

**32 Glenilla Road**  
Planning Statement

December 2015

**Tibbalds**

planning and urban design

Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design  
19 Maltings Place  
169 Tower Bridge Road  
London SE1 3JB

Telephone  
020 7089 2121

[mail@tibbalds.co.uk](mailto:mail@tibbalds.co.uk)  
[www.tibbalds.co.uk](http://www.tibbalds.co.uk)

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Introduction to the application	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Application Site and Surrounding Area</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Planning history</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>The Planning Application Proposals</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Planning policy context</b>	<b>6</b>
	The loss of an existing community building	7
	Acceptability of the proposed replacement use	9
	Design, heritage and conservation	9
	Impact on amenity of surrounding uses	11
	Basement impact	11
	Landscape and trees	12
	Energy and sustainability	12
	Transport	12
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>13</b>
	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>14</b>
	Appendix 1: Notes from meeting with Peter van Breda	14
	Appendix 2: Email confirmation of Hampton's instructions	16
	Appendix 3: Building Survey	17
	Appendix 4: Church Deed	21

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Introduction to the application

1.1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared on behalf of the owners of no. 34 Glenilla Road and the owners of 28 Glenilla Road (hereafter referred to as the 'Applicants') and in support of a planning and conservation area consent application for the comprehensive redevelopment of the land at 32 Glenilla Road, London NW3 4AN (the Site).

1.1.2 The Applicants share a friendship and are active members of the local community. Their love of modern architecture and the street in which they live lead them to join forces and purchase the Site with the view to redeveloping it in a way that is sympathetic to its surrounding.

1.1.3 The proposed development ('the Development') comprises the following:

*'Demolition of all existing buildings and redevelopment to provide two new family dwellings comprising a basement, ground, first and second floors, car parking, hard and soft landscaping and other associated works incidental to the development'*

1.1.4 The Development has been designed by Adam Khan Architects, who were selected via a limited design competition run by the applicants and who have a track record for producing schemes of a high architectural quality.

1.1.5 In addition to this introduction this planning statement comprises five sections as follows:

- Section 2: Site and surroundings.
- Section 3: Planning history
- Section 4: Application proposals
- Section 5 Planning policy review
- Section 6: Conclusions

1.1.6 The statement should be read in conjunction with the following documents submitted with the application:

- Design and Access Statement including landscape proposals prepared by Adam Khan Architects.
- Geotechnical Interpretative Report and Basement Impact Assessment by Card Geotechnics Limited.
- Daylight and Sunlight Report prepared by Waterslade.
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement prepared by Crown Consultants.
- Tree Constraints Plan, Impact Assessment Plan, Tree Protection Plan prepared by Crown Consultants.
- Tree Schedule prepared by Crown Consultants.
- Energy Statement prepared by Ritchi Daffin.

1.1.7 The Development represents a significant opportunity to:

- Bring a vacant, brownfield site back into use and remove a derelict building that has a negative impact on its surroundings;
- Deliver a new building of the highest design quality that will both preserve and enhance the conservation area in which it sits;
- Provide two new family homes; and
- Introduce a use, which is more compatible with the existing predominantly residential environment.

1.1.8 The emerging proposals were discussed with officers at two pre planning application meetings (26th May 2015 and 20th October 2016) and at a site visit (5th October 2016). In addition the Applicants shared their proposals with their immediate neighbours.

1.1.9 The feedback from these various consultations has helped shape and inform the content of the application proposals.

## 2 Application Site and Surrounding Area

2.1 The Site is located at No. 32 Glenilla Road in the London Borough of Camden. The National Grid Reference for the Site is 527141E, 184866N.

2.2 The Site is located in the Belsize Conservation Area, which forms a triangle of land bordered by Haverstock Hill, Adelaide Road and Fitzjohn's Avenue.

2.3 The Conservation Area Statement (CAS) , which has been prepared to in support of the designation divides the area into six sub areas. The site is included in sub area 4: Glenloch Area, which incorporates Glenloch, Glenmore, Glenilla and Howitt Roads.

2.4 This sub area is described in the statement as:

*'A distinct area of Edwardian terraced housing developed by the Glenloch Insurance Company close to Belsize Park Underground Station and Haverstock Hill. There is a clear change in character on entering this area from both Belsize Avenue and Belsize Park Gardens from the larger, grander, villa development to more modest family housing of a much smaller scale and tighter grain. These streets fall at a constant gradient to Glenilla Road which is flat'.*

2.5 The statement acknowledges that buildings that front onto Glenilla Road are less consistent in character than the other streets that make up the sub area: *'...having a variety of buildings of different ages, materials, architectural styles and heights'.*

2.6 Particular reference is made to Sussex House as *'an overbearing flat block significantly larger than the other buildings on the street'.*

2.7 There are no listed buildings in the sub area. The buildings fronting Belsize Park Gardens to the south of the site, nos 17, 19 and 34 Glenilla Road and the buildings fronting onto Glenloch and Glenmore Road in the vicinity of the Site are, however identified in the CAS as buildings, which *'make a positive contribution'* to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

2.8 The Site itself is currently occupied by a vacant single-storey community hall, garage and shed. The hall was constructed in 1948 to provide a temporary place of worship for a group called the Christian Community. The use of the hall continued until 2013 when the Church Hall was deconsecrated in May 2013 and has been vacant ever since.

