area was first designated in 1968 and has been extended several times, in 1977, 1978, 1980, 1985, 1988, 1991 and 2001. An Article 4 direction was imposed on the conservation area in 1976 primarily to protect the fronts of properties from inappropriate alteration. The Conservation Area Statement for Hampstead was adopted in October 2001, and includes a character appraisal and management guidelines.

4.15 The Appeal Site is located in sub-area two of the Hampstead Conservation Area, which is known as Christ Church/Well Walk. Sub-area two:

"The intricate network of lanes and narrow alleyways built on the complex slopes of the land to the east of Heath Street dates from the early 18th century through the 19th century. Except for Christchurch Hill and New End Square, the main streets and spaces run more or less along the contours, linked by narrow footpaths, steps and lanes running down the slopes to connect differing street levels. This network is punctuated by small and irregularly shaped spaces of great charm, such as Hampstead Square, New End Square, Mansfield Place and Stamford Close. The area contains an extraordinary variety of building types, ages and styles, ranging from tiny cottages of all ages, grand 18th century houses, Victorian tenements and substantial villas to 20th century council flats and small private houses." (p. 17)

4.16 Within sub-area 2 are several character zones; the Appeal Site is in the New End/New End Square Area and is adjacent to the Christchurch Area. The Christchurch Area is dominated by Christ Church its *"handsome spire [...]* towers over the slopes of Hampstead, visible for miles around. The streets in this zone are clustered around it."*(p. 18)* The New End/New End Square Area is described as a 19th century enclave of *"working class cottages and*

municipal buildings and that character is still strongly evident, alongside a few earlier properties.” (p. 20)

- 4.17 Within the New End/New End Square Area, the existing building on the Appeal Site is described as follows: *“The scale of New End changes east of the pub as the road widens and the type of buildings alters. The Nurses Home sits above the road level and is five storeys high with pitched roof and a ground floor that is set forward. It is a plain building with casement windows. There is mature horse chestnut in front of the Nurses Home, softening slightly the buildings overbearing quality as it looms over the street.” (p. 20)*
- 4.18 The former Nurses’ Home, the existing building on the Appeal Site, is not expressly identified in this description as either a positive contributor to, or a detracting feature from the conservation area, though the identification of the building’s overbearing quality is instructive and accurate. A ‘plain building’ which has an ‘overbearing quality’ and ‘looms’ over the street strongly suggests that it has a negative impact on the conservation area.
- 4.19 The Council’s Site Specific Allocation description (Section 7 – Other Localities, pp. 168-170) regarding the Appeal Site draws a different conclusion from the character appraisal of the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement. It states (under ‘Site Context’, p.169) that: *“The existing building is a large and prominent presence in the conservation area, and is identified as neutral to the character of the conservation area.”* I can find no such statement in the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement that the site *“is identified as neutral”*. However, I appreciate that LBC Officers in their Report to Committee when recommending approval of the Appeal Scheme also describe it as having a neutral impact, stating that: *“Demolition of the existing neutral building is acceptable.”* Similarly, English Heritage commented in relation to the withdrawn application of 31 October 2011 that they have: *“no objection to demolition of existing building which has neutral contribution to conservation area”* [...] (reported as item ‘4. Further amendments to report’, in the Supplementary Agenda for DCC 28.11.13, as a correction of the original Report to Committee).
- 4.20 The Council’s Site Specific Allocation description continues (on p. 169): *“Redevelopment of the site provides the opportunity [...] to enhance the appearance of the site to improve its relationship with the conservation area.”*

- 4.21 Later (under 'Further Information', p.169) it is stated that: "*The existing building is not considered to make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, but it has some positive attributes, not least its relationship with neighbouring buildings and the high quality of construction. Its replacement will only be supported if the new building demonstrates an appreciably high standard of design and architecture that enhances and is sensitive to the area's character and surrounding buildings. Redevelopment should respect the existing relationship with neighbours.*"
- 4.22 Direct and indirect neighbours include the following listed buildings. Their heritage significance will be described in detail here. Appendix RT1: *Relevant Designated Heritage Assets*, located at the end of my proof, will additionally set out in tabulated form the extent and contribution of their setting to their heritage significance.

Listed Buildings

NB. The bracketed numbers adjacent to the properties identified below refer to the numbers located on each heritage asset on the aerial view, Fig. 1 in Appendix RT1.

(1) Lawn House – Grade II

- 4.23 Lawn House is located midway along the western boundary of the Appeal Site. It is a detached house dating from c.1800 with late 19th century alterations. It is constructed in brown brick with red brick dressings and is three storeys high with a basement. The principal north elevation is four bays wide with a later full height single bay extension to the west side. The windows are square-headed sashes with red brick dressings and aprons below the first floor windows. The central entrance has an early 19th century prostyle portico with modified, fluted Doric columns and pilasters and a fluted frieze with roundels below a dentil cornice; the door is half-glazed with an overlight. A parapet conceals the roof.
- 4.24 The eastern flank wall of Lawn House sits on the party boundary wall to the Appeal Site. It has a stucco render fully concealing the walls beneath it and window openings in a similar style (but varying size) to that of the main brick front elevation. Low height brick chimney stacks rise above the render either side of the valley gutter. This sheer elevation drops down to a raised

embankment wall with buttresses that extend into the Appeal Site. There is a low set window within the embankment wall.

- 4.25 The terrace has architectural and historic interest as an example of late Georgian housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. The house has group value with 10-14 Elm Row, which are of a similar date but much more modest and of a different class of housing.

(2) 10-14 Elm Row including stables in rear yard of the Duke of Hamilton Public House (Public House not included) – Grade II

- 4.26 This terrace of three cottages in Elm Row dates from the late 18th century. They are two storeys high with basement stables to the rear elevation, which face into the yard of the Duke of Hamilton pub. Each house is two bays wide; one window bay and one door bay. The houses are constructed in multi-coloured stock brick. The plain doorways and sash windows are recessed in painted reveals and have cambered arches. The stable in the basements to the rear have original stalls, mangers and fittings. The rear also has a single storey, two window extension on supported on cast-iron columns. On the flank wall of No. 10 adjacent to a narrow stepped passageway is an old stone plaque inscribed "*Three feet west/from this wall/is private property*".
- 4.27 The terrace has architectural and historic interest as an example of late Georgian housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. The terrace has group value with Lawn House, which is of a similar date although much grander.

(3) Two lamp posts – Grade II

- 4.28 This pair of cast iron lamp posts dates from the 19th century. They have cast iron columns and one has the original Windsor lantern; the other has a 20th century reproduction lantern. They have historic interest as in-situ examples of 19th century street lighting. They have group value with the other listed lampposts in the vicinity.

(4) Elm Lodge and attached garden wall – Grade II*

- 4.29 This detached house originally had its principal frontage facing onto New End but is now orientated so the main front is to Elm Row. The house dates from c.1732 and is three storeys high and five bays wide to the north façade, the

ground floor was originally the rear basement before the house was divided and re-orientated in the 1930s. It is constructed in brown brick with red brick dressings. The central entrance bay projects forward and the main doorway is at first floor level, accessed by twin flights of curved steps, this entrance was added in c.1930. The ground floor doorway, formerly the basement, is directly below. Red brick bands divide the storeys and the roof is concealed behind a plain brick parapet. The sash windows have red brick flat arches and dressings, although several are now blind both on the north façade and the returns. The interiors are also of interest and known to include good panelling and a staircase with closed string, carved brackets, twisted balusters and column newels. The attached brick garden wall is also of interest.

- 4.30 This house has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. It has group value with the other houses and terraces from this period in the vicinity; 1-5 Elm Row and 1 and 2 Hampstead Square.

(5) 1 Elm Row – Grade II*

- 4.31 This terraced house dates from c.1720. It is four storeys high and was originally four bays wide to the principal south elevation with a later two bay extension. It is constructed in brown brick with red brick dressings to the windows. The corners of the older part have plain brick pilasters. The central entrance has a carved bracketed hood and half glazed door. The windows are square-headed sashes, the westernmost window at the second floor is bowed with cast-iron balcony and tented canopy. The extension, to the east, has a veranda with tented roof and cast-iron columns. The interior is thought to retain original panelling and staircase.
- 4.32 This house has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. It also has historic interest as the home of DH Lawrence in 1923. It has group value with the other houses and terraces from this period in the vicinity; Elm Lodge, 3 and 5 Elm Row and 1 and 2 Hampstead Square.

(6) 3 Elm Row – Grade II

- 4.33 This double fronted terraced house dates from c.1720 and was refaced in the late 19th century. It is constructed in red brick with brighter red brick

dressings. The house is three storeys with a basement below and a late 19th century dormered, attic storey in the patterned tiled mansard roof. The principal elevation, to the south, is five bays wide. The entrance is in the centre bay at the ground floor and consists of a moulded hood supported on console brackets and a 19th century, half-glazed door and reeded surround and patterned fanlight. The windows are segmental-arched sashes, the central first floor window has a moulded brick architrave with a *fleur-de-llys* keystone and a cornice. An original lead rainwater head and pipe survive. The interior is thought to original panelling.

- 4.34 This house has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. It also has historic interest as the home of Sir Henry Cole, founder of the Kensington Museum (now the V&A) and a postal reformer, between 1879 and 1880. It has group value with the other houses and terraces from this period in the vicinity; Elm Lodge, 1 and 5 Elm Row and 1 and 2 Hampstead Square.

(7) 5 Elm Row – Grade II

- 4.35 This terraced house dates from c.1720 and has been refaced twice, first in the late 19th century and more recently in the late 20th century. It is three storeys high with a dormered mansard roof and is five windows wide on the principal south elevation. It is constructed in red stock brick with red brick dressings and floor bands. The central entrance has a 20th century bracketed, hooded doorcase. The windows are segmental-arched sashes, the central window at the first floor has decorative moulded brickwork and a *fleur-de-llys* over the window.
- 4.36 This house has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. It has group value with the other houses and terraces from this period in the vicinity; Elm Lodge, 1 and 3 Elm Row and 1 and 2 Hampstead Square.

(8) 1 Hampstead Square and attached railings – Grade II

- 4.37 This semi-detached house adjoins No. 5 Elm Row and separated from No. 1 Hampstead Square by a narrow passage; Stamford Close. No. 2 dates from c.1720 and was refaced in the late 19th century. It is three storeys high with a dormered attic storey and basement below and is five windows wide on the

principal east elevation with a two bay return to the south. It is constructed in multi-coloured stock brick with moulded red brick dressings, cornice and floor bands. The central entrance is within a late 19th century projecting red brick porch with a round-arched doorway, radial fanlight and panelled door. The windows are segmental-arched sashes, the central first floor window has a moulded brick architrave with a *fleur-de-lys* keystone and a cornice. The parapet has ball finials at the corners and the roof has a central hexagonal dormer surmounted by a flagpole and a smaller dormer on each side. The basement area has cast-iron railings with urn finials.

- 4.38 This house has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. It has group value with the other houses and terraces from this period in the vicinity; 2 Hampstead Square, 1-5 Elm Row and Elm Lodge.

(9) 2 Hampstead Square and attached railings – Grade II

- 4.39 This semi-detached house adjoins No. 4 Hampstead Square and separated from No. 1 Hampstead Square by a narrow passage; Stamford Close. No. 2 dates from c.1720 and was refaced in the late 19th century. The house is constructed in red brick and is three storeys high with a hipped slate roof and basement below. The principal elevation, to the east is three bays wide with a one bay return to the north. The entrance is in the northernmost bay on the west elevation and has a carved, console-bracketed hood and architraved doorway with a radial fanlight. The windows are segmental-arched sashes at the ground and first floors and square headed at the second floor. There is a central dormered window in the roof. The basement area has cast-iron railings with urn finials.

