

Donald Insall Associates

11 Rosslyn Hill

Historic Building Report
for Andrew & Elizabeth Jeffreys

March 2015




Chartered Architects and Historic Building Consultants

11 Rosslyn Hill, London, NW3 5UL

Historic Building Report

For Andrew & Elizabeth Jeffreys



Ordnance Survey map with the site marked in red.

[Reproduced under Licence 100020449]

This report and all intellectual property rights in it and arising from it are the property of or are under licence to Donald Insall Associates. Neither the whole nor any part of this report, nor any drawing, plan, other document or any information contained within it may be reproduced in any form without the prior written consent of Donald Insall Associates. All material in which the intellectual property rights have been licensed to DIA and such rights belong to third parties may not be published or reproduced at all in any form, and any request for consent to the use of such material for publication or reproduction should be made directly to the owner of the intellectual property rights therein. Checked by HXE



Contents

Historic Building Analysis & Advice

1.1	Introduction	6
1.2	The Buildings and their Current Legislative Status	6
1.3	Assessment of Significance	7
1.4	Summary of Proposals and Justification	8
1.5	Conclusion	8

Historical Background

2.1	The Belsize Area and previous houses on the site of 11 Rosslyn Hill ¹	10
2.2	The Building and its occupants: 11 Rosslyn Hill	11
2.3	Relevant Recent Applications	14

Site Survey Descriptions

3.1	Setting	18
3.2	The Buildings Externally	18
3.3	The Buildings Internally	19

Commentary on the Proposals

4.1	Description of the Proposals and their Impact on the Heritage Assets	24
4.2	Justification of the Proposals	26
4.3	Conclusion	27

Appendices

- Appendix I – Planning Policy
- Appendix II – Statutory Listing Descriptions
- Appendix III – List of Plates, Sources and Endnotes

Contact Information

Kate Green (Senior Historic Buildings Advisor)

E: kate.green@insall-architects.co.uk

T: 020 7245 9888

London Office

12 Devonshire Street

London, W1G 7AB

www.insall-architects.co.uk

1.1 Introduction

Donald Insall Associates were commissioned in October 2014 by Andrew & Elizabeth Jeffreys to assist them in the preparation of proposals for 11 Rossllyn Hill.

The investigation has comprised historical research, using both archival and secondary material, and site inspections. An illustrated history of the area and the site, with sources of reference and bibliography, is in Section 2; the site survey findings are in Section 3. The investigation has established the historical and architectural significance of the heritage assets, which is set out below. This understanding has informed the development of proposals for change to the building, by Thomas Croft Architects. Section 4 provides a justification of the scheme according to the relevant planning guidance.

The investigation and this report were undertaken by Hannah Parham, Joanna Tavernor and Kate Green of Donald Insall Associates.

1.2 The Buildings and their Current Legislative Status

11 Rossllyn Hill is a Grade II listed building located in the Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area in the London Borough of Camden.

The statutory list description is included in Appendix II.

Alterations to listed buildings require listed building consent, alongside planning permission.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is the legislative basis for decision making on applications that relate to the historic environment. Sections 66 and 72 of the Act impose a statutory duty upon local planning authorities to consider the impact of proposals upon listed buildings and conservation areas and state that new development should preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic interest of listed buildings or their setting and the character and appearance of conservation areas.

In order for a local authority to consider granting such consent, the proposed development must be justified according to the policies on the historic environment set out in the *National Planning Policy Framework*.

The key message of the *National Planning Policy Framework* is the concept of 'sustainable development'. The *National Planning Policy Framework* requires that heritage assets (a term that, with regard to UK planning legislation, includes listed buildings, conservation areas, and unlisted buildings of local importance) should be conserved in a manner 'appropriate to their significance.' It also notes the desirability of 'sustaining and enhancing the significance' of heritage assets and of putting assets to viable uses 'consistent with their conservation.' The *National Planning Policy Framework* recognises the 'positive contribution of that the conservation of heritage assets can make towards economic

vitality'. However, it also recognises that, in some cases, proposals can lead to a heritage asset losing significance. The *National Planning Policy Framework* thus requires that the 'public benefits' of a proposal – which include securing the optimum viable use of a designated heritage asset – should outweigh any 'less than substantial' harm caused to the significance of a designated heritage asset.

Copies of the relevant planning policy documents are included in Appendix I.

1.3 Assessment of Significance

11 Rosslyn Hill was built c.1770 by an unknown architect or builder. It thus dates to the time when the countryside between London and Hampstead was carved up into building plots for large detached villas, the homes of well-off Londoners seeking solace away from the busy metropolis. Rosslyn Grove, as 11 Rosslyn Hill was originally known, was such a house. It was built with a coachhouse (necessary for its owner to travel into town) and set in a large park-like garden.

The house's setting has been utterly transformed, beginning with the construction of Alfred Waterhouse's Congregational Chapel (now a recording studio and Grade II listed) within its grounds in 1883 and continuing as field after field was given over to speculative development in the 19th century. Only two houses in the Belsize area (this and nearby Rosslyn Lodge) survive from the Georgian period and so 11 Rosslyn Hill has considerable historic interest as a rare surviving remnant of 18th-century Belsize. It also has architectural significance as an elegant detached Georgian house in beautifully-crafted brick, which survives with its principal elevations largely intact. Inside, the majority of the plan form and the staircase survive, albeit with some later modifications.

The house has undergone many phases of alteration since its construction, however, not all of which have been sympathetic to the original design. It was left vacant in the early 20th century which is believed to have resulted in the loss of a number of original features due to weather damage. Photos from 1969 show the house in a poor state of repair. The house was renovated in the 1950s (when the basement was converted to a garage) and in the early 2000s when many of the mid-century changes were reversed and a sensitive restoration was completed. The surviving internal fabric, therefore, has varying degrees of significance. Features such as the staircase – which is original in parts – are of primary importance. Some historic doors, architraves, shutters, windows, a single fireplace, and a neo-classical plaster ceiling survive and these also have significance. Much, however, has been replaced in replica, including fireplaces, cornices, doors, skirting, and architraves. While contributing to the character of the building, these replicas have no historic or architectural significance in themselves.

The 20th-century outbuildings which stand in the grounds of the house are of no architectural or historic building merit and, by virtue of their design and materials, detract from the setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of the wider conservation area.