2.9 The Site also contains a freestanding garage, which belongs to No 34 and a shed.

2.10 In terms of building footprint the three buildings occupy a total footprint of 278.2sqm:

■ Church: 250.7sqm

■ Garage: 20.7sqm

■ Shed: 7.4sqm

2.11 None of the existing buildings are noted in the CAS as buildings that make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.

## ■ 3 Planning history

3.1 This Site has a planning history dating back from the 1940s to the 1960s. The key relevant planning history is as follows:

- TP37587/2158 - In principle approval for the erection for a limited period of a building for use as a church on a site at 32, Glenilla Road, Hampstead, - Granted – 02 July 1947.
- TP37587/6555 – The erection of a church building at 32, Glenilla Road, Hampstead – Granted – 19 November 1947.
- 37587/2982 – Extension of existing church by the erection of a single storey to form committee and meeting room at No. 32 Glenilla Road, Hampstead. – Granted – 05 June 1958;
- TP37587/02/04/59 – The use for a limited period of the church hall at 32 Glenilla Road, Hampstead, as a nursery school. – Granted – 25 April 1959;
- TPD1536/05/05/64 - The continued use of the Church Hall, 32, Glenilla Road N.W.3 as a Nursery School. – Granted – 10 June 1964.

3.2 Thus whilst the original building was only intended to be in place for a temporary period, it has by virtue of the time it has been in place become the established use.

## 4 The Planning Application Proposals

4.1 The Design and Access Statement describes the proposals in detail. Detailed Planning and Conservation Area consents are being sought for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Site and demolition of all existing buildings to create a new building comprising two semi-detached family dwellings.

4.2 In terms of floorspace the application seeks permission for 679sqm (GIA) of residential floorspace, which may be broken down as follows:

	<b>32A</b>	<b>32B</b>
Basement	118.4	118.9
Ground	119.5	119.5
First	61.7	60.4
Second	39.8	40.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>339.4sqm</b>	<b>339.6sqm</b>

4.3 The proposals also involve the re-landscaping of the front and rear garden areas.

4.4 At the front of the development the garden areas will incorporate tree planting, bin storage and parking for three cars.

## 5 Planning policy context

5.1 Section 36(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.2 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be given by the decision maker to the desirability of preserving a listed building and its setting, and to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

5.3 The Development Plan documents for the Site comprise the following:

- The London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations since 2011) (March 2016).
- London Borough of Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025.
- London Borough of Camden Development Policies 2010-2025.

5.4 Other documents that are material considerations are listed below:

### *National*

- National Planning Policy Framework, published in March 2012.
- Planning Practice Guidance ('PPG') published in March 2014.
- Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

### *Regional*

- SPG: Housing 2016
- SPG: Sustainable Design and Construction 2014

### *Local*

- CPG1 Design
- CPG2 Housing
- CPG3 Sustainability
- CPG4 Basements and lightwells

- CPG6 Amenity

- Belsize Conservation Area Statement

5.5 The content of these policy documents give rise to a number of issues and considerations, which together have been used to shape and influence how the applicants and their design team has approached the redevelopment of the site.

5.6 In addition the proposals have been discussed with officers at two pre-application meetings and a site visit. The feedback from these meetings has been built into the design development process.

5.7 The applicants have also discussed their proposals with existing neighbours and relevant feedback has also been built into the process.

5.8 As a result and based on the content of the Development it is considered that the key planning policy considerations raised may be grouped under the following headings:

- The loss of an existing community building
- Acceptability of the proposed replacement use.
- Design, heritage and conservation.
- Impact on amenity of surrounding uses.
- Basement Impact
- Landscape and trees
- Energy and sustainability
- Transport and car parking

5.9 We deal with each of these considerations in the remainder of this section.



## The loss of an existing community building

5.10 Development Plan Policy 15 (Community and leisure uses) seeks to protect existing community facilities by resisting their loss unless:

*'d) The specific community facility is no longer required in its current use. Where this is the case, evidence will be required to show that the loss would not create, or add to, a shortfall in provision for the specific community use and demonstrate that there is no demand for any other suitable community use on the site'.*

5.11 The supporting text to this policy states:

*'Proposals involving the loss of a community facility will need to:*

- *Show that the loss would not create, or add to, a shortfall in provision for the specific community use; and*
- *Provide marketing evidence to show that the premises have been offered at a reasonable charge to community groups or voluntary organisations over a 12-month period. Existing community facilities should be offered to potential new users on the same financial basis as that of the previous occupant. If there were no recent users, the space should be offered at an appropriate rate for community groups/ voluntary organisations'.*

5.12 In order to respond to the above policy considerations and to gain an understanding of the history and use of the site the Applicants held a meeting in April 2015 with Peter van Breda who was Priest with the Christian Community London, the previous owners of the Site, since 2001 and who was responsible for the divestment of the house at No 34 and the Site and Church building.

5.13 Appendix 1 provides a minute of this meeting. If necessary the Applicants confirm that it will be possible to turn this minute into a signed legal statement or affidavit.