- 4.40 This house has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. It has group value with the other houses and terraces from this period in the vicinity; 1 Hampstead Square, 1-5 Elm Row and Elm Lodge.

(10) Two lamp posts – Grade II

- 4.41 This pair of lamp posts date from the 19th century, they have cast-iron standards and 20th century reproduction Windsor lanterns. They have historic

interest as in-situ examples of 19th century street lighting. They have group value with the other listed lampposts in the vicinity.

(11) Christ Church – Grade II

- 4.42 Christ Church forms the northern boundary of the Appeal Site. The church was constructed in 1850-2 when Hampstead's parish Church, St John's, became too small for the growing population and the parish was sub-divided. The Church was designed by Samuel Dawkes in Early English Gothic style and the north porch and projecting aisle were added in 1881-2 by Ewan Christian. It is constructed in Kentish ragstone with Portland stone dressings. The aisled nave is five bays long and the north side has a single storey four bay projection, each bay of which is gabled. There is a tall buttressed tower with corner finials and a spire at the western end. The windows are pointed arched with tracery and quatrefoil.
- 4.43 The southern elevation, which is set against the northern boundary of the Appeal Site has a relatively low stone elevation pierced by pointed arched windows surmounted by a steeply pitched tall slate roof. The landmark stone tower is located at the NE corner of the church and is separated from the site by two sets of three roofs. It is a prominent feature from New End when looking north along Christchurch Passage.
- 4.44 The Church has historic interest for its position within the growing village of Hampstead as it became absorbed by the urban sprawl of London in the 19th century. There is also architectural interest for its association with Samuel Dawkes a prominent Victorian architect. It also has group value with the adjacent Christchurch School.

(12) Three lamp posts – Grade II

- 4.45 This list entry comprises three 19th century lamp posts with cast iron standards and Windsor lanterns. They have historic interest as in-situ examples of 19th century street lighting. They have group value with the other listed lamp posts in the vicinity.

(13) Christchurch School and School Houses and attached railings – Grade II

- 4.46 Christchurch School was designed by WG and E Habershon in c.1854 and the attached school houses date from c.1857; both have some later 20th century alteration. They are an irregular group of Tudor-style, single storey buildings with a symmetrical pair of two storey school houses adjoining the west side. The buildings are all constructed in yellow stock brick with stone dressings and tiled, gabled roofs with dormers; the school houses have moulded chimney-stacks with stone chimney finials. The doorways have arched openings with drip-moulds and ball flower decoration and the windows are transomed and mullioned and some have traceried heads. Cast iron railings with urn finials define the area, the gates have lattice box piers.
- 4.47 As the village of Hampstead expanded in the Victorian period, eventually being absorbed into the urban sprawl of London, there would have been a greater need for schools. Christchurch School dates from the mid-Victorian period and so has historic and architectural value as an example of a village school in the wider urban context of London from this period. It has been closely linked with Christ Church, adjacent, since they were both constructed and so the pair forms a strong group.

(14) 4, 6 and 8 New End Square – Grade II

- 4.48 This terrace of three houses dates from the mid-18th century but has since been altered. They are constructed in brown brick with red brick dressings and are three storeys high with a basement. The houses are narrow, just one window bay wide. The ground floor of No. 4 has a single square-headed sash window and a round arched recessed doorway with radial fanlight. The first and second floors formerly has pairs of sash windows, those to the left side have been infilled and at the first floor replaced by two small 20th century windows. Nos. 6 and 8 have been combined into a single dwelling, each formerly had the same round arched doorway; the one to No. 8 has been converted into a window. The windows at the ground floor have also been replaced in the 20th century by a large canted 7-sash bay window with a dentil cornice. Both Nos. 6 and 8 have a single sash window at first floor and a wider tripartite sash window at the second floor. Nos. 6 and 8 share a dentilled cornice below the eaves.

- 4.49 The terrace has architectural and historic interest as an example of mid-18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London.

(15) Three lamp posts – Grade II

- 4.50 This list entry comprises three 19th century lamp posts with cast iron standards and Windsor lanterns. They have historic interest as in-situ examples of 19th century street lighting. They have group value with the other listed lampposts in the vicinity.

(16) 10, 12 and 14 New End and attached railings and lamp holder – Grade II

- 4.51 This terrace of three houses date from 1725 and were refaced in the later 19th century. The terrace is constructed in multi-coloured stock brick with red brick dressings to the windows. Each house is three windows wide and three storeys high, with basements below and dormered attic storey above. The basements are painted white and surrounded by cast-iron area railings. No. 14 has a wrought-iron overthrow with lamp-holder. The entrances have hoods supported on carved consoles and architraved doorways with panelled doors. All the windows are segmental arched sashes, No. 14 possibly retains its original glazing bars. Below the plain brick parapet is a red brick dentilled cornice. No. 12 retains its original lead rainwater pipe and head.
- 4.52 The terrace has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London.

(17) Original workhouse block at former New End Hospital and attached railings – Grade II

- 4.53 This building was constructed as the Hampstead parish workhouse in 1849 and was used as a general/geriatric hospital in 1915 until 1987. It was designed by HE Kendall Jnr and was converted for residential use by John Thompson Associates in the 1990s. The building is constructed in red brick with stuccoed dressings and quoins. The principal elevation is to New End and is two to three storeys high and fourteen bays wide. The composition of this main façade is symmetrical; the central four bays project forwards with three bay wings on either side, these are all three storeys, and two storey projecting end pavilions. The projecting centre and pavilions are topped with pediments; open to the pavilions and close to the centre, which also has an oculus. The

main entrance is in the centre and is round-arched with a keystone and pilasters supporting a cornice, which continues across the front of the buildings, and scroll pediment. The windows are all segmental headed sashes with stucco hoods and keystones. There is a large cornice, which projects and is supported on paired brackets. There are cast iron railings to the areas. The rear elevation is of similar style.

- 4.54 In 1848 Hampstead became an independent Poor Law parish. Instead of extending the existing workhouse building, a new purpose built workhouse was constructed. The building therefore has architectural interest as a mid-19th century example of workhouse design. The former workhouse forms a group with the circular ward and attached water tower, the infirmary block and the boiler house chimney; together they demonstrate the history of Poor Law provision for the sick and elderly in the 19th century; they have historic interest and exceptional townscape value.

(18) Infirmary block and linking corridors at former New End Hospital – Grade II

- 4.55 This building was constructed in 1869-71 as the infirmary block of the Hampstead parish workhouse and was extended in a similar style in 1878. The original and extension were both designed by John Giles of Messrs Giles & Bevan. The block was converted for residential use by John Thompson Associates in the 1990s. The building is long and narrow, orientated north south and is four storeys high with basements below. It is constructed in yellow stock brick with brick bands at the floor levels. At the southern end is an attached tower, which has cast iron balconies at its top level. The sash windows of the main range are segmental headed with stuccoed keystones.
- 4.56 The infirmary block was constructed in response to damning Lancet report in the 1865 of workhouse conditions and an inspection of the Hampstead workhouse in 1868. Provision had to be made for separate accommodation for sick and able-bodied paupers. Hampstead is one of the first and oldest surviving developed in response to these events and to be designed in response to Florence Nightingale's reforms in nursing and hospital design, including high, light wards which were narrow enough to allow cross-ventilation. It has historic and architectural interest for these reasons. The block also forms a group with the original workhouse block, the circular ward

and attached water tower and the boiler house chimney. The group has exceptional townscape value.

(19) Circular ward and attached ablution and water Tank Tower at former New End Hospital – Grade II*

- 4.57 This circular hospital ward and its attached water tank tower was designed by Charles Bell in 1884. The building was converted for residential use by John Thompson Associates in the 1990s. The main ward is circular in plan with a rectangular water tank tower to south-west and a short rectangular wing to north-east containing the stairs and formerly the kitchen. The building is three storeys with a semi-basement and an attic; it is constructed in pale yellow and grey bricks with pink brick bands and dressings. The roof of the circular ward is conical with and gabled dormers and central octagonal brick chimney, the tower has a pyramidal roof with a finial and lucarnes; both are slated. The windows are largely segmental arches sashes and on the south side there are cast-iron cantilevered "airing galleries" to the upper floors which are accessed via segmental-arched glazed doorways. The water and ablution tower has full height corner and central pilasters supporting pink brick round-arches each containing an oculus at attic level.
- 4.58 The building was the first free-standing example of the circular 'ward tower' in the country, the impetus for the design came from a paper given by John Marshall FRS, Professor of Surgery at University College & Hospital & Professor of Anatomy at the Royal Academy and which was reported in the Builder in 1878. Circular wards gave improved air, light and ventilation with the advantage of only needing a small site. For these reasons the building has architectural and historic interest. The building also forms a group with the original workhouse block, the infirmary block and the boiler house chimney; together they have considerable townscape value and are a local landmark.

Conclusions regarding the significance of the designated heritage assets in relation to the existing building on the Appeal Site

- 4.59 The Appeal Scheme is located in the Hampstead Conservation Area and the following listed buildings and structures identified above (numbered 1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17) are potentially visible in relation to the Appeal Site. I

will now consider the significance of this inter-visibility by firstly considering the contribution of the existing building on the Appeal Site to the conservation area and these listed buildings.

- 4.60 EH's *Conservation Principles* identifies four broad groups of values through which a site or place can be interpreted: evidential, historical, communal and aesthetic. Kevin Murphy (KM Heritage) who provided the Historic Environment Assessment in May 2012 has discussed these in section 3 of his Report when supporting the planning application that relates to the Appeal Scheme:

"3.18 In terms of English Heritage's 'Conservation Principles', buildings can provide us with 'evidence about past human activity' and by means of their fabric, design and appearance communicate information about its past. In the context of Hampstead, 29 New End plays a negligible part in providing that evidence or in communicating about the area - in contrast to say, the distinctive buildings of the former New End Hospital and other characterful older buildings in the area. The older buildings to its north, south and elsewhere in the conservation area exude the essential character of the conservation area, and immediately communicate their nature and past to us. In contrast, 29 New End is a generic and anonymous building.

3.19 The building does not have any associations with individuals, nor a discernible connection with any particular historical event or occurrences.

3.20 For the reasons given earlier it would simply be unrealistic to ascribe 'architectural interest', 'artistic interest' or 'aesthetic value' to 29 New End- the building plainly does not possess these qualities in any way.

3.21 In respect of design, 'Conservation Principles' says that 'design value... embraces composition (form, proportions, massing, silhouette, views and vistas, circulation) and usually materials or planting, decoration or detailing, and craftsmanship'. 29 New End does not coincide with this description of what might have design value.

3.22 29 New End can be acknowledged as having a certain degree of communal value deriving from its role in the nature of this part of London as a settlement; this quality is however, negligible."

- 4.61 Mr Murphy does not state categorically, following this analysis, that the existing building makes a neutral or negative contribution to the conservation area. It is a fair inference, however, that he does not believe the building is a positive contributor. I will therefore extend his assessment based on EH's more recent *Understanding Place. Historic Area Assessment: Principles and*

Practice (2010) and my own assessment of the significance of the Appeal Site.

