

HUGH CULLUM
ARCHITECTS LTD
Bloomsbury Design
61b Judd Street
London WC1H 9QT
t 020 7383 7647
f 020 7387 7645
mail@hughcullum.com

Grounds For Appeal for 16 New End Square, London, NW3 1LN

Planning Application Reference: 2017/2150/P

Related application and appeal ref: 2017/2832/L

Reason for Refusal:

The proposed single storey rear extension, by reason of its form, location and relationship with the host buildings, would be harmful to the character, appearance and special historic interest of the host buildings and the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017, paragraphs 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2016 and paragraphs 132 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Statement of Case for Appeal:

The reason for refusal of this application essentially reiterates the reasons given for the refusal of previous applications for related but crucially different proposals. We believe that this reflects a lack of consideration of this application in its own right

While the proposal now under consideration has inevitable similarities (although we believe we have made significant improvements) one key difference is in what our heritage statement has revealed.

- that almost all of the rear of the existing house is a postwar rebuild after severe wartime bombing
- the studio, which was previously believed to be of some age and historic value, actually dates from 1927 and is thus much less of a heritage asset.

These important facts mean that, referring to reason for refusal, there is little of 'special historic interest' to harm and following on from this, given also the invisibility of the proposal from the public realm, the impact on the conservation area is negligible.

Referring in more detail to each of the aspects of the proposal considered in the

officer's report and listed in the reason for refusal I outline our response below:

Form:

The form of the new proposal is quite different to the previous proposal.

The previous proposal was in '*traditional*' (sic.) conservatory style and was glazed with densely mullioned and timber framed doors and fixed panels. It had a solid roof with a large roof-light and glazed clerestory windows to the neighbouring property.

The current proposal is of contemporary design which distinguishes it from both host buildings (both C20 but the main house outshoot being in Georgian manner). It also allows the link elevation to effectively 'disappear' as a building during the summer because the glass doors to the garden slide back completely allowing it to be used, like a loggia, as a covered part of the garden and thus enhance the amenity value of the outside space.

Finally, in consultation with the neighbours, it has been agreed to have neither clerestory glazing nor roof lights so as to prevent any night-time light spillage into their garden.

Location:

Although the location of the new proposal is generally the same as the previous one it is, however, smaller. The current proposal is roughly 350mm lower and 200mm less wide than the refused proposal. The case officer's report mentions the reference of the Hampstead CA statement (para. H31) to rear infill extensions, stating that '*the infilling of yards and rear spaces between buildings will generally be unacceptable.*' I consider that in this case the nature of the construction, being a link rather than a 'space' in its own right, and the minimal footprint in the context of the whole garden hardly constitute 'infilling'.

Relation with the host building:

The previous proposal is of the same width as the main house outshoot wing while our current proposal is a critical 200mm less wide, allowing the corner of the outshoot wing to be read and the link to be seen as a secondary and subservient 'addition'. Being lower, the current proposal also exposes more of the primary brick wall at the end of the outshoot and allows a good margin of space below the first floor window.

The previous proposal was 350mm higher than the current proposal. It completely effaced the existing metal glazed window to the studio building while the current proposal maintains the width of the current opening and the top two rows of glazed panes.

Harmful to the character, appearance and special interest of the host buildings:

As described above, the impact of the new proposal is considerably less than the previous refused proposal because of its smaller size and more thoughtful relation to the host buildings.

In addition, the Heritage Statement which accompanies this current application establishes that the studio dates from 1927 and the main house outshoot as well is twentieth century both in fabric and in form (the house having been severely damaged by wartime bombing).

The previous application did not have the benefit of a heritage statement and this now sheds new light on the value of the host buildings' 'character and special interest', arguably diminishing them considerably - *'the rear elevation... is of architectural and historic interest but its later parts (including the offshoot) are of limited intrinsic value' . The current outshoot is not of special interest as it lacks age, character and detailing of note.'*

It also argues that the contemporary design is more sympathetic by allowing the character of the host buildings to be distinctly read in contrast to the new link.

Policy CS14 is concerned with promoting high quality places and conserving heritage.

Policy DP24 is concerned with securing high quality design.

Policy DP25 is concerned with preserving Camden's heritage.

In the light of the rebuttals above I suggest that these policies are now met with the current proposal. The quality of design of the current proposal, because of the greater consideration of context and its innovative nature and use of high quality materials compared to the previous proposal, can now be considered 'high quality' as can the space/place it creates. The new proposal raises the quality and usability of the studio and main house by providing covered access between them. It also enhances the use of the garden during the summer by creating a covered area (acting rather as a garden pavilion or loggia might).

The higher contextual sensitivity of the new proposal along with the now reduced perception of value of the heritage asset (thanks to a thorough Heritage Statement which was lacking in the previous application) now means that the impact on the heritage asset is much reduced. It can be balanced against the benefit of replacement of plastic and casement windows in the rear elevation.

Finally, the client has undertaken to ensure that the detailed design and

construction of the current proposal will be fully overseen by an accredited Conservation Architect (Hugh Cullum) in order to maximise the protection of the heritage asset.