5.14 In summary, however the Priest confirmed that:

- The previous owners of the building were the Christian Community Church, which was founded in 1922 in Switzerland and had been operating in the UK since the mid 1930s.

- The Community occupied the building on the Site from 1948. During the first 30 years the church thrived but numbers dwindled significantly from 1980.
  - During the period of occupation the community advertised the renting of the facility on a notice board on the street outside the building. The notice confirmed details for other community users to inquire about availability. This notice remained in place for some 14 years. During the period the only rentals recorded were from the Belsize Park Choir (now rehoused in another local church hall); the Belsize Park Music Club Quartet (intermittent bookings) and the Chekov School of Drama Teaching (temporary relocation from Hammersmith).
  - The building was vacated in 2013 as a result of falling church numbers and lack of funding to maintain the building. In the absence of a viable congregation or sufficient funds to upkeep the building the British Priest Synod agreed to sell the building in 2013.
  - Following the decision of the Christian Community to sell, Hamptons International was instructed to start a marketing process in November 2013 (Appendix 2 provides confirmation of Hampton's instructions).
  - The current owners of the property purchased the Site in October 2014.
  - During the 11-month marketing period Hamptons received only one approach from one community operator (a local synagogue) who wanted to let the building for a short-term period whilst their existing site was being upgraded.
  - The funds from the sale of the Site were used by the Christian Community to help fund their ongoing operation in West London and the construction of a new church in Stroud.
- 5.15 Given the above and in the context of DP15 the Applicants are in a position to demonstrate:
- Continuous marketing for a period of almost 12 months and that during this period only one community group showed interest in the Site and building but never pursued their interest;

- Only limited and intermittent use of the building by other local community groups in the area over a continuous period of 14 years; and
- That the proceeds from the sale of the Site have helped fund the expansion and consolidation of the church's operation in West London and hence that the sale of the Site has helped sustain the future of an existing community facility in a location, which is better located in relation to the remaining congregation

5.16 In addition to the above evidence and as part of the process of preparing this planning application the building has been surveyed in order to assess its condition and suitability for continued community use. This survey confirmed that the building comprises a single storey pre-cast concrete frame. There is a rear addition, which dates from around 1970.

5.17 The report describes the construction and in so doing concludes that the pre-cast concrete frame significantly limits the alterations that could be made to the property. The report also confirms that the building was designed as a temporary building and that it is well beyond its design life and that complete demolition represents the only viable option (Appendix 3).

5.18 Also of relevance in terms of the future potential use of the Site is the fact that it is subject to a number of legal constraints, as follows:

- A deed of covenant dated 15th July 1899 requires that any building erected on the site to be used only as private dwelling houses or a professional residences.
- A supplemental deed to the original covenant dated 4th March 1948 allowed for the erection of a temporary building for use as a church. The deed confirms, however that *'if at any time the said building shall cease to be used for religious purposes .... The commissioners....at their own expense shall demolish the said building and restore the ...land to the same conditions...'*

5.19 These covenants are contained under appendix 4.

5.20 As already stated the use ceased in 2013 and the Church was deconsecrated in May 2013. Based on the requirements of the covenant the existing building should have been demolished and the site made available for use as *'private dwellings or professional residences.'*

5.21 Based on the above the policy requirements set out in DP15 can be demonstrated. The evidence presented by the previous owners and the site marketing evidence confirms that local demand for its continued community use has been limited and intermittent. In addition even if this evidence did not exist the existing covenants require that the existing building, which was only constructed for a temporary period, be demolished once the church use has ceased and the land to be used as private dwellings or professional residences.

5.22 In addition a condition survey confirms the building has reached the end of its design life and needs to be demolished. It also suffers from problems of vandalism and squatters. It therefore has a negative contribution on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

5.23 Given the above situation Policy DP15 encourages the reuse of such sites for residential use.

## Acceptability of the proposed replacement use

5.24 Housing is regarded as the priority land-use and local policy (CS6, DP2) states that the Council will make the delivery of housing its top priority.

5.25 DP2 seeks to maximise the supply of additional homes in the borough by promoting the reuse of vacant and underused land and buildings that are considered suitable for residential use. Having established the position in relation to the current building and historic use the proposed redevelopment of the Site for residential purposes would therefore accord with policy DP2 and DP5.

5.26 The built form in the surrounding area is made up of large detached and semi-detached housing comprising of three bedrooms or more. The proposed housing is commensurate with this character and scale of properties in the locality and hence accords with the requirements of DP2.

5.27 The proposed housing satisfies the various quantitative and qualitative standards set by policy in terms of size, accessibility and amenity considerations.

## Design, heritage and conservation

5.28 The NPPF considers that *'good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people'*. It goes on to say that *'it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private space and wider area development schemes'*.

5.29 The NPPF further states that the Government attaches *'great importance to the design of the built environment'* and that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

5.30 The London Plan requires all new development in London to achieve the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design (Policy 7.2) to be consistent with the principles of Secure by Design (Policy 7.3). Development should have regard to the form, function or structure of an area and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings (Policy 7.4). Development should build on the positive elements that contribute to establishing character for the future function of the area.

5.31 Policy 7.6 of the London Plan sets out design principles, which include inclusive design and enhancement of the public realm.

5.32 The Borough seeks to encourage outstanding architecture and design. Innovative design is seen as a means to enhance the built environment and will be encouraged.