4.62 EH's *Understanding Place. Historic Area Assessment: Principles and Practice* (2010) states at para 2.6.2 that:

"In judging the significance of any given area or group of buildings it will be particularly helpful to consider how, and to what degree, the following criteria are met:

- *Rarity: Does it exemplify a pattern or type seldom or never encountered elsewhere? It is often assumed that rarity is synonymous with historical importance and therefore high value, but it is important not to exaggerate rarity by magnifying differences and downplaying common characteristics.*
- *Representativeness: Is its character or type representative of important historical or architectural trends? Representativeness may be contrasted with rarity.*
- *Aesthetic appeal: Does it (or could it) evoke positive feelings of worth by virtue of the quality (whether designed or artless) of its architecture, design or layout, the harmony or diversity of its forms and materials, or through its attractive physical condition.*
- *Integrity: Does it retain a sense of completeness and coherence? In a historic landscape with a high degree of integrity the functional and hierarchical relationships between different elements of the landscape remain intelligible and nuanced, greatly enhancing its evidential value and often its aesthetic appeal. Integrity is most often used as a measure of single-phase survival, but some buildings and landscapes are valuable precisely because of their multiple layers, which can have considerable evidential value.*
- *Associations: Is it associated with important historic events or people? Can those associations be verified? If they cannot, they may still be of some significance, as many places and buildings are valued for associations that are traditional rather than historically proven."*

4.63 It is surely incontrovertible that 29 New End is neither rare nor particularly representative of important historical or architectural trends. Moreover, it surely lacks integrity physically and spatially within its historic context. It does have associations with the old hospital opposite, but that site has since been turned to residential use and the link is a distant memory.

4.64 There is also the Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal to consider. *SUB AREA TWO: Christ Church/Well Walk of the Hampstead Conservation Area*

includes a map that clearly identifies Listed Buildings and buildings that make a positive contribution to the conservation area. 29 New End and Carnegie House, the residential development to its immediate east, are the only group of buildings not to fall in either of these two categories. This is clearly a reasoned decision.

- 4.65 It is stated that: *“The area contains an extraordinary variety of building types, ages and styles, ranging from tiny cottages of all ages, grand 18th century houses, Victorian tenements and substantial villas to 20th century council flats and small private houses.”* And 29 New End is mentioned: *“The Nurses Home sits above the road level and is five storeys high with pitched roof and a ground floor that is set forward. It is a plain building with casement windows. There is mature horse chestnut in front of the Nurses Home, softening slightly the buildings overbearing quality as it looms over the street.”*
- 4.66 This leads me to my conclusion regarding the status of the former Nurses’ Home in relation to its sensitive heritage context. My understanding is that buildings that make a positive contribution generally have form, features and characteristics that define the period from which the conservation area dates. The materials used; components such as windows, doors and chimneys; and the form and shape of the building including roofs, gables and bays, account for a major part of the consideration. In addition, the appropriateness of the setting, landscape and boundary treatments associated with these properties is an important consideration. Inevitably, buildings that comply with these criteria are also notable for possessing an essential quality in design as well as materials used. On the other hand, neutral buildings neither enhance nor detract from the character or appearance of the conservation area. Reasons for this could be due to, for example, a lack of defined style or age or because certain alterations have harmed their original character but not to such an extent that it detracts from the character or appearance of the area. A range of buildings are covered by this classification; many still possess merit and provide some form of contribution to the conservation area, especially when set in attractive gardens and surrounds with appropriate boundary treatments.
- 4.67 In short, negative buildings are those that evidently harm the conservation area. I agree with Kevin Murphy’s conclusion that the former Nurses’ Home has neither ‘architectural interest’, ‘artistic interest’, nor ‘aesthetic value’. What the Council describe as *“a plain building”* that is *“overbearing”* and *“looms over*

the street” is surely not a neutral building. Rather, it should be regarded as having a negative impact on this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area.

- 4.68 Its impact is negative, not necessarily because of its essential scale and mass, but because that scale and mass is not moderated and articulated sufficiently: because it is too plain a building, and the sheerness of its walls causes it to appear to loom over the street to the extent that is overbearing.
- 4.69 At paragraph 6.29 of their Report to Committee, LBC planning officers state (with my emphasis) that: *“When assessed against the English Heritage criteria in Understanding Place: Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management (2011), it would not be considered to make a positive contribution to the area; however its impact can be said to be more neutral rather than negative”*. Ultimately, whether the existing building is considered neutral or negative, the professional judgment of LBC Officers, when recommending approval of the Appeal Scheme in their Report to Committee, stated that the former Nurses’ Home does not warrant retention: *“Demolition of the existing neutral building is acceptable.”*
- 4.70 Similarly, English Heritage commented in relation to the withdrawn application of 31 October 2011 that they have: *“no objection to demolition of existing building which has neutral contribution to conservation area”* [...] (reported as item ‘4. Further amendments to report’, in the Supplementary Agenda for DCC 28.11.13, as a correction of the original Report to Committee).
- 4.71 Finally, I conclude that in order to preserve and enhance the Hampstead Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings, any replacement building does not necessarily need to be smaller than the existing building, but it does need to be better composed, articulated and detailed, and it should respect the spatial and physical relationship of the existing buildings with neighbouring properties.

5.0 The Design of the Appeal Scheme and its visual impact

Introduction

- 5.1 In order to account for the architectural character of the Appeal Scheme I will first consider how its design evolved as a considered response to the specifics of the Appeal Site. The design underwent an extraordinarily long gestation period, that commenced in November 2008 and which concluded in the May 2012 planning application (PA Ref.: 2012/3089/P) and – following re-consultation with all respondents in May 2013 – finally with a recommendation for approval by LBC Officers to the planning committee (subject to a Section 106 agreement).
- 5.2 I will then assess the design and elevational treatment of the Appeal Scheme, its height, scale and bulk, and – with the benefit of newly commissioned verified views of the Appeal Scheme from key views, which I requested be commissioned in order to write this proof – how it will be experienced in its sensitive historic urban context.
- 5.3 I will conclude this chapter with my assessment of the visual impacts of the Appeal Scheme on its urban setting, including relevant heritage assets.

Design Evolution of the Appeal Scheme

- 5.4 The design evolved in full consultation with officers at LBC and is described in detail in section 3 of KSR architects' DAS and the proof of Mr Gordon Jefferys on behalf of the Appellant. I have paraphrased that information here as eight key phases, as follows:

1. Following initial discussions with Camden in **November 2008**, the possibility of changing the site arrangement from the existing T-shaped arrangement to a separate front building and two rear buildings was explored. The principle of openness and views through the site are characteristics of the conservation area, which this layout echoed. The resulting scheme formed the basis of the first public exhibition, but was subsequently abandoned as the impact on the private open space to the rear was considered excessive.

2. In **July 2009** the design returned to the T-shape arrangement of the existing building. This maintained the private open space to the rear and so protected the setting of the listed Christ Church and maintained the open views of Lawn House and the Hampstead Square buildings. A traditional approach was

adopted for the proposed building in terms of architectural style, materials, proportions and details in direct response to the character of its context.

3. In September 2009 significant top floor setbacks were created to reduce the impact of the building's scale at street level on New End. LBC officers also encouraged a more contemporary approach to the building's appearance.

4. In January 2010 adjustments were made to the main south elevation and projecting bays were created to moderate the scale of the elevation on New End, and contemporary design principles were developed to complement the character of the local conservation area. The second basement level was omitted at this stage.

5. In April 2010 the massing was reduced along Christchurch Passage. Detail and proportional refinements made to the elevations to complement the context of the site: feature windows and recessed balconies were introduced, and the northern elevation onto the open space further refined in order to complement Lawn House, and 10 and 11 Hampstead Square.

6. In August 2010 adjustments were made to the width of the 'back building' at the upper levels to echo more clearly the T-shape of the original building. Adjustments were made to the heights of the side bays onto Christchurch Passage and Hampstead Square to reduce the impact of the scale and massing; window positions were refined and the line of the roof pitch and eaves adjusted to soften the building profile.

7. In August 2011 the scheme was submitted to planning (PA Ref.: 2011/4317/P), but subsequently withdrawn on 31 October 2011 following a negative response from LBC planners. Changes were then made that included:

South-facing elevation on New End:

The overall width of the building was reduced;

The side bay facing Carnegie House was removed;

The elevation and front bays were set further back from New End;

The basement wall was moved away from Lawn House; and

The building line of the top floor was adjusted so that the corners facing New End were recessed to minimise their visibility.

North elevation onto the open space:

The overall width was reduced; and

The footprint moved away from Lawn House to maintain the same separation as the existing building.

To minimize overlooking:

Window sizes were reduced to reduce overlooking towards Lawn House and Carnegie house;

Terraces facing Lawn House, Carnegie House and Christ Church Cottage were provided with restricted access and landscaped; and

Parapet levels were raised.

Materials:

Upper level facing materials were changed from bronze to slate; and

Balustrades were changed from glass to metal

NB. It was in relation to this scheme that English Heritage commented that they have: “*no objection to demolition of existing building which has neutral contribution to conservation area*” [...] (reported as item ‘4. Further amendments to report’, in the Supplementary Agenda for DCC 28.11.13, as a correction of the original Report to Committee).

8. The revised planning application – the Appeal Scheme – was submitted in May 2012 (PA Ref.: 2012/3089/P). Additional information and further revisions were submitted in response to feedback from LBC Officers’ and external consultant’s responses, including as follows (in relation to townscape issues):

Revision 1 – September 2012 (No re-consultation)

Reduction in the 3rd floor terrace overlooking Christchurch Passage, and the provision of obscured glazing for windows on the side elevations; and

Additional comparative studies were made for the elevation to New End.

Revision 2 – May 2013 (re-consultation with all respondents)

The position of western wall at basement, ground and 1st floors were adjusted to allow retention of adjoining listed wall buttresses.

The KM Heritage report of May 2012 was revised in response to the new design.

- 5.5 The Appeal Scheme was strongly recommended for approval by LBC Officers (subject to the Section 106 agreement); the conclusion to the report to committee stated that it will ‘preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area: *“Demolition of the existing neutral building is acceptable. The replacement building is considered appropriate in terms of bulk, height, footprint, layout and design and it will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The scheme will retain existing private open space and valuable trees and will provide an adequate amount of soft landscaping and green roofs. The new building will not seriously harm neighbour amenity in terms of outlook, light, privacy or noise subject to appropriate safeguards. The scheme with its basement car park and new entrance should not, on balance, harm overall transport and parking conditions in the area.”*

Description of the Height, Scale and Massing of the Appeal Scheme

- 5.6 The height, scale and mass of the Appeal Scheme will be broadly similar to that of the existing building. However, KSR Architects have adopted a very different design approach to that evident in the existing building. Their approach was to design a well modelled and articulated building form that will sit comfortably within this sensitive urban context, and that relates directly to the street, rather than appearing to stand aloof above it.
- 5.7 The entrance will be set a storey lower than that of the existing building and will be accessible without a major level change directly from New End through a perimeter brick wall. The sheer verticality of the external walls of the existing building, which causes the existing building to appear to loom over New End, will be replaced by strongly defined horizontals, softened by landscaping. These will not be applied to a single vertical plane, but a series of planes that will step back from New End.
- 5.8 The first step will comprise two symmetrically arranged front bays located either side of the entrance, with recessed balconies and metalwork balustrades creating a central vertical emphasis above the entrance. Windows will be punched into the brickwork of the bays on either side derived from the same modular widths, with a single windows placed closest to the centre followed by a double window on the outside. Those on the first floor will have

metalwork balconies. The two bays will each be topped by a metalwork balustrade partially each concealing two sets of double windows placed on the same wall as the entrance.