1.4 Summary of Proposals and Justification

The proposals are described in detail in the Thomas Croft Architects drawings and design and access statement which accompany this report. The scheme proposes to demolish the two single-storey outbuildings/sheds adjacent to the former church and to construct a new single storey dining room extension which links to the south-west corner on the ground floor. It is also proposed to replace the 1950s lodge to the east of the house with a new single storey outbuilding and to excavate new basement areas to the east and north-west of the basement of the main house.

The proposed works would preserve the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area – indeed the setting of the listed building, and the listed former church adjacent, would be enhanced by the removal of the outbuildings to the north-west and the replacement of the 1950s lodge with a high quality contextual building sympathetic to the architectural character of the listed building. Therefore the presumption against the grant of planning permission imposed by Sections 66 and 72 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Act is not engaged.

Whilst the proposed scheme would cause no harm to the significance of the listed building or the conservation area, and therefore paragraphs 133 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework are not engaged, it is still helpful to consider the public benefits of the scheme. The proposals offer heritage benefits of enhancing the setting of the listed building, and the listed former church adjacent, through the removal of the existing outbuildings outlined above and replacement with structures which would stand more comfortably within the grounds.

1.5 Conclusion

The proposals have been designed with the significance of the listed building very much in mind and would form a new phase of alteration in the life-time of this building which has already transformed a number of times in its history. The sensitive additions would preserve the architectural and historic interest of the building whilst taking advantage of the opportunity to enhance its setting (and of the adjacent church) through the removal of the outbuildings to the north-west and replacement of the existing poor quality 1950s lodge. The proposals would therefore meet the tests within the NPPF for sustainable development, insofar as these relate to the historic environment.


2.1 The Belsize Area and previous houses on the site of 11 Rosslyn Hill¹


The Belsize estate, situated on both sides of Haverstock Hill, was in monastic ownership until the Dissolution of the Monasteries in the 1530s, when it became the property of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster Abbey. The name is derived from the archaic French 'bel assis' meaning 'beautifully situated'. The area was popular in the fifteenth century with merchants and the aristocracy, who sought a country house with good access to London. The Earl of Chesterfield leased the area from the Dean and Chapter in the seventeenth century; at this time the substantial Belsize House (located to the south of 11 Rosslyn Hill) was at the centre of the estate.

By 1646 there were several houses on the western side of Haverstock Hill. One such house, on the site of the present 11 Rosslyn Hill, was built by Sir Isaac Wake (d. 1632), a courtier. Screened by a grove, and standing back from the road, it was described as a fine seat with its views and walks of pines and firs. The house had passed by 1646 to John Wilde, Chief Baron of the Exchequer and parliamentarian, who died there in 1669. At this time it was assessed at 17 hearths, one of the largest houses in the parish. The house was inherited by Wilde's daughter and her husband Charles West, Baron De La Warr (d. 1687), who sold it c.1683 to a London citizen, probably John Coggs, a goldsmith to whom the lease was assigned after 1685 and who rebuilt the house in 1686. The lease was assigned to Thomas Ketteridge, upholsterer, and the underlease sold in 1711 to William Paget, Baron Paget (d. 1713), listed as occupier in 1714, when the house was set in formal gardens.

Between 1679 and 1714 the number of houses in the area increased from around 6 to around 14; by 1808 there were 22. On the Wilde estate three

1. *Ordnance Survey map 1867-70.*
London Metropolitan Archives





2. *Leases on the Belsize Estate in 1808. 'Hampstead: Belsize', A History of the County of Middlesex: Volume 9: Hampstead, Paddington (1989)*

- 3. *Map from lease Rosslyn Grove estate 1882. Camden Local Studies Archive*
- 4. *Map from lease Rosslyn Grove estate 1884. Camden Local Studies Archive*


new houses were added: one by 1757; another in 1774 (later replaced by Rosslyn Lodge); and, by 1779, a small house adjoining Wilde's own house.

Until 1770 Wilde's house itself was occupied by a Sarah Ketteridge and was described as 'an old messuage' ('messuage' is an archaic legal term for house or dwelling). It is likely to have been in a state of dereliction at this point for it was pulled down by its next leasee, one John Stokes, probably a lawyer. He built a new house, coach house and stables on the site; this is the house that survives today, known then as Rosslyn Grove, but now as 11 Rosslyn Hill.

2.2 The Building and its occupants: 11 Rosslyn Hill

11 Rosslyn Hill was built c.1770. The architect is unknown, if indeed it was designed by an architect at all; the man who built it, John Stokes, may have simply employed a builder for the work.


In 1808 the Belsize estate was split into nine leasehold estates, largely based upon the traditional underleases and focussed on single houses. A map in the *A History of the County of Middlesex*, published in 1986, shows the boundaries of different leases on the Belsize estate in 1808 (Plate 2). 11 Rosslyn Hill is labelled 'Wilde's House (Rosslyn Grove)' and is one of three portions of land in the area leased to Thomas Roberts. Roberts had lived at 11 Rosslyn Hill as a sub-leasee of John Stokes since 1800 and remained there with his family until 1835 or later. One new house was built on the Rosslyn Grove estate between 1808 and 1817, on the north corner of Belsize Lane and the London Road. This, the first encroachment on Rosslyn Grove's garden, was a harbinger of things to come.



Yet the house was to enjoy its bucolic setting for a little while longer. The first edition of the Ordnance Survey map, published in 1866, shows that the area was then still relatively undeveloped (Plate 1). Large villas had been built along the main streets, but they still overlooked fields behind. Hampstead Heath station had opened in 1860, heralding the transformation of the area, but Rosslyn Grove was still sited in a large park-like garden with footpaths and trees.

During the nineteenth century the freehold of the Rosslyn Grove estate passed from the Dean and Chapter of Westminster to the Church Commissioners. When Thomas Roberts' tenure of Rosslyn Grove ended, the Church Commissioners leased part of the land to the Congregationalists, who desired to build a new chapel here, and part to one Thomas Adolphus Amos. A lease document between Amos and the Church Commissioners, dating from 1882, included a map (Plate 3) illustrating the boundaries of Rosslyn Grove (in green), the site for the proposed chapel (in blue) and also the land which had been sold to Amos by the Congregationalists and earmarked for development (in red). The sale of this land funded the construction of the church. In the lease Amos agreed to provide drainage for and to erect a number of houses on Belsize Lane, originally Rosslyn Gardens (later nos. 4-26 Belsize Lane). The lease suggests that at this time he became the occupant of Rosslyn Grove, having previously resided in Sutton. Amos' profession is not known and thus it is not possible to substantiate the claim made in the Victoria County History or in the listing entry for 11 Rosslyn Hill that the building was the manse for the Congregational Church. A later lease document, dating from 1884, shows the newly built chapel, which was constructed in 1883 to designs by Alfred Waterhouse. The map also shows the boundaries of the chapel and of Rosslyn Grove (Plate 4).