5.33 CS 14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) sets out the Borough's overall strategy on promoting high quality places and in so doing seeks to ensure that Camden's places and buildings are attractive, safe, healthy and easy to use. The policy requires development to be of the highest standard of design and to respect local context and character.

5.34 DP24 (Securing high quality design) sets out the Council's detailed approach to the design of new developments. Developments are expected to consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, the compatibility of materials, their quality, texture, tone and colour; the composition of elevations; its contribution to the public realm and the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value.

5.35 DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) states that in considering new developments the Council will take account of conservation area statements and will only permit development within conservation areas that preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area.

5.36 As already stated the Site is located in the Belsize Conservation Area. The Belsize CAS requires that new development in the Conservation Area to: *'respect existing features such as building lines, roof line, elevational design, and, where appropriate, architectural characteristics, detailing, profile and materials of adjoining buildings'* (BE19).

5.37 BE20 of the CAS goes on to state that: *'...modern architecture will not be resisted provided it respects the layout, height and scale of existing development within the Conservation Area'*.

5.38 None of the existing buildings are noted as making a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area. In addition officers confirmed during the course of our pre-application discussions that the replacement of the existing building would be acceptable in principle and that they would welcome the opportunity to enhance the conservation area with a high quality new building or buildings (Pre-application response letter to pre-application meeting 1, dated 29/06/2015).

5.39 The scheme has been designed by Adam Khan Architects. The D&A that accompanies this application demonstrates that a rigorous design process has been undertaken and that AKA has developed an approach, which responds to the Site and its surroundings:

- Existing building lines are respected to both the front and rear of the development.
- The scale and form of the development is consistent with the scale and form of development in the surrounding area.
- The approach to the architecture and the building form borrows from the existing context and provides a response, which whilst being contemporary, echoes the Arts and Crafts traditions expressed by other housing in the Conservation Area.
- The use of brick, the choice of colours and the way in which the brick is used borrow from the traditions expressed by other buildings in the Conservation Area.
- The rear extension is more contemporary in character. It is clearly separate from the main building but, in line with policy, is subservient to the main building.
- The treatment of the front garden echoes and interprets the approach taken by its more traditional neighbours.

5.40 The proposals will result in the removal of a building that has a negative impact on the Conservation Area and the construction of a new building that will both preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area.

## Impact on amenity of surrounding uses

5.41 DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) states that in considering new development the Council will seek to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. Factors that will be considered include visual privacy and overlooking; overshadowing and outlook; sunlight/ daylight; microclimate and noise.

5.42 In pursuit of this policy the application is accompanied by a daylight/ sunlight report. The report considers the impact on sunlight/ daylight amenity to the properties surrounding the Site and the daylight / sunlight within the proposed residential accommodation.

5.43 The report concludes that the proposals will have very limited impact on neighbouring properties. Indeed the report confirms that all properties will continue to receive very good daylight and sunlight amenity once the development is complete.

5.44 The report also confirms that sunlight/ daylight within the proposed houses will also be very good.

5.45 In addition the D&A statement that accompanies the application demonstrates that great care has been taken to limit overlooking e.g. through the location of dormers, the staggering of windows and limiting the number of windows in the eastern and western elevations.

5.46 To the rear of the proposed housing the garden extensions are lower in height than the existing church building that currently occupies the Site. In addition their rear elevations have been pulled back from the rear garden fence and hence they do not extend as far back into the garden when compared with the existing Church hall.

5.47 The rear elevation of the main building also respects the rear building line of neighbouring existing properties and the proposed ridgelines correspond in height to the ridge line heights of other buildings in the vicinity.

5.48 In terms of the housing themselves the properties will deliver a very high standard of accommodation. New garden space and terraces will be created. In addition facilities for storage, recycling and disposal of waste have all been built into the design.

5.49 In terms of the future construction of the development it is anticipated that there will be a requirement to produce a Construction Management Plan, which will need to be agreed with the Council in advance of the Development's implementation.

## Basement impact

5.50 Policy DP27 (Basements and lightwells) states, *'In determining the proposals for basement and other underground development, the Council will require an assessment of the scheme's impact on drainage, flooding, groundwater conditions and structural stability, where appropriate'.*

5.51 Further guidance on the processes and recommendations for Basement Impact Assessments is set out within CPG4 (Basements and Light wells, September 2013) and the associated Camden geological, hydrogeological and hydrological study 2010.

5.52 In pursuit of this policy and guidance a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been prepared. The BIA has been prepared in accordance with the processes and procedures as set out within CPG4 and addresses the screening, scoping, site investigation and impact assessment stages of the assessment.

## Landscape and trees

5.53 Six category C trees will be removed as a result of the Development. The tree report that accompanies the application confirms that these are all relatively small trees and are not considered worthy of special protection.

5.54 Four high quality trees will replace the trees lost. In addition the front garden spaces will be re- landscaped and will accommodate three off street parking spaces, bin stores and a bench.

5.55 The roofs of the rear garden extensions will incorporate green roofs.

## Energy and sustainability

5.56 DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction) requires development to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures.

5.57 The policy, whilst being out of step with National Policy also encourages new build housing to target Code Level 6 or zero carbon housing and requires developments to incorporate green or brown roofs.