- 5.9 Thus, the main south-facing elevation will have a clearly defined symmetrical composition, with three distinctly separate brick wall surfaces (the two pronounced bays and the main wall to which they are attached) that will define the entrance and will have a scale that relates positively and directly to the street, and the different heights of properties either side – the low set New End Theatre to the west, the taller Carnegie House to the east, and the varied scales and characters of the listed 10, 12 and 14 New End and former New End Hospital buildings opposite. The careful arrangement of windows, and the associated tertiary layer of visual detail provided by the metalwork balustrades, will enliven this overall composition so that it will not appear static or heavy, but will have a well-orchestrated balance of formality and informality. It will avoid the regulated institutional character of the former Nurses' Home.
- 5.10 The mansard roof levels will step away from the street and will be clad in slate, and will be appropriately articulated and detailed so that it steps back and away from the brick elevations below – so that it recedes and is regarded as a recessive form. The roof will define the Appeal Scheme's top in common with the different styles of mansards and dormers that already exist within this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area. It will relate positively to the diverse character of its urban context.
- 5.11 This composition for the main face of the building – of base (perimeter brick wall on the street with central opening), middle (defined by the two pronounced brick bays either side of the entrance) culminating in an attic storey at the top of the brickwork (comprising a horizontal band with which the vertically aligned central entrance band of recessed balconies connects) and topped by the dark slate stepping roof – will be anchored visually at the southeast corner of the Appeal Site by a brick wall adjacent to Christchurch Passage, which adds an asymmetrical note to the composition and establishes an additional horizontal datum at first floor level. The entrance to the underbuilding car park pierces this single storey high wall, which is surmounted by a terrace and a band of metalwork balustrading.
- 5.12 Set back from the main south-facing elevation are two slender bays in brickwork placed symmetrically on either side of building, which define the

east and west facing elevations of the Appeal Scheme. They have protruding oriel windows with larger glass windows than those on the south elevation, and define the outer edge of the entire frontal composition. These outermost brick bays rise as high as the main brickwork of the front.

- 5.13 The east elevation facing Christchurch Passage and Carnegie House has been designed to be more informal than the south front. There will be one predominant window type – the same as the single window to the front – and two oriel windows will be located at the top right of the two different width bays to provide them with asymmetrical highlights. The narrow brick bay will have three vertical tiers of windows, the wider brick bay to the north will be set back in relation to the more slender body of the T-plan, and will have four vertical tiers of windows, the fourth tier arranged as pairs under the oriel. The base of the building to the northeast will have a single terrace that protrudes no further than the southeast corner of the building (and so will not be clearly visible from New End – it will also be hidden from view by the high wall along Christchurch Passage). Access to the terrace will be restricted at the northeast corner by permanent raised planting to prevent access and overlooking towards Carnegie House. Windows will have obscured elsewhere on this elevation where there is potential overlooking of neighbours.
- 5.14 The west elevation faces the western boundary wall that has New End Theatre at the southwest street end, the party wall with windows of Lawn House towards the centre, and the rear of the semi-detached houses on Hampstead Square to the northwest. To minimise overlooking the southwest wall of the Appeal Scheme, the narrowest part of the plot in relation to neighbouring properties, the end wall will be in plain brick with no window openings (the existing building has windows in this area, so this will represent a marked improvement for the privacy of neighbours). The northwest wall of this elevation will have just three principal vertical window tiers, and protruding bays at its base will counter them with a horizontal emphasis and will be planted to restrict access. Windows will have obscured elsewhere on this elevation where there is potential overlooking of neighbours.
- 5.15 The north elevation facing the enclosed garden and the boundary with Christ Church will be the smallest elevation and will be comparable in scale to the principal north elevation of Lawn House. It will be entirely symmetrical in composition, and will be arranged with a square of brickwork on which the

slate mansard sits, and the vertical pairing of windows (with metalwork balconies at what reads as first floor on the composition) will be balanced by a balcony step above the second level of windows, which forms an attic band for the uppermost brick storey. Low set balconies belonging to the two side elevations will flank the south elevation, to create a visually pleasing northern face to the Appeal Scheme, in scale with the private open space that it will address.

- 5.16 The quality and coherent character of the Appeal Scheme, such that every elevation is a direct response to the specific context it addresses, is very evident to me. It will be better composed, articulated and detailed than the existing building, has been designed to respect the spatial and physical relationship with neighbouring properties, and therefore has the potential to preserve and enhance the Hampstead Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings. This potential will now be tested in the visual impact assessment that follows.

The Visual Impact of the Appeal Scheme

- 5.17 In order to fully understand the visual impact of the Appeal Scheme in its heritage context I requested that my client commission seven accurately verified Computer Generated Images (CGIs) for my assessment. These have been produced by the leading townscape visualisers, AVR London, and – according to good practice – have been taken from publicly accessible locations I selected with Mr Gordon Jefferys at street level positions (on pavements rather than the road, and with a 1.60m camera height to relate to eye level). The methodology that AVR London have adopted (lens size etc) is industry standard and is described in Appendix RT2. They illustrate the visual impact of the existing building, the former Nurses' Home, on the views and allow a direct comparison to be made with the scale, mass and architectural design of the Appeal Scheme. The resulting existing and proposed CGIs are set out – as existing and proposed – in Appendix RT2. The relevant text is also provided below for completeness.

Table of selected views

View number	Title of view
1	Looking Northwest from New End Square
2	Looking north towards the Appeal Site
3	Looking west along New End from Carnegie House
4	Looking east along New End from opposite the Duke of Hamilton pub
5	Looking southeast towards the entrance and entry court of Lawn House (12 Hampstead Square)
6	View southwards from junction of Holford Road and Cannon Place towards Christ Church
7	Looking southwards along Christchurch Passage from adjacent the NE corner of the Appeal Site

View 1: Looking Northwest from New End Square

- 5.18 **Existing:** The viewing location is taken from directly opposite the Grade II listed buildings at 4, 6 and 8 New End Square, the low brick boundary wall of which is on the left of the picture frame. The view looks up the sloping street past The Old White Bear pub on the right and the historic houses on the left towards Carnegie House, which appears in the view as two simple brick boxes each with a pair upper storey protruding balconies, and with a separating white band above defining an attic storey: the buildings have no visible roofs. The existing building, the former Nurses' Home, is the distant focus of this view and is set back from New End. It is the tallest building in view and the three tall chimney stacks emphasise its greater scale and provide the view with its skyline focus. The existing building has terrace blocks at its base that step out of the established vegetation adjacent to Christchurch Passage. The building rises sheer above this base, its windows arranged in a regular pattern that is relieved only by a protruding brick cornice and eaves at the attic level.
- 5.19 **Proposed:** The Appeal Scheme will have a clearly defined symmetrical composition, with three distinctly separate brick wall surfaces, the two pronounced bays and the main wall to which they are attached. These will

define the entrance and will have a scale that relates positively and directly to the street, and the different heights of the properties in view. The careful arrangement of windows, and the associated tertiary layer of visual detail provided by the metalwork balustrades, will enliven this overall composition so that it will not appear static or heavy. The mansard roof levels clad in traditional slate will be a darker recessive form that steps away from the street frontage. The Appeal Scheme will have a clear base, middle and top and while having a similar scale and mass to the existing building it will have more visual interest and will fit more comfortably into the context for which it has been designed. The character of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area will be preserved and enhanced. No heritage assets will be harmed.

View 2: Looking north towards the Appeal Site

- 5.20 **Existing:** This view is taken from outside the group of Grade II listed terraced houses at 10, 12 and 14 New End and looks towards the steps on Christchurch Passage, which is bounded by a high stepping wall adjacent to the Appeal Site, and is set high above the street datum and neighbouring properties on New End. The severity of its box-like form with its regular punched windows is relieved only by the marked horizontality of the attic storey, defined by a brick cornice below and the roof eaves above, and the strong vertical thrust of the chimney stack at its east end extending from base to roof, and two roof top chimney stacks arranged symmetrically around the centre of its main elevation, which compete for attention with the pointed stone spire of the Grade II listed Christ Church, a prominent local landmark. A curved stair tower at the NE corner of its T-plan is the only other distinguishing feature visible from the public realm, and this is perhaps the best view from which to understand the building. However, the sheer and mostly unmodulated walls of the building, and its aloof almost monumental setting in relation to New End, provides it with an overbearing character that the architecture fails to mitigate.
- 5.21 **Proposed:** The clearly defined symmetrical composition of the Appeal Scheme will be more evident here than in View 1, with its three distinctly separate brick wall surfaces comprising the two pronounced bays and the main wall to which they are attached. The two front bays will define the entrance and will have a scale that relates positively and directly to the street.

The careful arrangement of windows, including the pronounced oriel windows of the side wing visible from here, and the associated tertiary layer of visual detail provided by the metalwork balustrades, will enliven this overall composition so that it will not appear static or heavy. It will have a well-orchestrated balance of formality and informality, which will avoid the regulated institutional character of the former Nurses' Home it has been designed to replace. The mansard roof levels clad in traditional slate will be a darker recessive form that steps away from the street frontage: the loss of the tall chimneys of the existing building will accentuate the prominence of the Grade II listed Christ Church spire, which will become once again the dominant form in the view, its setting enhanced. The Appeal Scheme will have a clear base, middle and top and while having a similar scale and mass to the existing building it will have more visual interest and will fit more comfortably into the context for which it has been designed. The character of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area will be preserved and enhanced. No heritage assets will be harmed and the setting of the Grade II listed Christ Church spire will be enhanced.

View 3: Looking west along New End from Carnegie House

- 5.22 **Existing:** To the left of the frame is part of 10 New End, one of three Grade II listed terraced houses (with 12 and 14 New End) located opposite the steps of Christchurch Passage. Beyond no. 10 is the red brick Grade II listed original workhouse block, which became more recently New End Hospital – now residential. Its contrastingly heavy white painted classical details (cornices, quoin blocks and – more eclectic – window heads), pronounced pedimented central bay and symmetrically positioned end bays with broken pediments, provides a strong focus to the street view. Mature trees on the Appeal Site mostly block views to the junction with Heath Street beyond. The existing building on the Appeal Site rises precipitously to the right. Although built as a Nurses' Home to provide accommodation associated with hospital immediately across the road, it shares no visual association whatsoever with it and dominates the historic building it was built to serve.
- 5.23 **Proposed:** The pronounced brick bays and central recessed balcony bay of the Appeal Scheme will relate positively to the historic former hospital opposite: both buildings will have a symmetrical frontal composition, red-

brown bricks and contrasting light coloured banding and window details. The pronounced lower bays of the Appeal Scheme will have a height similar to that of the former hospital before stepping away from the street to a roof height set lower than that of the existing building on the Appeal Site. While complementary forms, the window details and organisation of the Appeal Scheme will show it to be a 21st century building – true to its own time and functional needs. Its brick coloration, while similar to that of the listed hospital opposite, is derived from the tall existing wall that forms the west side of Christchurch Passage in this view – the character and coloration of which will be extended around the street base of the Appeal Scheme using complementary reclaimed bricks – and will appear to climb with the wall of the Passage northwards (to the right) of the view, such that it will appear derived from the materiality and natural topography of the Appeal Site. It will represent a high quality architectural response to this specific place, without attempting to directly imitate any of the architectural styles nearby, such that all the buildings in view will have their own architectural integrity. Consequently, the character of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area will be preserved and enhanced. No heritage assets will be harmed and the setting of the Grade II listed terraced houses (10, 12 and 14 New End) and Grade II listed original workhouse block/former New End Hospital will be enhanced.