5. Ordnance Survey map 1915. London Metropolitan Archives



Census records reveal that Amos was still resident in Rosslyn Grove in 1887, but again his occupation is unrecorded. By 1891 Rosslyn Grove was home to Francis Giles, a stockbroker, which suggests that if this was ever a vicarage it was not connected to the church for very long. The census also gives details of a 'Chapel keeper's house, Rosslyn Grove', home to James Thomas and his family, the caretaker of the church; this is likely to be a separate property. By the turn of the century, the house was known as 11 Rosslyn Hill and it appears as such in the Post Office Street Directories of 1898 and 1902, occupied by a Nunn Thomas and then a Nunn Thomas Hancock.

In the census of 1911, the only reference to a house in the location of 11 Rosslyn Hill is the Lyndhurst Church House, home to the same James Thomas and his wife, the church officer and cleaner. It is possibly that 11 Rosslyn Hill was empty at this point. Planning applications held by Camden Council described the house as being in a state of dereliction at the start of the twentieth century, when original features were lost to weather damage; while no documentary evidence has been found to support this, the fact that the house was empty in 1911 suggests that, if this was the case, it was at this point in the building's history that the deterioration occurred.

By the time the second edition Ordnance Survey map was published of 1915 (Plate 5), all of the open land around Rosslyn Grove had been taken up for development. The first drainage plans for the building date from 1916 and they show that at this time a new sink was added to the pantry. The next records date to 1933 when the builders Truck & Son installed an additional lavatory and W.C. on the ground floor. The area escaped relatively unscathed from damage caused by bombs during the Second World War (Plate 6).

6. Bomb Damage map 1939-45.
London Metropolitan Archives



In January 1948 the owner of the property, D.L. Jordon commissioned the architect A.E. Prower and the builders Stuart Brothers to devise plans to convert the premises into three flats including three new bathrooms, two new kitchens and two new W.C.s (Plate 7). It appears that this work did not take place.

In June 1953 Dr C. Evans employed the Contemporary Design Group to install additional sanitary facilities (two bathrooms and a cloakroom) and to construct a new garage in the basement and an area on the north front (Plate 8). Five years later, in May 1958 the same owner employed the architect Julian Sofaer to provide designs for a lodge within the grounds of the house.

The Lyndhurst Congregationalist Church was closed in 1978. Since 1913 membership had fallen drastically and, when the Presbyterian and Congregational churches merged in 1972, it became a United Reformed Church place of worship. The building was refurbished as a recording studio in 1991 to become the Sir George Martin's Air Studios.

2.3 Relevant Recent Applications

On May 5th 1999 Listed Building Consent was granted for various internal and external works of alteration and internal refurbishment. The object of the works was to reinstate original features where they had been lost, to remove the 1950s additions, and to return the basement from a garage to part of the house. These changes included but were not limited to:

- changes to windows on north-east (front) elevation, repair to brickwork, replacement of garage doors with sash windows;
- on the south-west (garden) elevation, the rear door reinstated with metal steps and railings to the garden;
- on the south-west (garden) elevation, multiple-pane sash window added to staircase window;
- on the south-west (garden) elevation, Venetian window restored with new door, fanlight and balconette;
- on the south-west (garden) elevation, new French doors basement level underneath Venetian window, with stone steps leading up to garden (this was never implemented);
- on the south-east elevation, railings to the parapet wall and new French windows leading to the flat roof of the canted bay (this was never implemented);
- on the north-west elevation, new front door and restoration of portico.

A number of changes were also made internally. These included but were not limited to:

- The basement was completely renovated and the garage removed;
- On the ground floor a new kitchen was added, the fireplace from this room was relocated to the dining room. A new opening was made between the kitchen and dining room. Dining room plaster work was restored as well as sashes and shutters. Sashes were restored in the living room.

- On the first floor a small modern partition between the staircase was removed and a new bathroom was added. In the master bedroom a new doorway was added through to a bathroom. A number of sash windows were also restored on this floor.

On 11 July 2000 Listed Building Consent was granted for a fireplace and surround to the ground floor living room.


On 23 October 2001 Listed Building Consent was granted for the erection of an entrance gate and railings to the front entrance drive.

On 28 April 2005 Listed Building Consent was granted for the replacement of existing garage building with a new garden building, incorporating a new glazed/timber structure to link to the main single family dwelling house. This consent was not implemented.



On 14 January 2010 Listed Building Consent was granted for the demolition of the existing detached single storey garage at the side/rear of the dwelling house and erection of a single storey garden building and connecting glazed link structure and replacement of window with a door in the ground floor rear elevation of the single family dwelling house. To date, this consent has not been implemented.

On 18 July 2013 Listed Building Consent was granted for internal alterations comprising the reconfiguration of bedrooms and bathrooms layout at first and second floors.