5.58 DP23 (Water) requires developments to reduce their water consumption by incorporating water efficient features and equipment and capturing, retaining and re-using surface water and grey water on –site.

5.59 The application is accompanied by an energy statement, which confirms that the houses will be designed to meet the energy requirements of the now withdrawn Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. This means a 19% reduction in carbon emissions over Building Regulations 2013 Part L1A compliant building (equivalent to 25% reduction over 2010 Building Regulations).

## Transport

5.60 DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking) states the Council will seek to ensure that developments provide the minimum necessary car parking provision.

5.61 In terms of standards, appendix 2 of the Council's Development Management Policies allows for a maximum of 1 space per dwelling.

5.62 The scheme retains the existing parking space associated with No. 34 Glenilla Road and in line with policy provides two additional off street spaces (one per dwelling, in line with policy).

5.63 As described in the D&A statement the proposals also involve re-arranging existing on street parking to provide a new cross-over to provide street access to the new housing.

5.64 In addition the Applicants would expect to enter an agreement whereby they will not be able to apply for parking permits in line with policy.

## **6 Conclusions**

6.1 The proposals presented in this application have been shown to comply with the Development Plan. They bring an underused and derelict site back into use as housing. They introduce buildings of the highest quality architecture, which will contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

6.2 The proposals will result in the loss of a Site, which did support a community facility. The evidence presented, however demonstrates that the use could no longer be sustained on the Site and that the building had reached the end of its design life.

6.3 Marketing evidence, together with evidence from the previous occupier of making the building available to other users demonstrated that interest in using the building was intermittent and limited and when it came to the sale of the building only one community user showed interest. This interest was, however never pursued.

6.4 The sale of the site allowed the previous owner to reinvest in new and enhanced Church facilities in a new location and hence the funds have been used to sustain an existing community use.

6.5 The Site is also subject to restrictive covenants, which require the building to be removed if the permitted Church use ceased. The covenants then permit the use of the Site for residential or business use.

6.6 In advancing this evidence the Applicants demonstrate compliance with policy in relation to the protection of community uses.

6.7 In relation to the specifics of the design the Applicants have, as part of the process consulted with all relevant parties. The proposals have also been tested to ensure that their impacts on neighbouring properties are minimised. Measures have also been incorporated to support the sustainability credentials of the scheme and the necessary assessment work has been undertaken to support the creation of a basement in the location.

6.8 Given this situation we respectfully request that the application be approved, as quickly as possible.



# **I Appendices**

## **Appendix 1: Notes from meeting with Peter van Breda**

**Notes from meeting with Peter van Breda, Priest with the Christian Community London since 2001. He was day to day responsible for the divestment of the North London facilities(House at no 34 and church at no 32 Glenilla Rd.)**

### **Activity at Christian Community Church in Glenilla Rd**

2001 – 2003 No Service

2003 – 2011 regular service once a month

2012 – Sept 2013 Weekly service every Sunday as provisional replacement for Hammersmith site while building works ongoing

Sept 2013 – May 2014 No service until final deconsecration service

Belsize Park Choir had regular weekly singing practices until summer 2014, rehoused in another local church hall

Belsize Park Music Club Quartet – irregular practice session, decreasing activity over the years. Not used the church in recent years

Chekov School of Drama Teaching – short term displaced from Hammersmith. Not providing service for local residents

Over 14 years with the phone number of the Christian Community on the board in front of the Church. No approaches to rent the place

### **Marketing**

-decision 25 years ago to sell North London house and Church over time due to downward trend in attendance/congregation

-financially not viable

-In 2001; Peter Button the North London priest retired

-sold house, Glenilla Rd no 34, in 2008 to finance other activities –

congregation almost disappeared due to old age or moved elsewhere

-when church announced to sell, local group( church goers) consulted

-only 3 members of North London Church alive and one of them moved to Oxfordshire and attending Stroud congregation

-Trustees of London Christian Community, Church Council and Synod of priests in Great Britain and Ireland all agreed that the church was not viable any more and focus resources on Hammersmith site

-Marketed in line with the Charity Commissions requirements – widely marketed and final transaction signed off by Hamptons that requirements were met



- Carl Underhill, Hamptons sold the house in 2008 and there was a understanding that he also would market the Church when the work at Hammersmith was completed. It was regular contact.
- 13th September 2013 Hamptons were contacted/informed that the Hammersmith work was finished and the church was ready to be marketed subject to internal processes
- November 2013 meeting at the site with Carl Underhill and Keith Isaacs Hampton to kick start the sales process
- December 2013 pre marketing to selected clients
- January 2014 local and countrywide marketing – Ham and High ran article on the front page of Newspaper as well as photo of the church on the whole front page of the real estate magazine.
- marketed with a board as well as newspaper advertising, on line advertising and brochures
- 25 to 30 viewings, 12 expressed further interest – 1 community user among those, local synagog looking for temporary housing while their site being upgraded, in the end only 1 property developer took the process further
- the site exchanged at the end of August 2014 with the current owners and the transaction completed October 2014