View 4: Looking east along New End from opposite the Duke of Hamilton pub

- 5.24 **Existing:** The Duke of Hamilton pub to the left and the New End Theatre immediately beyond it are not listed, but – with the other buildings in view – emphasise the good quality and considerably diverse architectural character of the buildings locally within this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area. To the immediate right is the most westerly corner of the Grade II listed original workhouse block/former New End Hospital, which its idiosyncratic classical detailing contrasting with its plain red brick walls. The contrastingly simple block-like character of Carnegie House can be seen beyond, its flat roof contrasting with the steep roof of New End Theatre and the residential buildings at that conclude the street vista from here. The former Nurses' Home on the Appeal Site is mostly concealed by the foreground trees, including the large Horse Chestnut, and only part of its brick-faced attic storey can be seen

past the tree against the sky at left of centre and its brick boundary wall on the back of pavement in front of the tree. From this viewing position the former Nurses' Home has only a minor impact on the view.

- 5.25 **Proposed:** The visibility of the Appeal Scheme will be similar to that of the existing former Nurses' Home on Site. The brick boundary wall on the back of pavement in front of the tree of the Appeal Scheme will have a similar character to that of the existing. The amount of building visible above and beyond the New End Theatre will be similar to the existing, except that less brickwork will be visible and more of the recessive coloured roof slate of the Appeal Scheme: the impact of windows in the view will be less in the Appeal Scheme than is evident currently in the former Nurses' Home. No heritage assets will be harmed and the setting of the Grade II listed original workhouse block/former New End Hospital will – if any change is noticed at all by the casual observer – be enhanced.

View 5: Looking southeast towards the entrance and entry court of Lawn House (12 Hampstead Square)

- 5.26 **Existing:** On the left of the view is no. 11 Hampstead Square, the southern half of a pair of semi-detached houses (nos. 10-11). Its rich Arts & Crafts character of undulating projecting brick bays with curved white painted cornice/eaves, surmounted by a recessed brick and stuccoed simple pedimented top and flanked by steep roofs and small plain tiles, contrasts with restrained planar character of the Georgian Grade II listed Lawn House (12 Hampstead Square), part of the front formal north elevation of which can be seen through the trees that frame its entrance, beyond the modern brick gate posts to the property capped by stone balls. Being the north elevation the front of Lawn House is in shade, while the visible part of the west-facing side elevation of the former Nurses' Home is more brightly sunlit. Three storeys of windows are visible set into brickwork, and five windows are clearly visible from here with others partially visible through the trees even in summer. Above is the clay tile pitched roof.
- 5.27 **Proposed:** The Appeal Scheme will have a similar scale and mass impact on this view as the existing Nurses' Home. Its red-brown brick will complement the colours of the brick buildings and the structures in the foreground, the slate

clad uppermost storey will provide the building with a recessive top. The elevation will not be on a single plane (as is the existing Nurses' Home) but will step back in stages, each marked by a light coloured horizontal band and the transition of planes softened by planting. Four windows will be clearly visible, but only one of these will not be set behind balcony planting. The visual separation and backdrop of the Grade II listed Lawn House from the Appeal Scheme will be enhanced not harmed and the character of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area will be preserved and enhanced.

View 6: View southwards from junction of Holford Road and Cannon Place towards Christ Church

- 5.28 **Existing:** The soaring spire of the Grade II listed Christ Church dominates the left of this view, the mature trees its centre. Only a very small part of the Nurses' Home is visible at right of centre between the trees and beyond the chancel of the Church. Its clay tile roof contrasts with the Kentish ragstone walls of the Church, but has a negligible impact on its urban setting.
- 5.29 **Proposed:** The Appeal Scheme will have a similar scale and mass to the existing Nurses' Home on Site, and its uppermost storey will be clad in slate rather than clay tiles so that it will recede from rather than draw the eye. Its richer red-brown walls will be slightly more visible but will step back in stages, and the transition of planes softened by planting. The Appeal Scheme will have a negligible impact on the Grade II listed Christ Church, the urban setting of which will be preserved and left unharmed. Similarly, the character of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area will be preserved not harmed.

View 7: Looking southwards along Christchurch Passage from adjacent the NE corner of the Appeal Site

- 5.30 **Existing:** This long narrow pedestrian passage is hard landscaped, with wall-to-wall paving slabs. The land falls away to the east with distant views of central London and down into Christchurch School and School Houses, which frames the northern end of the Passage to the east and Christ Church itself to the west: both properties are Grade II listed. Three Grade II listed lamp posts illuminate the Passage at night and emphasise the historic character of this

pedestrian route. The viewing position is located adjacent to all these listed buildings and structures, which are not visible in the photograph. Ahead on the left is the frontage of Christ Church Cottage, and beyond – set lower on New End – are visible the upper storeys and dormer roofs of the Grade II listed terrace at 10, 12 and 14 New End. An important local landmark, the boiler house chimney of the original workhouse block (part of the Grade II listed original workhouse block at former New End Hospital), punctuates the skyline beyond the listed terrace. The north elevation of the former Nurses' Home is visible through the trees and planting at the rear of the Appeal Site, and further right are the upper storeys of the east and north elevations of the Grade II listed Lawn House (12 Hampstead Square).

- 5.31 **Proposed:** The scale and mass of the Appeal Scheme would be slightly taller than that of the former Nurses' Home in this view, but it will – as existing – be seen through a screen of trees and planting. Its form will not read simply as a single elevation, but as a series of setback planes each articulated by planting that will emphasise the already well landscaped character of the Appeal Site, maintaining the contrast with the hard landscaping of Christchurch Passage. The terrace at the NW corner of the Appeal Scheme will slightly reduce the visibility of the Grade II listed Lawn House, otherwise the visibility of all the other listed structures will be left unchanged, and their settings will benefit from the high quality of the Appeal Scheme. The Appeal Scheme will preserve and leave unharmed the listed buildings adjacent to the Site. Similarly, the character of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area – and of Christchurch Passage in particular – will be preserved not harmed.

Conclusions regarding the visual impact of the Appeal Scheme

- 5.32 There are several character zones within sub-area 2 of the Hampstead Conservation Area; the Appeal Site being in the New End/New End Square Area and adjacent to the Christchurch Area. The Christchurch Area is dominated by Christ Church its *“handsome spire [...] towers over the slopes of Hampstead, visible for miles around. The streets in this zone are clustered around it.”* (p. 18) The New End/New End Square Area is described as a 19th century enclave of *“working class cottages and municipal buildings and that character is still strongly evident, alongside a few earlier properties.”* (p. 20)

- 5.33 The Appeal Scheme would affect the setting of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area, which contains important listed structures and buildings, the significance of which is enhanced by their varied character and history, and by their proximity to each other. I believe that the Appeal Scheme, as demonstrated by my assessment of its impact in key views in around this part of the Conservation Area, will not harm the setting of all of these heritage assets and that the significance of these assets, either individually or as a group, would not be harmed by it.
- 5.34 As stated previously, within the New End/New End Square Area, the existing building on the Appeal Site is described in the Conservation Area Appraisal as having an “*overbearing quality as it looms over the street.*” (p. 20). It is my conclusion that the setting of the Conservation Area and the settings of all relevant heritage assets would benefit from the careful modelling of the scale and mass of the Appeal Scheme, its materials and detailing, which has been designed as a contextual response to this specific place. It will neither be overbearing, nor loom over New End. Instead, I believe it will complement the existing townscape and will contribute positively to this place.
- 5.35 I therefore agree with the judgment of other key professionals who have considered the Appeal Scheme in depth – LBC planning officers (in their Report to Committee), where enhancement is identified, and with Mr Murphy of KMHeritage (in his original response to the planning submission), that the Appeal Scheme will both preserve and enhance its sensitive heritage context.
- 5.36 In relation to the Barnwell Manor case, should the Inspector agree with the judgments of LBC planning officers, Mr Murphy – as well as myself – that the Appeal Scheme will preserve and enhance relevant heritage assets, it follows that very considerable weight and importance should be given to this conclusion in the planning balance.

6.0 Response to the Council's Reasons for Refusal 1 and 5

- 6.1 Five reasons were given for refusal by the Council. The first Reason for Refusal is relevant to my expertise and has provided the focus of my evidence.

Reason for Refusal 1

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its design, bulk and massing, would detract from the character of the streetscene and townscape and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

- 6.2 In relation to this Reason for Refusal my evidence has described the existing building, its scale, mass and character in its specific sensitive heritage context from an independent perspective, but which inevitably draws from the Design and Access Statement (DAS) provided by KSR. Based on my experience of the Appeal Site and its context and the available documentation and my own assessment of relevant heritage assets (Hampstead Conservation Area, listed buildings and structures) I have considered:

- the design evolution of KSR's design proposals, and the principal changes that were made to its external appearance (scale, massing, window sizes, and materials);
- the visual impact of the bulk and massing of the existing building on Site and the Appeal Scheme (scale, massing, window sizes, and materials); and
- the visual impact of the Appeal Scheme on adjacent listed buildings and this part of the Conservation Area.

- 6.3 With regard to the demolition of the existing building on Site, the former Nurses' Home, it is my professional judgment (as it was Mr Kevin Murphy's of KMHeritage) that it has neither 'architectural interest', 'artistic interest', nor 'aesthetic value'. I note that the Council describe this in the Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal as "*a plain building*" that is "*overbearing*" and "*looms over the street*", which I have concluded describes a building that has a

negative impact on this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area, while the Council and English Heritage describe it as 'neutral'.

- 6.4 Its impact is negative in my judgment, not necessarily because of its essential scale and mass, but because that scale and mass is not moderated and articulated sufficiently. It is its plainness as a building and its unremitting verticality – the sheerness of its walls — that causes it to appear to 'loom' over the street, and to the extent that is described as 'overbearing'.
- 6.5 Therefore, to preserve the Hampstead Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings, any replacement building does not necessarily need to be smaller than the existing building, but it does need to be better composed, articulated and detailed, while respecting the spatial and physical relationship of the existing buildings with neighbouring properties.
- 6.6 It is my conclusion that the Appeal Scheme, as demonstrated by my assessment of its impact in key views in around this part of the Conservation Area, will not harm the setting of all of these heritage assets and that the significance of these assets, either individually or as a group, would not be harmed by it.
- 6.7 Also, as the settings of all relevant heritage assets would benefit from, and not be harmed by the careful modelling of the scale and mass of the Appeal Scheme, which has been designed as a contextual response to this specific place, I have concluded that it will complement the existing townscape and will contribute positively to this place. Consequently, I believe that the Appeal Scheme will both preserve and enhance this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area, and will preserve and enhance the settings of all relevant listed buildings and structures seen in relation to it.
- 6.8 Whether the former Nurses' Home is described as having a negative or neutral impact, it is relevant that – in their Report to Committee – the professional judgment of the Council's own planning and design officers was that the Appeal Scheme would preserve and enhance – not harm – relevant heritage assets: *"Demolition of the existing neutral building is acceptable. The replacement building is considered appropriate in terms of bulk, height, footprint, layout and design and it will **preserve and enhance** the character and appearance of the Conservation Area [...]."*

6.9 I therefore disagree with Reason for Refusal 1, and believe instead that by virtue of its design, bulk and massing, the character of the streetscene and townscape would benefit from the Appeal Scheme, which would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings.