· NO. 11 ROSSLYN HILL · HAMPSTEAD · NW3 ·
 · ALTERATIONS FOR DR. CHRISTOPHER · EVANS ·
 · SCALE ONE INCH EQUALS EIGHT FEET ·




SECOND FLOOR




FIRST FLOOR



GROUND FLOOR



BLOCK PLAN SCALE 1/1000



NE (FRONT) ELEVATION


· DRG. NO. 2/9/52/1. · MAY · 1953 ·

· CONTEMPORARY · DESIGN · GROUP ·


· 30 · GREENHILL · HAMPSTEAD · NW3 ·

GG/6


7. Drawings detailing the proposed conversion of 11 Rosslyn Hill, 1948. Camden Local Studies Archive




S.W. ELEVATION (GARDIN)




N.E. ELEVATION (FRONT)




BLOCK PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'




BASEMENT PLAN




GROUND FLOOR PLAN



SECOND FLOOR PLAN



FIRST FLOOR PLAN



SECTION THROUGH BASEMENT

PROPOSED CONVERSION OF 11 ROSSLYN HILL, HAMPSTEAD N.W.3
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'

8. Drawings detailing proposed alterations to 11 Rosslyn Hill, 1953. Camden Local Studies Archive

Site Survey Descriptions **3.1 Setting**

Rosslyn Hill forms part of the main route from Central London to Hampstead and is consequently a busy road. The buildings situated in the vicinity of 11 Rosslyn Hill vary in date: they include the red brick 1-7 Rosslyn Hill, dating from the 1880s, and the very differently scaled and almost suburban 9 & 9a-d Rosslyn Hill, built in the 1950s. 13 Rosslyn Hill occupies a prominent position at the junction of Lyndhurst Road; it has a two-storey bay window, stucco plasterwork, tripartite windows, and decorated gables. Most significant to the setting of 11 Rosslyn Hill is the former Lyndhurst Road Congregational Church, to its north east, this a centrally-planned hexagonal building of 1883 by Alfred Waterhouse and is Grade II listed. Constructed of purple Luton brick with red brick and terracotta dressings, it is Romanesque in style with gabled frontages to each side under a hexagonal tiled roof with a central lantern. The church overlooks 11 Rosslyn Hill's back garden and the boundary of the gravel area in front of the house's north-west (entrance) front is defined by the church walls.

11 Rosslyn Hill is set back from the main road and accessed via a driveway which broadens into a gravel forecourt in front of the building. To the north-west of the house, within its grounds, is a small one-storey outbuilding/shed. To the east of the house, also within its grounds and in the same ownership, is a small brick lodge dating to c.1953.

3.2 The Buildings Externally

The house dates to c.1770 and is constructed from brown brick with a red brick dentil cornice. The architect, if there was one, is unknown. The house is detached and has two storeys with an attic and a basement. The windows on the whole are six-pane recessed sashes with stone sills and gauged red brick flat arches, some historic, some replica.

3.2.1 North-east (front) elevation

At the centre of the façade is a 3-light canted bay window running from basement to first floor. This is flanked by single window bays. Above the central canted bay is a pedimented attic bay. There is a brick dentil cornice below the parapet at first floor level and to the pediment. The windows are six-pane recessed sashes with stone sills and gauged red brick flat arches. All the windows on the basement level and the windows in the left-hand bay are replacements in replica. The basement windows are shown in a photo of 1969 as non-original casements and the left-hand bay contained a garage door. The two upper floor windows of the left-hand bay were at this time bricked in. The area railings are also modern. Parts of the façade have been insensitively repointed, though the quality of the brickwork in the parts which have not been repaired is still in evidence.

3.2.2 North-west (entrance) elevation

This elevation is two bays wide, the right-hand upper window of which is blind. Also in the right-hand bay is the front door, set in a timber Doric portico. The doorway is round arched with panelled reveals, a patterned



9. *View of 11 Rosslyn Grove, east to west along entrance path, 1969. LMA*

10. *View of 11 Rosslyn Grove, from east to west elevation, 1969. LMA*



11. View of 11 Rossllyn Grove, from south to north from rear garden, 1969. LMA

12. View of 11 Rossllyn Grove, from the north west, 1969. LMA

fanlight and a panelled door (the last a modern replica). To the left of the entrance, original stone steps with painted iron railings lead down to the basement.

3.2.3 South-west (garden) elevation

The fenestration of this façade is irregular. There is a central pedimented attic storey with two sash windows, located asymmetrically. At first floor level there are four sash windows and one small casement window, the latter added in 1953. The first-floor right-hand window in the central bay is a modern reinstatement of an original, lost in the 1950s. The long staircase window has been lengthened downwards (in 1999) and contains replica glass and panes. At ground floor level is a central architraved doorway with a console-bracketed pediment; the door itself and its steps and railings are modern. To the right is a Venetian-style French window (probably dating to the 1920s); the fanlight, door, marginal lights, and balconette are modern. To the left is a small window, added in the 1950s, the lintel of which was changed to red brick and the window pane replaced in 1999.

3.2.4 South-east elevation

Originally, this elevation overlooked the house's extensive garden. Hence the elevation has a ground floor 3-light canted bay with recessed sash windows; the basement window was added in 1953. At first floor level are four windows: 3 recessed sash windows and 1 with a thick mullion between the two sashes. The latter is unlikely to be original.

3.2.5 Roof

There is a pitched roof over the attic storey and two hipped roofs over the wings. These are slate covered and date to 1999.

3.3 The Buildings Internally

A note on joinery: The building has historic joinery dating to various different phases of works, with several different profiles in evidence for the glazing bars to the sash windows, architraves, shutters, skirting and doors etc. It is likely that only a few of these features are original to the house, with much else dating to the early-19th century or later. The most common type of sash windows in the house, for example, (a 2 over 4 sash with thin glazing bars, used on the principal elevations) is likely to be early-19th century. The internal doors are all likely to be mid-Victorian or later, some set in earlier architraves. Other items are wholly replica, ranging in quality from poor (such as the cornices in the master bedroom and bathroom) to good (the restored sash windows of 1999). The description below describes where features are either self-evidently or documented as new or replica; all else is described as 'historic', meaning that it ranges in date from the late-18th century to the turn of the 20th century and is considered as part of the special interest of the building.

Basement

B1

No original features: new windows, new floors, an empty chimney flue and breast.

B2

Wine cellar with original painted brick stores. An original cast iron grille door.

B3

Central room with large canted bay. Modern floor, original large timber beam along centre of ceiling visible, modern windows & skirting. Door to the left of windows leads to a modern shower room. The four-panelled door to the landing is a historic four-panelled door.

B4

Large room. All windows modern. Chimney breast on internal wall, no fireplace. Modern floor and skirting; no original features.

B5

New bathroom with all modern features. Small rectangular casement window.

B6

Main circulation corridor, has new floors and skirting. Replica hornless sash window with thin glazing bars facing south to garden. Stair treads are carpeted, therefore date unknown.