## **Other**

- Had a building survey done in 2013 that concluded the building was in such a state that investments in upgrade work not viable. Have contacted the firm to reissue the report
- The site never viable for an institutional use long term, since there are no parking facilities according to the church
- Security and squatters continuously an issue
- Not sure if the Church ever registered for community use. Initially renewed by Camden for 10 years at a time and when there was a change in the law that required the Church to register, not sure they did

## Appendix 2: Email confirmation of Hampton's instructions

**From:** Carl Underhill <[UnderhillC@hamptons-int.com](mailto:UnderhillC@hamptons-int.com)>  
**Date:** 27 November 2013 14:09:17 GMT  
**To:** "'[peter.vanbreda@mac.com](mailto:peter.vanbreda@mac.com)'" <[peter.vanbreda@mac.com](mailto:peter.vanbreda@mac.com)>  
**Cc:** Keith Isaac <[Isaack@hamptons-int.com](mailto:Isaack@hamptons-int.com)>, Matt Henderson <[HendersonM@hamptons-int.com](mailto:HendersonM@hamptons-int.com)>  
**Subject:** 32 Glenilla Road

Good afternoon Peter, I hope you are well. Thank you very much for your time on Friday. It was very good to see you again and fascinating to see the church for the first time. I think we may have mentioned, but we actually invited a colleague, Matt Henderson, to attend the meeting on Friday, but he was on holiday and therefore unable to come along. He is now back and I have sought his opinion on the likely value and future of the site, as he specialises in exactly this, as head of our Land department. He would really like to know more about the history and the existing building, before he/we can really finalise our thoughts on the likely sale price and on the best way to deal with this possible sale, in light of the Charities Commission's guidelines.

Would it be possible for us to be copied in to any detail you or your solicitor may have on file, including any plans that may exist for the church as it is. We will gladly liaise with your solicitor directly if you are happy for us to do this. As this is such an unusual and potentially valuable piece of property, that has been in the Christian Community's hands for as long as it has, we want to make certain that we really are giving you the very best advice and this will entail gathering some more information.

Please come back to me when you have a moment so that we can agree a way forward. Thanks very much and I look forward to hearing.

Kind regards.

**Carl Underhill**  
**Director**

t. +44 (0) 207 794 8222  
m. +44 (0) 78 5091 9610  
f. +44 (0) 207 435 9796  
e. [underhillc@hamptons-int.com](mailto:underhillc@hamptons-int.com)

**Hamptons International**  
Hampstead Sales  
21 Heath Street | Hampstead | London NW3 6TR  
[www.hamptons.co.uk](http://www.hamptons.co.uk)



[For a full list of our current properties, click here.](#)



### John Moody Surveying Limited Chartered Surveyors



Corndon View, Lower Lane  
Chirbury, Montgomery  
SY15 6UD

Mr Jon Gausen and Mr Alain de Botton  
32 Glenilla Road  
Belsize Park  
London  
NW3 4AN

t: 01938 561460  
m: 07855 782560  
e: [john@johnmoodyfrics.co.uk](mailto:john@johnmoodyfrics.co.uk)  
w: [www.johnmoodyfrics.co.uk](http://www.johnmoodyfrics.co.uk)

1 May 2015

Dear Sirs

#### **Redundant Church at 32 Glenilla Road, Belsize Park, London, NW3 4AN**

##### Instructions

I confirm your instructions to carry out an inspection of the above property to advise on the possible conversion of the building. The single-storey structure was erected on the site in 1946 for use as a church for five to ten years maximum. Originally, it was erected elsewhere as a repair workshop.

My inspection was carried out on 30 April 2015 on a dry, warm day.

The front of the property onto Glenilla Road faces approximately north-east.

##### History

It is understood that the property was erected elsewhere during the Second World War as a repair workshop. It was moved to its present location in 1946, where it was, until recent times, used as a church. It is currently disused and unoccupied.

##### General description

The property comprises a single-storey pre-cast concrete framed building, originally constructed around 1940. There is a rear addition, probably dating back to around 1970, comprising cavity brick walls beneath a shallow mono-pitched roof covered with felt.

##### Structural arrangement of the main building

The original hangar comprises a pre-cast concrete frame with external walls infilled with solid brickwork. The pre-cast concrete frame supports pre-cast concrete purlins, which in turn support the roof covering of asbestos cement sheeting.

All of the external walls have been rendered.

Timber secondary glazed windows have been provided to the side elevations and the rainwater goods are of PVC.

Lightweight timber partitions have been provided internally with small mezzanine floors to the front and rear.

CHARTERED SURVEYORS | ACCREDITED COMMERCIAL ENERGY ASSESSORS | BUILDING SURVEYORS | VALUERS

Registered in England Company number 5930656

Registered office Corndon View, Lower Lane, Chirbury, Montgomery, SY15 6UD

The ground floor is of solid construction covered with woodblock flooring.

There is a 1970's single-storey rear addition, as noted above.

t: 01938 561460

m: 07855 782560

e: [john@johnmoodyfrics.co.uk](mailto:john@johnmoodyfrics.co.uk)

w: [www.johnmoodyfrics.co.uk](http://www.johnmoodyfrics.co.uk)

#### Pre-cast concrete frame

The pre-cast concrete frame comprises pre-cast concrete columns and roof portals tied together with pre-cast concrete purlins and pre-cast concrete ridge beams. It was clearly designed as a temporary structure and has long outlived its design life.