6.10 Consequently, LBC policy in the Local Development Framework Core Strategy, CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) will be satisfied. Similarly, those in the Local Development Framework Development, policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) will be met.

6.11 In relation to **Reason for Refusal 5**:

The proposed development and its associated excavation works would result in the removal of a number of trees on the site which are considered to have a high amenity value in the townscape, which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene and conservation area, contrary to policy CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity) of London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

6.12 Mr Adam Hollis, Registered Consultant and Fellow of the Arboricultural Association and a Chartered Environmentalist, Forester and Surveyor, has responded directly to this Reason for Refusal in his proof written on behalf of the Appellant. I have responded to it through my assessment of the selected key views, set out in Appendix RT2, which illustrate the visual effect of the stepped elevations of the Appeal Scheme, with their landscaped terraces and the new planting layout on this part of the conservation area and adjacent listed buildings. My conclusion is that the proposed landscaping layout on and around the Appeal Scheme will enhance its character and immediate setting, and will preserve and enhance the setting of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings and structures that will be seen in relation to it.

6.13 Therefore, in relation to my specific expertise, I commend the Appeal Scheme to the Inspector unequivocally.

7.0 Summary and Conclusions

Introduction

- 7.1 My name is Robert Tavernor. I am an architect, university academic, and architectural and urban design consultant of longstanding and considerable experience, nationally and internationally. I was engaged by Karawana Holdings Ltd in March 2014. I have not worked directly on the Appeal Scheme previous to this appointment. I have not worked before with the practice KSR Architects, or Mr Gordon Jefferys of KSR. I have therefore been able to review the Appeal Scheme and its earlier design evolution, as set out in KSR Architects' DAS with a fresh and open mind.
- 7.2 I appear at this Inquiry in support of the Appeal Scheme (APP/X5210/A/14/2218243), which I understand from reviewing the relevant documents was carefully developed and negotiated by the Appellants over a lengthy period with the Council's design officers. It is evident that they concluded that the new building would not only preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area but also enhance it; and furthermore that the setting of existing listed buildings will not be harmed.
- 7.3 Having reviewed the relevant documents and having assessed the Appeal Scheme myself in relation to the sensitive heritage considerations of the Appeal Site, I have concluded that the professional judgment of the Council's design officers was correct, and that they were justified in reaching their own reasoned conclusions.
- 7.4 My proof responds to the Council's Reason for Refusal 1, and my evidence describes the existing building, its scale, mass and character in its specific sensitive heritage context from an independent perspective, but which inevitably draws from the Design and Access Statement (DAS) provided by KSR.
- 7.5 I also make reference to Reason for Refusal 5 through my assessment of seven key views I selected, and which are set out in Appendix RT2, which illustrate the visual effect of the stepped elevations of the Appeal Scheme, with their landscaped terraces and the new planting layout on this part of the conservation area and adjacent listed buildings.

The Appeal Site in its existing urban context

- 7.6 The Appeal Site is situated at the northern end of Hampstead Village, which includes buildings from many architectural periods and styles, and is located on land sloping steeply upwards away from the road, on the west side of Christchurch Passage, a pedestrian alleyway that connects New End with Christchurch Hill. The Appeal Site is located in sub-area two of the Hampstead Conservation Area, which is known as Christ Church/Well Walk. The existing building on the Appeal Site, a former Nurses' Home at 29 New End, is a T-shaped building built in the 1950s and is currently unoccupied (except for a caretaker).
- 7.7 The former Nurses' Home is not expressly identified explicitly in the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement as either a positive contributor to, or a detracting feature from the conservation area. However, it is described as a '*plain building*', which has an '*overbearing quality*' and '*looms*' over the street. The Council's Site Specific Allocation description (Section 7 – Other Localities, pp. 168-170) states that it is: "*a large and prominent presence in the conservation area, and is identified as neutral to the character of the conservation area.*" Also that it: "*is not considered to make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area*". Similarly, English Heritage commented in relation to the withdrawn application of 31 October 2011 that they have: "*no objection to demolition of existing building which has neutral contribution to conservation area*" [...] (reported as item '4. Further amendments to report', in the Supplementary Agenda for DCC 28.11.13, as a correction of the original Report to Committee).
- 7.8 My own assessment of the former Nurses' Home is that it should be regarded as having a negative impact on this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area. However, I note that LBC Officers regarded its impact as neutral when recommending approval of the Appeal Scheme in their Report to Committee, stating that: "*Demolition of the existing neutral building is acceptable.*" I agree that the former Nurses' Home does not warrant retention.
- 7.9 Further, I conclude that in order to preserve and enhance the Hampstead Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings, any replacement building does not necessarily need to be smaller than the existing building, but it does need to be better composed, articulated and detailed, and

it should respect the spatial and physical relationship of the existing buildings with neighbouring properties.

Design, scale and mass, and elevational treatment of the Appeal Scheme

- 7.10 The height, scale and mass of the Appeal Scheme will be broadly similar to that of the existing building. However, KSR Architects have adopted a very different design approach to that evident in the existing building. Their approach was to design a well modelled and articulated building form that will sit comfortably within this sensitive urban context, and that relates directly to the street, rather than appearing to stand aloof above it. I believe they have succeeded in developing a design that will achieve these aims.
- 7.11 The quality and coherent character of the Appeal Scheme, such that every elevation is a direct response to the specific context it addresses, is very evident to me. It will be better composed, articulated and detailed than the existing building, has been designed to respect the spatial and physical relationship with neighbouring properties, and therefore has the potential to preserve and enhance the Hampstead Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings.

The impact of the Appeal Scheme on relevant heritage assets

- 7.12 The Appeal Scheme would affect the setting of the part of the Hampstead Conservation Area in which it is located, which contains important listed structures and buildings, the significance of which is enhanced by their varied character and history, and by their proximity to each other (see section 4 of my proof for a detailed description of these, and Appendix RT1). I believe that the Appeal Scheme, as demonstrated by my assessment of its impact in key views in around this part of the Conservation Area (in Appendix RT2), will not harm the setting of all of these heritage assets and that the significance of these assets, either individually or as a group, would not be harmed by it.
- 7.13 I conclude that the setting of the Conservation Area and the settings of all relevant heritage assets would benefit from the careful modelling of the scale and mass of the Appeal Scheme, its materials and detailing, which has been

designed as a contextual response to this specific place. It will neither be overbearing, nor loom over New End. Instead, I believe it will complement the existing townscape and will contribute positively to this place.

- 7.14 I agree with the judgment of other key professionals who have considered the Appeal Scheme in depth – LBC planning officers (in their Report to Committee), where enhancement is identified, and with Mr Murphy of KMHeritage (in his original response to the planning submission), that the Appeal Scheme will both preserve and enhance its sensitive heritage context.

Final conclusions in relation to reason for refusal

- 7.15 I therefore disagree with Reason for Refusal 1, and believe instead that by virtue of its design, bulk and massing, the character of the streetscene and townscape would benefit from the Appeal Scheme, which would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings. Consequently, the relevant sections of planning legislation, national, regional and local planning policy, and specifically LBC planning policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 will be met.
- 7.16 In relation to Reason for Refusal 5, I have assessed selected key views set out in Appendix RT2, which illustrate the visual effect of the stepped elevations of the Appeal Scheme, with their landscaped terraces and the new planting layout on this part of the conservation area and adjacent listed buildings. My conclusion is that the proposed landscaping layout on and around the Appeal Scheme will enhance its character and immediate setting, and will preserve and enhance the setting of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings and structures that will be seen in relation to it.
- 7.17 Consequently, in relation to my specific expertise as set out in this proof, I commend the Appeal Scheme to the Inspector unequivocally.

Professor Robert Tavernor, *RIBA*

Appendix RT1: Relevant Designated Heritage Assets



Fig. 1. Aerial view identifying location of Appeal Site and its immediate heritage assets within the Hampstead Conservation Area: relevant assets are numbered and a key provided overleaf

NB. This map is to be read with the detailed description of relevant listed buildings set out in section 4.0 of this proof.

Numerical key to Listed Buildings

1. Lawn House – Grade II
2. Stables in rear yard of the Duke of Hamilton Public House (Public House not included) – Grade II
3. Two lamp posts – Grade II
4. Elm Lodge and attached garden wall – Grade II*
5. 1 Elm Row – Grade II*
6. 3 Elm Row – Grade II
7. 5 Elm Row – Grade II
8. 1 Hampstead Square and attached railings – Grade II
9. 2 Hampstead Square and attached railings – Grade II
10. Two lamp posts – Grade II
11. Christ Church – Grade II
12. Three lamp posts – Grade II
13. Christchurch School and School Houses and attached railings – Grade II
14. 4, 6 and 8 New End Square – Grade II
15. Three lamp posts – Grade II
16. 10, 12 and 14 New End and attached railings and lamp holder – Grade II
17. Original workhouse block at former New End Hospital and attached railings – Grade II
18. Infirmary block and linking corridors at former New End Hospital – Grade II
19. Circular ward and attached ablution and water Tank Tower at former New End Hospital – Grade II*

Table RT1. Relevant Designated Heritage Assets: the extent and contribution of their setting to their heritage significance

No.	Listed Building/ Grade		Description	Significance	Extent and contribution of setting to significance
1	Lawn House	II	Lawn House is a detached house dating from c.1800 with late 19th century alterations. It is constructed in brown brick with red brick dressings and is three storeys high with a basement. The principal north elevation is four bays wide with a later full height single bay extension to the west side. The windows are square-headed sashes with red brick dressings and aprons below the first floor windows. The central entrance has an early 19th century prostyle portico with modified, fluted Doric columns and pilasters and a fluted frieze with roundels below a dentil cornice; the door is half-glazed with an overlight. A parapet conceals the roof.	The terrace has architectural and historic interest as an example of late Georgian housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. The house has group value with 10-14 Elm Row, which are of a similar date but much more modest and of a different class of housing.	The setting of Lawn House is limited to its immediate vicinity. To the north and west is Hampstead Square a small, residential enclave occupied by Georgian and Victorian houses, many of which are listed. There are many trees in the street and in the gardens of these houses; foliage plays a significant role in the setting of Lawn House, reinforcing the village character. Close to the north is Christ Church: its spire is an important feature of the house's setting. Adjacent to the east is the former Nurses' Home, which is larger in scale and mass than the rest of the surrounding development. Otherwise, the setting is generally high quality and complementary to Lawn House, both in material and scale, and as such contributes to its significance. The exception is the former Nurses' Home, its larger scale means it is an overbearing and dominant feature in the setting and does not relate positively or contribute to the significance of the listed building.
2	10-14 Elm Row including stables in rear yard of the Duke of Hamilton Public House (Public House not included)	II	This terrace of three cottages in Elm Row dates from the late 18th century. They are two storeys high with basement stables to the rear elevation, which face into the yard of the Duke of Hamilton pub. Each house is two bays wide; one window bay and one door bay. The	The terrace has architectural and historic interest as an example of late Georgian housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. The	The setting of the listed terrace is limited to its immediate vicinity. To the north and west is Hampstead Square a small, residential enclave occupied by Georgian and Victorian houses, many of which are listed. There are many trees in the street and in the gardens of these houses; foliage plays a significant role in the setting of the terrace, reinforcing the village character. Close to the north is Christ