Ground Floor

G1

Dining room. Room restored during late 20th century. Skirting and dado rail historic, possibly original. Acanthus leaf cornice (probably a replica). Fine-moulded plaster ceiling with Neo-classical design, believed to be original. Modern cast iron radiators. Historic box sash windows to north and west facades with original shutters. Original Neo-classical marble fireplace, moved here from present kitchen in 1999. Glass-fronted

cupboard to right of chimney piece is not an original feature (there was a door added here in 1953). Opening and door to G6, a late 20th century addition.

G2

Entrance hall. Stone floor, probably Victorian addition.

G3

Hallway. Original late-eighteenth-century staircase running from basement to first floor. Dog-leg staircase with a half landing, open string with a wave shaped motif to the end of each tread, simple stick balusters, painted white and a wooden handrail finishing with a curtail step. Large ground to first floor hornless sash window to garden, 4 over 4 over 4 panes with thin glazing bars; all modern replica. Hallway floor has wooden floorboards.

G4


Door leading to the garden, a replica reinstated in late 20th century. Internal door with stained glass panels either side between the hallway and the inner house hallway, a modern replica.


G5

Sitting room. 3 bay canted window to south-east. Historic hornless sashes with 6 over 6 panes and thin glazing bars, shutters and (modern) window seats [NB these may be the only original late-18th century windows in the house]. Window to the southwest is an early-20th-century Venetian style window with pilasters and French doors providing access to the garden; window and door joinery modern. Shallow cast iron balcony to the exterior, modern. Fitted bookshelves to walls either side of French doors, all modern. Neo-classical cornice and skirting, replica work, as is marble fireplace.

G6

Room converted to a kitchen in late 20th century. 3 bay window to northeast. Historic hornless sash windows 2 over 4 panes with shutters and window seats. Cornice, dado rail and skirting are historic, probably original.





1st floor

F1

Bedroom. Modern fitted cupboards, a replica cornice and skirting. Historic box sash windows with glazing bars and shutters. Architrave to doors within the room are historic, possibly original.

F2

Bathroom on two levels. Replica triglyph cornice which goes around a mid-19th century internal glazed window. Historic box sash 2 over 4 panes with shutters. Otherwise, all modern joinery and fabric.

F3

Small room used as an airing cupboard and boiler room with vinyl flooring and fixed cupboards and boiler. Modern window. New door to hallway.

F4

Front room. Replica cornice and wall cupboards. Canted bay window with historic box sashes with glazing bars and shutters. Cast iron radiators sit beneath, not original. Architrave to doors within the room are historic, possibly original. Some historic skirting but mostly modern replacement.

F5

Master bedroom. The door from the landing has panelled reveals. The room has a Neoclassical cornice, skirting and a modern cupboard, with doors to match, in a fluted architrave; these features are all replica work. There are three windows: two on south-east elevation are historic box sashes, hornless, with glazing bars and shutters; that to north-east is a modern replica.

F6


Dressing room and bathroom. Opening from F5 is a recent addition. The bathroom has a Grecian cornice with triglyphs and skirting, all replica. The dressing room also has the same replica cornice, except for where new modern cupboards have been added. No evidence of any historic cornice or skirting inside the fitted cupboards.

The windows on the south-west façade are two sash windows with no glazing bars, with a large mullion between them, probably Victorian or later. Earlier box sash window in historic architrave to south-west with glazing bars but no shutters.

F7

Corridor and hallway. Windows are hornless sashes, 2 over 4 panes with thin glazing bars (that under the stair is a modern replica, the other historic). Outer architraves to all the doors are modern. Doors themselves are probably Victorian.

Winder staircase to the second floor, original fabric with some new balusters and handrail; later skirting.



2nd floor

S1

Bedroom with three sash windows (2 over 2 hornless sashes), probably replicas. Modern partition at centre. There are doors either side of this partition leading off the landing: historic two-panel doors set in historic architraves. The room has no cornice and a plain box skirting, not original.

S2

Bathroom. 2 over 2 hornless sash window, modern window set in historic lining. The architrave and door matches those to S1, probably historic. No cornice or skirting. All modern fittings otherwise.

S3

Landing and stairs. Fixed cupboard to wall, probably Victorian. Box skirting, possibly original.

4.1 Description of the Proposals and their Impact on the Heritage Assets

The proposals are described in detail in the Thomas Croft Architects drawings and design and access statement which accompany this report. The scheme proposes to demolish the two single-storey outbuildings/sheds adjacent to the former church and to construct a new single storey dining room extension which links to the south-west corner of the ground floor. It also proposed to replace the 1950s lodge to the east of the house with a new single storey outbuilding and to excavate new basement areas to the east and north-west of the basement of the main house.

Rear extension

Planning permission and listed building consent were granted (albeit not implemented) in 2010 to demolish the existing outbuildings to the north-west side of the house and to construct a similarly sized extension with a link into the entrance hall. The proposals now seek to relocate the extension to the opposite side of the building with a link corridor providing access into the drawing room. As part of these works a lightwell would be excavated around the drawing room bay window to provide light and access into the playroom below.

The new location of the extension would be more discreet than previously approved; with the extension set to the southern side of the garden, the removal of the existing outbuildings would now allow views through to the garden when approaching the main entrance, enhancing the setting of the listed building. Furthermore, the removal of the utilitarian timber outbuildings would better reveal the handsome brickwork and windows of the church wall which runs along the boundary, enhancing the setting of the listed former church building.

The extension has been designed to read as an 'orangery' style addition to the original building with large glazed sections within painted metal frames, set within painted timber columns, with a pitched lead roof. The proposed design is suited to its garden setting and would be clearly subordinate to the listed building. The dining room extension is linked to the main house via a lightweight glazed structure which would maintain a clear distinction between the two. A new door would provide access from the link into the drawing room; the interior of the drawing room has been subject to previous alteration including the early-20th-century Venetian window which leads out on to the garden, the modern fitted bookshelves to be removed to form the doorway opening and replica decorative features. Consequently the addition of a door in this location would not upset the character or architectural integrity of this room and would have a lesser impact than the link into the entrance hall previously approved.

Lightwells run nearly the whole perimeter of the house, including around the similar canted bay window on the north-east (front elevation), exposing the basement façade and modern sash windows which serve the children's room behind. The creation of similar lightwell around the bay on the side, more concealed, elevation with sash windows to serve

playroom and access into the basement would not cause harm to the appearance of the listed building. The internal character of the playroom is entirely modern following conversion from its previous use as a garage and the proposed insertion of windows and a door would have no impact on the significance of the building's interior.