It is an early pre-cast concrete structure and is relatively lightweight. Reinforced concrete design has moved on significantly since the concrete frame was originally cast. There is now a requirement that all reinforcement must be covered with 50mm of concrete to prevent spalling. Where I was able to see the exposed concrete frame in the mezzanine roof spaces, it was noted that sections of the frame are beginning to spall due to corrosion of the reinforcement. The concrete cover over the reinforcement is minimal, estimated to be only around 10mm thick. I suspect that if the structure is opened up, particularly where the columns are clad in brickwork externally and beneath the roof sheets, significant spalled concrete is likely to be found.

The frame has been designed to accept light loads only. Consequently, a lightweight corrugated asbestos cement roof has been provided.

The nature of construction is such that the frame could not withstand significant alterations. For example, if a new mezzanine floor were to be installed, a complete new structure would need to be provided. This could of course be formed internally within the building but significant repairs would still be necessary to the existing structural frame, which would impact on the viability of any such scheme.

It is also apparent that the iron fixings between the frame members are corroding and complete overhaul of these sections of the frame will be necessary to prevent possible future collapse.

#### The roof

The roof comprises asbestos cement sheeting which has been fixed to the concrete purlins utilising iron fixings.

Roof sheeting of this type has an anticipated lifespan of between 25 and 30 years. This has been well exceeded and it was noted that the roof has been coated, no doubt to prevent water penetration. Indeed, there are several areas where the roof is currently leaking.

The roof covering is at the end of its useful life and will need to be replaced.

The existing structure will only allow an industrial sheet form of roof covering to be utilised. However, I should warn that the weight of any new roof covering should not be significantly greater than the existing. If the property is converted then insulation to current standards will need to be incorporated, which will add to the weight and give rise to the risk of overloading of the concrete frame.

#### Rainwater goods

The rainwater goods are cast iron. These are corroded and will need to be replaced.

#### External walls

The walls to the main building are of solid brick construction and have been rendered externally. Generally the walls are not load-bearing.

If the property is converted, the thermal insulation values of the walling will need to meet current standards.

#### Windows and doors

The windows are single glazed timber casements. Secondary glazing has been provided internally.

There is much rot evident to the windows and significant repair or replacement will be required.

In any event, if the property is converted then the windows will need to be upgraded to meet current insulation standards, which would necessitate full replacement.

Similar comments apply to the doors. The front door has been removed and boarded up.

#### Floors

The floor is of solid construction and finished with woodblock.

Areas of the woodblock have suffered from water penetration due to roof leaks, which has caused them to swell and lift.

Elsewhere there are a number of loose blocks.

Again, if the property is converted the floor will need to meet current insulation standards.

#### Internal partitions

The internal partitions are generally of lightweight timber construction. They are non-structural and can be altered to suit any new arrangements.

However, the walls are finished with a material that is likely to contain asbestos, which gives rise to health and safety risks, particularly if the material is disturbed.

The partitions are also in poor condition and the potential risk from asbestos is significant.

#### Rear addition

The rear addition is a basic brick extension with a monopitched roof covered with felt. Felt is an unsuitable covering for such a pitch.

There is some slight cracking evident to the walling. Although not considered significant, local repointing is required.

The external joinery to the extension is in poor condition.

Again, the thermal elements of the extension will need to be upgraded if the building is converted.

#### Asbestos

There are a number of potential asbestos-containing materials in the building. These include the following:

- The roof sheeting
- The ceiling lining panels
- The partition wall panels
- The electric heaters

To comply with the asbestos regulations, before any work is considered, and as part of your feasibility study, an asbestos specialist should undertake an asbestos survey for demolition and construction purposes.

Some of the elements noted above are in poor condition and the building should not be used until an asbestos report has been obtained.

#### Conclusion

The pre-cast concrete frame significantly limits the alterations that can be made to the property.

There are inherent defects to the frame and full opening up of the structure will be required and all necessary repairs undertaken. I suspect that vulnerable sections of the frame are beyond repair.

However, given the limitations imposed by the frame, I do not believe any form of development would be viable without full demolition.

If the frame is to be retained then a sheet roof system, incorporating insulation, will be necessary, which again may cause overloading of the structural frame. In addition, the presence of asbestos and the costs of removal are likely to make any institutional use of the existing property unviable.

The property was designed as a temporary building and is well beyond its design life. I am of the view that complete demolition is the only viable option.

If you have any queries on the above please let me know.