			houses are constructed in multi-coloured stock brick. The plain doorways and sash windows are recessed in painted reveals and have cambered arches. The stable in the basements to the rear have original stalls, mangers and fittings. The rear also has a single storey, two window extension on supported on cast-iron columns. On the flank wall of No. 10 adjacent to a narrow stepped passageway is an old stone plaque inscribed <i>"Three feet west/from this wall/is private property"</i> .	terrace has group value with Lawn House, which is of a similar date although much grander.	Church, its spire is an important feature of the setting. To the east is the former Nurses' Home, which is larger in scale and mass than the rest of the surrounding development. Adjacent the south, downhill, the development is fine-grained, it is mainly residential. Further south are the larger scale buildings of the former workhouse/hospital complex, due to their embedded nature these will have minimal contribution to the significance of the terrace. The setting is generally high quality and complementary to the listed terrace, both in material and scale, and as such contributes to its significance. The exception is the former Nurses' Home, its larger scale means it is an overbearing and dominant feature in the setting and does not relate or contribute to the significance of the listed terrace.
3	Two lamp posts	II	This pair of cast iron lamp posts dates from the 19th century. They have cast iron columns and one has the original Windsor lantern; the other has a 20th century reproduction lantern.	They have historic interest as in-situ examples of 19th century street lighting. They have group value with the other listed lampposts in the vicinity.	The fine-grained residential area of Hampstead village forms the setting of the lampposts. The historic village street pattern of this part of Hampstead remains intact. This along with the continued residential nature of the setting contributes to the significance of the listed lamp posts.
4	Elm Lodge and attached garden wall	II*	This detached house originally had its principal frontage facing onto New End but is now orientated so the main front is to Elm Row. The house dates from c. 1732 and is three storeys high and five bays wide to the north façade, the ground floor was originally the rear basement before the	This house has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. It has	The setting of Elm Lodge is limited to its immediate vicinity. To the north and east is Hampstead Square a small, residential enclave occupied by Georgian and Victorian houses, many of which are listed. There are many trees in the street and in the gardens of these houses; foliage plays a significant role in the setting of Elm Lodge, reinforcing the village character. To the west Heath Road forms part of the setting of Elm Lodge,

			<p>house was divided and re-orientated in the 1930s. It is constructed in brown brick with red brick dressings. The central entrance bay projects forward and the main doorway is at first floor level, accessed by twin flights of curved steps, this entrance was added in c.1930. The ground floor doorway, formerly the basement, is directly below. Red brick bands divide the storeys and the roof is concealed behind a plain brick parapet. The sash windows have red brick flat arches and dressings, although several are now blind both on the north façade and the returns. The interiors are also of interest and known to include good panelling and a staircase with closed string, carved brackets, twisted balusters and column newels. The attached brick garden wall is also of interest.</p>	<p>group value with the other houses and terraces from this period in the vicinity; 1, 3 and 5 Elm Row and 1 and 2 Hampstead Square.</p>	<p>this is a busier main street with shops and more mixed collection of buildings; it only makes a minor contribution to the significance of Elm Lodge. Downhill, to the south, the development is fine-grained and mainly residential. Further south are the larger scale buildings of the former workhouse/hospital complex: due to their embedded nature in their urban context these make a minimal contribution to the significance of the terrace. The setting is generally high quality and complementary to Elm Lodge, both in material and scale, and as such contributes to its significance.</p>
5	1 Elm Row	II*	<p>This terraced house dates from c. 1720. It is four storeys high and was originally four bays wide to the principal south elevation with a later two bay extension. It is constructed in brown brick with red brick dressings to the windows. The corners of the older part have plain brick pilasters. The central entrance</p>	<p>This house has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. It also has historic</p>	<p>The setting of this house is limited to its immediate vicinity. It is within Hampstead Square a small, residential enclave occupied by Georgian and Victorian houses, many of which are listed. There are many trees in the street and in the gardens of these houses; foliage plays a significant role in the setting of the listed house, reinforcing the village character. To the west Heath Road forms part of the setting of Elm Lodge, this is a busier main street with shops</p>

			has a carved bracketed hood and half glazed door. The windows are square-headed sashes, the westernmost window at the second floor is bowed with cast-iron balcony and tented canopy. The extension, to the east, has a veranda with tented roof and cast-iron columns. The interior is thought to retain original panelling and staircase.	interest as the home of DH Lawrence in 1923. It has group value with the other houses and terraces from this period in the vicinity; Elm Lodge, 3 and 5 Elm Row and 1 and 2 Hampstead Square.	and more mixed collection of buildings. It only makes a contribution to the significance of the listed building by, again by reinforcing the village character. The setting is generally high quality and complementary to the listed house, both in material and scale, and as such contributes to its significance.
6	3 Elm Row	II	This double fronted terraced house dates from c.1720 and was refaced in the late 19th century. It is constructed in red brick with brighter red brick dressings. The house is three storeys with a basement below and a late 19th century dormered, attic storey in the patterned tiled mansard roof. The principal elevation, to the south, is five bays wide. The entrance is in the centre bay at the ground floor and consists of a moulded hood supported on console brackets and a 19th century, half-glazed door and reeded surround and patterned fanlight. The windows are segmental-arched sashes, the central first floor window has a moulded brick architrave with a fleur-de-lys keystone and a cornice. An original	This house has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. It also has historic interest as the home of Sir Henry Cole, founder of the Kensington Museum (now the V&A) and a postal reformer, between 1879 and 1880. It has group value with the other houses and terraces from this period in the vicinity; Elm Lodge, 1 and 5	The setting of the listed house is limited to its immediate vicinity. It is located within Hampstead Square a small, residential enclave occupied by Georgian and Victorian houses, many of which are listed. There are many trees in the street and in the gardens of these houses; foliage plays a significant role in the setting of the listed house, reinforcing the village character. To the west Heath Road forms part of the setting of Elm Lodge. This is a busier main street with shops and more mixed collection of buildings; it only makes a minor contribution to the significance of the listed house. The setting is high quality and complementary to the listed building, both in material and scale, and as such contributes to its significance.

			lead rainwater head and pipe survive. The interior is thought to original panelling.	Elm Row and 1 and 2 Hampstead Square.	
7	5 Elm Row	II	This terraced house dates from c.1720 and has been refaced twice, first in the late 19th century and more recently in the late 20th century. It is three storeys high with a dormered mansard roof and is five windows wide on the principal south elevation. It is constructed in red stock brick with red brick dressings and floor bands. The central entrance has a 20th century bracketed, hooded doorcase. The windows are segmental-arched sashes, the central window at the first floor has decorative moulded brickwork and a fleur-de-lys over the window.	This house has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. It has group value with the other houses and terraces from this period in the vicinity; Elm Lodge, 1 and 3 Elm Row and 1 and 2 Hampstead Square.	The setting of the listed house is limited to its immediate vicinity. It is within Hampstead Square a small, residential enclave occupied by Georgian and Victorian houses, many of which are listed. There are many trees in the street and in the gardens of these houses; foliage plays a significant role in the setting of the listed house, reinforcing the village character. The setting is high quality and complementary to the listed building, both in material and scale, and as such contributes to its significance.
8	1 Hampstead Square and attached railings	II	This semi-detached house adjoins No. 5 Elm Row and separated from No. 1 Hampstead Square by a narrow passage; Stamford Close. No. 2 dates from c.1720 and was refaced in the late 19th century. It is three storeys high with a dormered attic storey and basement below and is five windows wide on the principal east elevation with a two bay return to the south. It is constructed in multi-coloured stock	This house has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. It has group value with the other houses and terraces from this period in	The setting of the listed house is limited to its immediate vicinity. It is within Hampstead Square a small, residential enclave occupied by Georgian and Victorian houses, many of which are listed. Close to the north is Christ Church, its spire is an important feature of the house's setting. There are many trees in the street and in the gardens of these houses; foliage plays a significant role in the setting of the listed house, reinforcing the village character. To the east is the former Nurses' Home, which is larger in scale and mass than the rest of the surrounding development, due to its downhill

			brick with moulded red brick dressings, cornice and floor bands. The central entrance is within a late 19th century projecting red brick porch with a round-arched doorway, radial fanlight and panelled door. The windows are segmental-arched sashes, the central first floor window has a moulded brick architrave with a fleur-de-lys keystone and a cornice. The parapet has ball finials at the corners and the roof has a central hexagonal dormer surmounted by a flagpole and a smaller dormer on each side. The basement area has cast-iron railings with urn finials.	the vicinity; 2 Hampstead Square, 1-5 Elm Row and Elm Lodge.	location this building is a peripheral feature in the setting of the listed house; it does not contribute to its significance. The setting is generally high quality and complementary to the listed building, both in material and scale, and as such contributes to its significance.
9	2 Hampstead Square and attached railings	II	This semi-detached house adjoins No. 4 Hampstead Square and separated from No. 1 Hampstead Square by a narrow passage; Stamford Close. No. 2 dates from c.1720 and was refaced in the late 19th century. The house is constructed in red brick and is three storeys high with a hipped slate roof and basement below. The principal elevation, to the east is three bays wide with a one bay return to the north. The entrance is in the northernmost bay on the west elevation and has a carved, console-	This house has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London. It has group value with the other houses and terraces from this period in the vicinity; 1 Hampstead Square, 1-5 Elm Row and Elm Lodge.	The setting of the listed house is limited to its immediate vicinity. It is within Hampstead Square a small, residential enclave occupied by Georgian and Victorian houses, many of which are listed. Close to the north is Christ Church, its spire is an important feature of the house's setting. There are many trees in the street and in the gardens of these houses; foliage plays a significant role in the setting of the listed house, reinforcing the village character. The setting is high quality and complementary to the listed building, both in material and scale, and as such contributes to its significance.

			bracketed hood and architraved doorway with a radial fanlight. The windows are segmental-arched sashes at the ground and first floors and square headed at the second floor. There is a central dormered window in the roof. The basement area has cast-iron railings with urn finials.		
10	Two lamp posts	II	This pair of lamp posts date from the 19th century, they have cast-iron standards and 20th century reproduction Windsor lanterns.	They have historic interest as in-situ examples of 19th century street lighting. They have group value with the other listed lampposts in the vicinity.	The fine-grained residential area of Hampstead village forms the setting of the lampposts. The historic village street pattern of this part of Hampstead remains intact. This along with the continued residential nature of the setting contributes to the significance of the listed lamp posts.
11	Christ Church	II	Christ Church was constructed in 1850-2 when Hampstead's parish Church, St John's, became too small for the growing population and the parish was sub-divided. The Church was designed by Samuel Dawkes in Early English Gothic style and the north porch and projecting aisle were added in 1881- 2 by Ewan Christian. It is constructed in Kentish ragstone with Portland stone dressings. The aisled nave is five bays long and the north side has a single storey four bay projection, each bay of which is gabled. There	The Church has historic interest for its position within the growing village of Hampstead as it became absorbed by the urban sprawl of London in the 19th century. There is also architectural interest for its association with Samuel Dawkes a prominent Victorian architect. It also has group value with the adjacent Christchurch	Aside from Christchurch School the setting of the Church is wholly residential. To the west is the fine-grained residential enclave of Hampstead Square, which dates from the 18th century and is part of the historic core of Hampstead village. The areas to the north and east were developed in the 19th century, when the village was rapidly expanding. The houses in these areas are Victorian mansions and mansion blocks; these make a strong contribution to the significance of the Church which was established in response to the increase in population of the village. The School is intimately connected with the Church and so forms a significant feature in its setting and contributes to its significance. The setting is high quality and complementary to the listed building and as such