Lodge building

The existing lodge building located to the east of the house was constructed in the 1950s and is of no architectural merit or historic interest. Furthermore, its simple modern form and detailing and poor quality brickwork detract from the setting of the listed building.

It is proposed to demolish and replace the existing building; this offers the opportunity to construct a building which is more sympathetic to the architectural character of the listed building and its setting. The design proposed has an octagonal floor plan with a pitched slate roof which makes reference to the former church which opposes the lodge in the principal views of the listed building when entering the drive from the street. The canted appearance this gives the new lodge also references the canted bays of the main listed building which it faces and the detailed design and materials, including sash windows and a portico entrance, are sympathetic to its architectural character. Although taller than the existing lodge, this does not in itself render it unacceptable; it is not unusual for a building of this scale to have outbuildings of size located in close proximity, particularly in the driveway entrance, despite the size of the (former) wider grounds. Furthermore, the proposed guest lodge is a high quality design which is far more sympathetic to the architectural character of the main listed building and offers a more pleasing feature in views of the building – enhancing its setting and the character and appearance of the conservation area. In these views of the front elevation, the increased presence of the lodge would not unduly intrude into the setting of the listed building but instead would serve to counter the presence of the church and balance the symmetry of the façade.

Basement extensions

Two basement extensions would also be formed as part of the proposed works. The first would be located to the east of the existing basement floor to accommodate a pool and gym suite which would link into the basement playroom and to the new guest lodge. The second would be accessed from the original basement service entrance on the north-west elevation to provide a cinema room.

The basement extensions would both sit outside of the building's footprint and be accessed through discreet openings which detach them from the appreciation of the building's main circulation and the original scale, hierarchy and historic plan form of the house. Consequently, they would read as completely separate and distinct entities which would be only appreciated once entered and their scale, form and internal characteristics would have no impact on the significance of the main listed building.

The basement extension to the north-east would lie beneath the existing hard-landscaped driveway, accessed via a small extension within the front lightwell into the playroom. Photographs from 1969 (plate 9) show how heavily this part of the front elevation and basement have been altered as part of the works to create a garage and then bring in back into internal accommodation. The minor infill of the modern lightwell and connection into what appears to be a partially rebuilt wall to provide access would cause no harm to the appearance of this part of the building. Indeed it would enhance this elevation by introducing a degree of symmetry in the form of the lightwell. The only other external manifestation of the proposed basement is a door which opens out into the new lightwell on the side elevation, owing to its concealed location this would not be visible in any views of the listed building and would not cause harm to its significance. The playroom has been subject to extensive alteration and lacks any historic features - the proposed entrance into the new basement would cause no harm to the internal characteristics of the space.

The cinema room would be accessed from within the original service entrance lightwell and would be entirely detached from the interior of the listed building – as such it would not impact on the historic layout or circulation pattern of the original building. The existing vaulted ceiling would be retained and no external manifestations are proposed. Therefore, once constructed, the basement extension in this location would not impact on the significance of the listed building.

4.2 Justification of the Proposals

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is the legislative basis for decision making on applications that relate to the historic environment. Sections 66 and 72 of the Act impose a statutory duty upon local planning authorities to consider the impact of proposals upon listed buildings and their setting and conservation areas and to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the special architectural or historic interest of listed buildings and preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

New development should preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic interest of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas. As a minimum, therefore, the impact of development on these heritage assets should be neutral to not engage the presumption within the Act against the grant of planning permission.

As outlined above, the proposed works would preserve the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area – indeed the setting of the listed building, and the listed former church adjacent, would be enhanced by the removal of the outbuildings to the north-west and the replacement of the 1950s lodge with a high quality contextual building sympathetic to the architectural character of the listed building. Therefore the presumption against the grant of planning permission within the Act is not engaged.

The NPPF has crystallised previous policy approaches to the historic environment and has given strong emphases to the need to 'weigh up' the pros and cons of a proposal to alter the historic environment. In particular, policy now states that benefits, and in particular 'public benefits', arising from proposals should be part of the weighing up process. The extent of 'public benefits' required to balance any potential 'harm' to a heritage asset is dependent on whether the 'harm' is 'substantial' or 'less than substantial' (paragraphs 133 and 134). While, as outlined in section 4.1 above, the proposed scheme would cause no harm to the significance of the listed building or the conservation area and therefore paragraphs 133 and 134 of the NPPF are not engaged, it is helpful to consider the public benefits of the scheme.

Public benefits which follow from development could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 7). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits. Public benefits may include heritage benefits, such as:

- *sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting*
- *reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset*
- *securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation*

The proposals offer heritage benefits of enhancing the setting of the listed building, and the listed former church adjacent, through the removal of the outbuildings to the north-west and the replacement of the 1950s lodge with a high quality contextual building sympathetic to the architectural character of the listed building would stand more comfortably within the grounds.

4.3 Conclusion

The proposals have been designed with the significance of the building very much in mind and would form a new phase of alteration in the lifetime of this building which has already transformed a number of times in its history. The sensitive additions would preserve the architectural and historic interest of the building whilst taking advantage of the opportunity to enhance its setting (and of the adjacent church) through the removal of the outbuildings to the north-west and replacement of the existing poor quality 1950s lodge. The proposals would therefore meet the tests within the NPPF for sustainable development, insofar as these relate to the historic environment.

Appendix I

Planning Policy and Guidance

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

The Act is legislative basis for decision making on applications that relate to the historic environment.

Sections 66 and 72 of the Act impose a statutory duty upon local planning authorities to consider the impact of proposals upon listed buildings and conservation areas.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that:

in considering whether to grant 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.

Similarly, section 72(l) of the above Act states that:

... with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

National Planning Policy Framework

Any proposals for consent relating to heritage assets are subject to the policies of the NPPF (2012). This sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. With regard to 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment', the framework requires proposals relating to heritage assets to be justified and an explanation of their effect on the heritage asset's significance provided.