Yours sincerely

**John Moody FRICS**  
**Chartered Building Surveyor**



## Appendix 4: Church Deed

10/

THIS DEED OF VARIATION is made the *fourth* day of *March* One thousand nine hundred and forty eight BETWEEN THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS FOR ENGLAND (hereinafter called "the Commissioners") of the one part and ALFRED HEIDENREICH of 1001 Finchley Road Golders Green Middlesex *"Royal Holloway"* OLIVER LEWIS MATHEWS of *34 Glenilla Road Hampstead London* ADAM JOHN BITTLESTON of 179 Hampstead Way Golders Green aforesaid EVELYN FRANCIS of 34 Glenilla Road Hampstead aforesaid and STANLEY DRAKE of 20 Ravenscroft Avenue Golders Green aforesaid all Ministers of Religion being the present Trustees of The Christian Community in England (hereinafter called "the Owners") of the other part SUPPLEMENTAL to a Deed of Covenant dated the Fifteenth day of July One thousand eight hundred and ninety nine and made between John Cathles Hill and Charles Joseph Bentley of the one part and the Commissioners of the other part WHEREBY the said John Cathles Hill and Charles Joseph Bentley entered into certain covenants with the Commissioners with regard to the user and otherwise of certain land in the Parish of Hampstead in the County of London WHEREAS the land coloured red on the plan annexed hereto (hereinafter called the red land) being part of the land to which the said Deed of Covenant relates is now vested in the Owners for an estate in fee simple absolute in possession free from incumbrances and the Owners are registered at H.M. Land Registry as the <sup>proprietors</sup> ~~properties~~ thereof with an absolute title under the reference County London Parish Hampstead Title No. 243279

AND WHEREAS by the said Deed of Covenant it was provided that there should not be erected or maintained on the said land any messuage or any other building for any other purpose than that of a private dwellinghouse or a professional residence for a solicitor medical practitioner architect surveyor engineer music professor tutor accountant dentist manicurist oculist or aurist and that any house erected thereon should not be used or occupied otherwise than as a private dwellinghouse or as such professional residence as aforesaid AND WHEREAS the Owners desire to erect or cause or permit to be erected on the red land a temporary building for use as a Church and it has been agreed between the Owners and the Commissioners that the covenants contained in the said Deed of Covenant shall be varied in manner hereinafter appearing

NOW THIS DEED WITNESSETH AS FOLLOWS:-

1. It is hereby agreed and declared that the said Deed of Covenant

/shall

shall be read and construed and shall operate and enure subject to the covenants and provisions hereinafter contained as if it had provided that the Owners might erect or cause or permit to be erected upon the red land a temporary building for use as a Church

2. The Owners hereby covenant with the Commissioners as follows:-

- (a) That no building shall be built or set up on the red land without the plans and specifications of such building being submitted to the Surveyors of the Commissioners and their approval in writing thereof having been first obtained and that no alteration shall be made in the plan or elevation of such building without the like approval and that such building shall be used only as and for the purposes of a Church
- (b) That no bell shall at any time be rung in the said building or on any part of the red land
- (c) That if at any time the said building shall cease to be used for religious purposes at the request in writing of the Commissioners and at their own expenses forthwith to demolish the said building and restore the red land to the same condition it is in at the date hereof.
- (d) At all times to keep the red land and the said building erected thereon in a neat and tidy condition
- (e) At all times hereafter to indemnify and keep indemnified the Commissioners against all actions proceedings claims and demands by or on the part of any person or persons whatsoever on account or in respect of anything done by the owners or any persons claiming through them in pursuance of these presents

3. It is hereby agreed and declared that if at any time or times any question arises as to whether the said building is or is not being used as a Church or for religious purposes as hereinbefore mentioned the decision of the Commissioners on such question shall be final.

IN WITNESS whereof the said parties hereto have hereunto set their hands and seals and the Commissioners have caused their Common Seal to be hereunto affixed the day and year first before written



108

WELSH  
TOWN  
GARDENS

GLENILLA  
ROAD

ROAD

GLENILLA ROAD

1/1056

Secretary  
1001 Finchley Rd.  
London, N.W. 11

SIGNED SEALED and DELIVERED  
by EVELYN FRANCIS in the  
presence of:-

Eric J. Drake  
Hillcroft Avenue  
20 Hillcroft Avenue  
London N.W. 11

E Francis

SIGNED SEALED and DELIVERED  
by STANLEY DRAKE in the  
presence of:-

Secretary  
1001 Finchley Rd.  
London N.W. 11

Stanley Drake

SEALED by the Ecclesiastical  
Commissioners for England in  
the presence of:-

*A. Heidenreich*  
Registrar,  
Ecclesiastical Commission,  
1. Millbank,  
Westminster, S.W.1.



SIGNED SEALED and DELIVERED )  
by ALFRED HEIDENREICH in )  
the presence of:-

*John Lawrie,*  
Secretary,  
Elbington Hall,  
Broad Oak,  
Thrusbury.

*A. Heidenreich*

SIGNED SEALED and DELIVERED )  
by OLIVER LEWIS MATHews )  
in the presence of:-

*Oliver Lewis Mathews*  
Commercial Traveller  
17 St. John's Road  
Belle Park  
Leamington Spa

*OL Mathews*

SIGNED SEALED and DELIVERED )  
by ADAM JOHN BITTLESTON )  
in the presence of:-

*Adam John Bittleston*  
Secretary  
1001 Finchley Rd.  
London N.W. 11

*A.J. Bittleston*

SIGNED SEALED and DELIVERED )  
by EVELYN FRANCIS in the )  
presence of:-

*Evelyn Francis*  
20 Ravenscroft Avenue  
London N.W. 11

*E Francis*

SIGNED SEALED and DELIVERED )  
by STANLEY DRAKE in the )  
presence of:-

*Stanley Drake*  
Secretary  
1001 Finchley Rd.  
London N.W. 11

*S. Drake*