			is a buttressed tower with corner finals and a spire at the western end. The windows are pointed arched with tracery and quatrefoil.	School.	contributes to its significance.
12	Three lamp posts	II	This list entry comprises three 19th century lamp posts with cast iron standards and Windsor lanterns.	They have historic interest as in-situ examples of 19th century street lighting. They have group value with the other listed lampposts in the vicinity.	The fine-grained residential area of Hampstead village, with local Church and School, forms the setting of the lampposts. The historic village street pattern of this part of Hampstead remains intact. This along with the continued residential nature of the setting contributes to the significance of the listed lamp posts.
13	Christchurch School and School Houses and attached railings	II	<p>Christchurch School was designed by WG and E Habershon in c.1854 and the attached school houses date from c.1857; both have some later 20th century alteration. They are an irregular group of Tudor-style, single storey buildings with a symmetrical pair of two storey school houses adjoining the west side. The buildings are all constructed in yellow stock brick with stone dressings and tiled, gabled roofs with dormers; the school houses have moulded chimney-stacks with stone chimney finials. The doorways have arched openings with drip-moulds and ball flower decoration and the windows are transomed and mullioned and some have traceried heads. Cast iron railings with</p>	<p>As the village of Hampstead expanded in the Victorian period, eventually being absorbed into the urban sprawl of London, there would have been a greater need for schools. Christchurch School dates from the mid-Victorian period and so has historic and architectural value as an example of a village school in the wider urban context of London from this period. It has been closely linked with Christ Church,</p>	<p>Aside from Christ Church the setting of the School is wholly residential. To the west is the fine-grained residential enclave of Hampstead Square, which dates from the 18th century and is part of the historic core of Hampstead village. The areas to the north and east were developed in the 19th century, when the village was rapidly expanding. The houses in these areas are Victorian mansions and mansion blocks, which make a strong contribution to the significance of the School, which itself was established in response to the increase in population of the village. The Church is intimately connected with the School and so forms a significant feature in its setting and contributes to its significance. The setting is high quality and complementary to the listed building and as such contributes to its significance.</p>

			urn finials define the area, the gates have lattice box piers.	adjacent, since they were both constructed and so the pair forms a strong group.	
14	4, 6 and 8 New End Square	II	<p>This terrace of three houses dates from the mid-18th century but has since been altered. They are constructed in brown brick with red brick dressings and are three storeys high with a basement. The houses are narrow, just one window bay wide. The ground floor of No. 4 has a single square-headed sash window and a round arched recessed doorway with radial fanlight. The first and second floors formerly has pairs of sash windows, those to the left side have been infilled and at the first floor replaced by two small 20th century windows. Nos. 6 and 8 have been combined into a single dwelling, each formerly had the same round arched doorway; the one to No. 8 has been converted into a window. The windows at the ground floor have also been replaced in the 20th century by a large canted 7-sash bay window with a dentil cornice. Both Nos. 6 and 8 have a single sash window at first floor and a wider tripartite sash window</p>	<p>The terrace has architectural and historic interest as an example of mid-18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London.</p>	<p>The setting of this terrace extends south to include New End Square, a small, triangular-shaped, cobbled open space with its boundary occupied by Georgian and Victorian houses on the north and south sides and to the west, Wells House, a 20th century Council block. There is an arts and crafts style pub at the entry to the Square, just north of the listed terrace, and further north the large, post-war residential blocks of Carnegie House with the equally large former Nurses' Home beyond. All the buildings in the setting of the listed terrace are constructed in brick. The setting is generally high quality and complementary to the listed terrace, both in material and scale, and as such contributes to its significance. Exceptions to this are Carnegie House and the former Nurses' Home, their larger scale and elevated position uphill from the terrace mean they form an overbearing and dominant feature in the setting and do not relate or contribute to the significance of the listed terrace.</p>

			at the second floor. Nos. 6 and 8 share a dentilled cornice below the eaves.		
15	Three lamp posts	II	This list entry comprises three 19th century lamp posts with cast iron standards and Windsor lanterns.	They have historic interest as in-situ examples of 19th century street lighting. They have group value with the other listed lampposts in the vicinity.	The fine-grained residential area of Hampstead village forms the setting of the lampposts. The historic village street pattern of this part of Hampstead remains intact. This along with the continued residential nature of the setting contributes to the significance of the listed lamp posts.
16	10, 12 and 14 New End and attached railings and lamp holder	II	This terrace of three houses date from 1725 and were refaced in the later 19th century. The terrace is constructed in multi-coloured stock brick with red brick dressings to the windows. Each house is three windows wide and three storeys high, with basements below and dormered attic storey above. The basements are painted white and surrounded by cast-iron area railings. No. 14 has a wrought-iron overthrow with lamp-holder. The entrances have hoods supported on carved consoles and architraved doorways with panelled doors. All the windows are segmental arched sashes, No. 14 possibly retains its original glazing bars. Below the plain brick parapet is a red brick dentilled cornice. No. 12 retains its original lead rainwater pipe	The terrace has architectural and historic interest as an example of early 18th century housing in Hampstead, at the time a village on the outskirts of London.	The setting of this terrace extends east and west along New End, which is a narrow and primarily residential street. Adjacent to the west are the collection of listed former workhouse/hospital buildings, which together have high townscape value. Aside from the principal block, all are set back from the street and so their relatively large footprints do not dominate. To the east the grain is finer and the buildings smaller scale, they are mainly terraces of houses and an arts and crafts style pub. Opposite the terrace are the large, post-war residential blocks of Carnegie House with the equally large former Nurses' Home. All the buildings in the setting of the listed terrace are constructed in brick. The setting is generally high quality and complementary to the listed terrace, both in material and scale, and as such contributes to its significance. Exceptions to this are Carnegie House and the former Nurses' Home, their larger scale and elevated position uphill from the terrace mean they form an overbearing and dominant feature in the setting and do not relate or contribute to the

			and head.		significance of the listed terrace.
17	Original workhouse block at former New End Hospital and attached railings	II	<p>This building was constructed as the Hampstead parish workhouse in 1849 and was used as a general/geriatric hospital in 1915 until 1987. It was designed by HE Kendall Jnr and was converted for residential use by John Thompson Associates in the 1990s. The building is constructed in red brick with stuccoed dressings and quoins. The principal elevation is to New End and is two to three storeys high and fourteen bays wide. The composition of this main façade is symmetrical; the central four bays project forwards with three bay wings on either side, these are all three storeys, and two storey projecting end pavilions. The projecting centre and pavilions are topped with pediments; open to the pavilions and close to the centre, which also has an oculus. The main entrance is in the centre and is round-arched with a keystone and pilasters supporting a cornice, which continues across the front of the buildings, and scroll pediment. The windows are all segmental headed sashes with stucco</p>	<p>In 1848 Hampstead became an independent Poor Law parish, instead of extend the existing workhouse building, a new purpose built workhouse. The building therefore has architectural interest as a mid-19th century example of workhouse design. The former workhouse forms a group with the circular ward and attached water tower, the infirmary block and the boilerhouse chimney; together they demonstrate the history of Poor Law provision for the sick and elderly in the 19th century; they have historic interest and exceptional townscape value.</p>	<p>The setting of the original workhouse building largely consists of the other buildings on the former workhouse/hospital complex but also extends east and west along New End. The setting to the south is high quality and complementary to the listed building both in material and scale; the former workhouse/hospital complex form a homogenous group and as such the other buildings in this set contribute to the significance of the workhouse. To the east the grain is finer and the buildings smaller scale, they are mainly terraces of houses and an arts and crafts style pub; these also make a contribution to the significance of the workhouse. Development on the north side of the street also has a fine grain and small scale with the exception of the former Nurses' Home opposite and the post-war residential blocks of Carnegie House, which both have larger scale and mass; their elevated position uphill from the workhouse means they form an overbearing and dominant feature in the setting. Adjacent to the north is a modern residential block, which is an unsuccessful pastiche of the style of the workhouse. The setting opposite and adjacent to the west do not contribute to the significance of the listed building.</p>

			hoods and keystones. There is a large cornice, which projects and is supported on paired brackets. There are cast iron railings to the areas. The rear elevation is of similar style.		
18	Infirmary block and linking corridors at former New End Hospital	II	<p>This building was constructed in 1869-71 as the infirmery block of the Hampstead parish workhouse and was extended in a similar style in 1878. The original and extension were both designed by John Giles of Messrs Giles & Bevan. The block was converted for residential use by John Thompson Associates in the 1990s. The building is long and narrow, orientated north south and is four storeys high with basements below. It is constructed in yellow stock brick with brick bands at the floor levels. At the southern end is an attached tower, which has cast iron balconies at its top level. The sash windows of the main range are segmental headed with stuccoed keystones.</p>	<p>The infirmery block was constructed in response to damning Lancel report in the 1865 of workhouse conditions and an inspection of the Hampstead workhouse in 1868. Provision had to be made for separate accommodation for sick and able-bodied paupers. Hampstead is one of the first and oldest surviving developed in response to these events and to be designed in response to Florence Nightingale's reforms in nursing and hospital design, including high, light wards which were narrow enough to allow cross-ventilation. It</p>	<p>The setting of the infirmery block largely consists of the other buildings on the former workhouse/hospital complex and surrounding residential terraces. The former workhouse/hospital complex form a homogenous group and are high quality and complementary to the listed infirmery both in material and scale. As a group they have high townscape value and as such the other buildings in this set contribute to the significance of the infirmery. The workhouse complex is embedded within a fine-grained residential area of the Hampstead village; this aspect of its setting remains consistent and so contributes to the significance of the listed buildings in the complex.</p>

				has historic and architectural interest for these reasons. The block also forms a group with the original workhouse block, the circular ward and attached water tower and the boilerhouse chimney. The group has exceptional townscape value.	
19	Circular ward and attached ablution and water Tank Tower at former New End Hospital	II*	This circular hospital ward and its attached water tank tower was designed by Charles Bell in 1884. The building was converted for residential use by John Thompson Associates in the 1990s. The main ward is circular in plan with a rectangular water tank tower to south-west and a short rectangular wing to north-east containing the stairs and formerly the kitchen. The building is three storeys with a semi-basement and an attic; it is constructed in pale yellow and grey bricks with pink brick bands and dressings. The roof of the circular ward is conical with and gabled dormers and central octagonal brick chimney, the tower has a pyramidal	The building was the first free-standing example of the circular 'ward tower' in the country, the impetus for the design came from a paper given by John Marshall FRS, Professor of Surgery at University College & Hospital & Professor of Anatomy at the Royal Academy and which was reported in the Builder in 1878. Circular wards gave improved air, light and ventilation with the advantage of only needing a	The setting of the circular ward largely consists of the other buildings on the former workhouse/hospital complex and surrounding residential terraces. The former workhouse/hospital complex form a homogenous group and are high quality and complementary to the listed ward both in material and scale. As a group they have high townscape value and as such the other buildings in this set contribute to the significance of the listed ward. The workhouse complex is embedded within a fine-grained residential area of the Hampstead village; this aspect of its setting remains consistent and so contributes to the significance of the listed buildings in the complex.

			<p>roof with a finial and lucarnes; both are slated. The windows are largely segmental arches sashes and on the south side there are cast-iron cantilevered "airing galleries" to the upper floors which are accessed via segmental-arched glazed doorways. The water and ablution tower has full height corner and central pilasters supporting pink brick round-arches each containing an oculus at attic level.</p>	<p>small site. For these reasons the building has architectural and historic interest. The building also forms a group with the original workhouse block, the infirmary block and the boilerhouse chimney; together they have considerable townscape value and are a local landmark.</p>	
--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--