The NPPF has the following relevant policies for proposals such as this:

*14. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a **presumption in favour of sustainable development**, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.*

The NPPF sets out twelve **core planning principles** that should underpin decision making (paragraph 17). Amongst those are that planning should:

- *not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives;*
- *proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities;*
- *always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;*

- *support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change, and encourage the reuse of existing resources, including conversion of existing buildings, and encourage the use of renewable resources (for example, by the development of renewable energy);*
- *conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations;*

With regard to the **significance** of a heritage asset, the framework contains the following policies:

129. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

In determining applications local planning authorities are required to take account of significance, viability, sustainability and local character and distinctiveness. Paragraph 131 of the NPPF identifies the following criteria in relation to this:

- *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.*

With regard to potential '**harm**' to the significance designated heritage asset, in paragraph 132 the framework states the following:

...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. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

With regard to '**less than substantial harm**' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, of the NPPF states the following:

134. 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.

In relation to the consideration of applications for development affecting the **setting of a designated heritage asset**, paragraph 137 of the document states the following:

Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.

In terms of **non-designated heritage assets**, the NPPF states:

135. 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 balance judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

With regards to the loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to a **Conservation Area**, paragraph 138 states this should be treated:

...As substantial harm under paragraph 133 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 134, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area...as a whole.

National Planning Policy Guidance

The planning practice guidance was published on the 6th March 2014 to support the National Planning Policy Framework and the planning system. It includes particular guidance on matters relating to protecting the historic environment in the section: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. The relevant guidance is as follows:

Paragraph 3: What is meant by the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment?

The conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance is a core planning principle. Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and effective conservation delivers wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits.

Conservation is an active process of maintenance and managing change. It requires a flexible and thoughtful approach to get the best out of assets as diverse as listed buildings in every day use to as yet undiscovered, undesignated buried remains of archaeological interest.

In the case of buildings, generally the risks of neglect and decay of heritage assets are best addressed through ensuring that they remain in active use that is consistent with their conservation. Ensuring such heritage assets remain used and valued is likely to require sympathetic changes to be made from time to time. In the case of archaeological sites, many have no active use, and so for those kinds of sites, periodic changes may not be necessary.

Where changes are proposed, the National Planning Policy Framework sets out a clear framework for both plan-making and decision-taking to ensure that heritage assets are conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a manner that is consistent with their significance and thereby achieving sustainable development.

Part of the public value of heritage assets is the contribution that they can make to understanding and interpreting our past. So where the complete or partial loss of a heritage asset is justified, the aim then is to capture and record the evidence of the asset's significance which is to be lost, interpret its contribution to the understanding of our past, and make that publicly available.

Paragraph 8: What is "significance"?

"Significance" in terms of heritage policy is defined in the Glossary of the National Planning Policy Framework.

In legislation and designation criteria, the terms 'special architectural or historic interest' of a listed building and the 'national importance' of a scheduled monument are used to describe all or part of the identified heritage asset's significance. Some of the more recent designation records are more helpful as they contain a fuller, although not exhaustive, explanation of the significance of the asset.

Paragraph 9: Why is 'significance' important in decision-taking?

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 impact and acceptability of development proposals

Paragraph 13: What is the setting of a heritage asset and how should it be taken into account?

The “*setting of a heritage asset*” is defined in the Glossary of the National Planning Policy Framework.

A thorough assessment of the impact 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.

Setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced, and may therefore be more extensive than its curtilage. All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not.

The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each.

The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This will vary over time and according to circumstance.

When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset’s significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its ongoing conservation.

Paragraph 20: What is meant by the term public benefits?

Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 7). Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits.

Public benefits may include heritage benefits, such as:

- *sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting*
- *reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset*
- *securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset*

Paragraph 7 states:

There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:

- *an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;*
- *a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and*

- *an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.*

English Heritage Guidance

English Heritage’s “Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide” (2010) elaborates on the policies set out in the now superseded PPS5 but still applies to the policies contained in the NPPF.

In paragraph 79 the guide addresses potential **benefits** of proposals for alterations to heritage assets. It states the following:

There are a number of potential heritage benefits that could weigh in favour of a proposed scheme:

- *It sustains or enhances the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting.*
- *It reduces or removes risks to a heritage asset.*
- *It secures the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation.*
- *It makes a positive contribution to economic vitality and sustainable communities.*
- *It is an appropriate design for its context and makes a positive contribution to the appearance, character, quality and local distinctiveness of the historic environment.*
- *It better reveals the significance of a heritage asset and therefore enhances our enjoyment of it and the sense of place.*

And it adds in paragraph 80:

A successful scheme will be one whose design has taken account of the following characteristics of the surroundings, where appropriate:

- *The significance of nearby assets and the contribution of their setting.*
- *The general character and distinctiveness of the local buildings, spaces, public realm and the landscape.*
- *Landmarks and other features that are key to a sense of place.*
- *The diversity or uniformity in style, construction, materials, detailing, decoration and period of existing buildings and spaces.*
- *The topography.*
- *Views into and from the site and its surroundings.*
- *Green landscaping.*
- *The current and historic uses in the area and the urban grain.*

Some or all of these factors may influence the scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and proposed use in any successful design.

The Guidance has specific advice for **additions and alterations** to heritage assets. This includes the following:

178. The main issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets, including new development in conservation areas, are proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, use, relationship with adjacent assets, alignment and treatment of setting. Replicating a particular style may be less important, though there are circumstances when it may be appropriate. It would not normally be acceptable for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting. Assessment of an asset’s significance and its relationship to its setting will usually suggest the forms of extension that might be appropriate.

179 The fabric will always be an important part of the asset’s significance. Retention of as much historic fabric as possible is therefore a fundamental part of any good alteration or conversion, together with the use of

appropriate materials and methods of repair. It is not appropriate to sacrifice old work simply to accommodate the new.

And:

184. The introduction of new floors into a building or removal of historic floors and ceilings may have a considerable impact on an asset's significance.

186. New features added to a building are less likely to have an impact on the significance if they follow the character of the building.(...)

Local Policy

Camden Council

Camden's Local Development Framework was adopted in 2010 and contains policies relevant for sites such as this. These policies are as follows:

DP24 – Securing high quality design

The Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider:

- a) character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;
- b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed;
- c) the quality of materials to be used;
- d) the provision of visually interesting frontages at street level;
- e) the appropriate location for building services equipment;
- f) existing natural features, such as topography and trees;
- g) the provision of appropriate hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatments;
- h) the provision of appropriate amenity space; and accessibility.

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage

CONSERVATION AREAS

In order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will:

- a) take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management plans when assessing applications within conservation areas;
- b) only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area;
- c) prevent the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area where this harms the character or appearance of the conservation area, unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;
- d) not permit development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character and appearance of that conservation area; and
- e) preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character of a conservation area and which provide a setting for Camden's architectural heritage.

Camden's Core Strategy states the following regarding heritage:

CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

The Council will ensure that Camden's places and buildings are attractive, safe and easy to use by:

- a) requiring development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character;
- b) preserving and enhancing Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens;

- c) promoting high quality landscaping and works to streets and public spaces;
- d) seeking the highest standards of access in all buildings and places and requiring schemes to be designed to be inclusive and accessible.

Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area Statement

11 Rosslyn Hill is not mentioned in the Conservation Area Statement. The building is located in sub-area two, 'Rosslyn' of the conservation area: 'The street layout in this sub-area has a smaller and more intimate character, with gentler gradients, and the architecture ranges from the earlier period of 1860s to the 1880s.'

The London Plan Policies (Revised Early Minor Alterations 2013)

On 11 October 2013, the Mayor published Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan. These are for consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework. The Revised Early Minor Alterations are operative as formal alterations to the London Plan. The London Plan contains policies that would both affect directly and indirectly the historic environment and development of locations such as this. It states:

Policy 7.8

Heritage assets and archaeology

Strategic

A 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.

B Development should incorporate measures that identify, record, interpret, protect and, where appropriate, present the site's archaeology.

Planning decisions

C Development should identify, value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets, where appropriate.

D Development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

Policy 7.9

Heritage-led regeneration

Strategic

A Regeneration schemes should identify and make use of heritage assets and reinforce the qualities that make them significant so they can help stimulate environmental, economic and community regeneration. This includes buildings, landscape features, views, Blue Ribbon Network and public realm.

Planning decisions

B The significance of heritage assets should be assessed when development is proposed and schemes designed so that the heritage significance is recognised both in their own right and as catalysts for regeneration. Wherever possible heritage assets (including buildings at risk) should be repaired, restored and put to a suitable and viable use that is consistent with their conservation and the establishment and maintenance of sustainable communities and economic vitality.

Appendix II

Statutory List Descriptions

TQ2785SW ROSSLYN HILL 798-1/39/1390 (South West side) 14/05/74
No.11 (Formerly Listed as: ROSSLYN HILL No.11 Manse of Congregational
Church)

GV II

Detached house, formerly the Congregational Church manse. c1770. Brown brick with red brick dentil cornice and pediments. 2 storeys, attic and semi-basement. Gauged red brick flat arches to recessed sashes. North east front to drive with central 3-light canted bay flanked by single window bays, left hand bay blind; central pedimented attic bay. North west entrance front with 2 windows, right hand blind. Timber Doric portico; round-arched doorway with panelled reveals, patterned fanlight and panelled door. South west garden front, 3 windows. Central architraved doorway with console-bracketed pediment altered for use as a window. C20 Venetian type French window to right. Central pedimented attic storey. South-east garden front with ground floor canted bay. INTERIOR: retains some original features.

TQ2685SE LYNDHURST ROAD 798-1/38/1092 (South side) 14/05/74
Lyndhurst Hall, Air Recording Studios (Formerly Listed as: LYNDHURST
ROAD Congregational Church)

GV II

Congregational church with church hall to rear, now a recording studio. 1883-4. By Alfred Waterhouse with additions of 1905 by Spalding & Spalding. Purple Luton brick with red brick and terracotta dressings. Tiled gabled roofs with central hexagonal roof terminating in a lantern having louvred arcading and pyramidal roof. Romanesque style. Irregular hexagonal plan with gabled frontages to each side. Each gabled frontage with 3 large round-arched lancets above 4 smaller arcaded lancets; gable apexes each have a band of 7 arcaded lancets below diaper work. 2 entrances in angles each having a gabled portico with moulded round-arch entrance flanked by buttresses; above, 2 lancets in a shallow round-arched recess. Main entrance with octagonal stair-tower having round-arched lancets, stepped at lower storey. INTERIOR: central plan with galleries on 3 sides and polychrome banded brickwork, mostly currently painted over. To rear, attached church hall in similar style a cohesive part of the composition.

Appendix III

List of Plates, Sources and Endnotes

Plates

1. Ordnance Survey map 1867-70. London Metropolitan Archives
2. Leases on the Belsize Estate in 1808. 'Hampstead: Belsize', *A History of the County of Middlesex: Volume 9: Hampstead, Paddington* (1989)
3. Map from lease Rosslyn Grove estate 1882. Camden Local Studies Archive
4. Map from lease Rosslyn Grove estate 1884. Camden Local Studies Archive
5. Ordnance Survey map 1915. London Metropolitan Archives
6. Bomb Damage map 1939-45. London Metropolitan Archives
7. Drawings detailing the proposed conversion of 11 Rosslyn Hill, 1948. Camden Local Studies Archive
8. Drawings detailing proposed alterations to 11 Rosslyn Hill, 1953. Camden Local Studies Archive
9. View of 11 Rosslyn Grove, east to west along entrance path, 1969. LMA
10. View of 11 Rosslyn Grove, from east to west elevation, 1969. LMA
11. View of 11 Rosslyn Grove, from south to north from rear garden, 1969. LMA
12. View of 11 Rosslyn Grove, from the north west, 1969. LMA

Sources

Primary Sources

The London Metropolitan Archive
Camden Council Local Studies Archive

Secondary Sources

'Hampstead: Belsize' in *A History of the County of Middlesex: Volume 9: Hampstead, Paddington* (1989), pp.51-60

Adrian Shire (ed.) *Belsize 2000 : a living suburb* Belsize Conservation Area Advisory Committee(2000)

Cherry, B. and Pevsner, N. *Buildings of England: London 4: North*, Yale University Press (2002)

Streets of Belsize Camden History Society (2009)

Endnotes

- 1 The following paragraphs are adapted from: 'Hampstead: Belsize', *A History of the County of Middlesex: Volume 9: Hampstead, Paddington* (1989), pp. 51-60. [URL:http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=22638&strquery=rosslyn](http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=22638&strquery=rosslyn)
Date accessed: 12 December 2012.

London Office

12 Devonshire Street
London, W1G 7AB

Tel: 020 7245 9888

www.insall-architects.co.uk