

[REDACTED]

OBJECTION TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF
COSSEY COTTAGE, 9 PILGRIM'S LANE, LONDON NW3 1SJ
PLANNING APPLICATION ref. 2019/5817/P

I am writing in respect of the current application to add a rear extension to Cossey Cottage, 9 Pilgrim's Lane.

In 1988 my late husband and I purchased the [REDACTED] and the leasehold to [REDACTED]

We carried out extensive internal and external restoration [REDACTED] and then in [REDACTED] to [REDACTED].

History

The previous owners of the property drew our attention to the significance of its history which had been shown on the earliest Deeds to be in the ownership of the Cavendish family, the Dukes of Devonshire.

During our own further research from visiting the archives at the ancestral seat, Chatsworth House, the indications were that the land had been in the family's ownership prior to the construction of the house.

There is evidence from the records that Cossey Cottage formed a part [REDACTED] Indeed, in early maps of the 19th century the combined properties are shown together simply as [REDACTED]

Clear evidence of the relationship [REDACTED] at external basement level, that previously provided joint service access.

[REDACTED]

The archivist at Chatsworth was of the opinion that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] afforded the Cavendish family a modest country house that was also used as a base for hunting on Hampstead Heath (there was also some indication that the adult children of the Duke used the property at other times).

The archivist's view accorded with the early history of Hampstead as a hunting ground when it was incorporated by Henry VIII into the Bishopric of Westminster, a proclamation¹ being issued

¹ Mandate to the mayor and sheriffs of London to make proclamation that, whereas the King desires to keep "the games of hare, partridge, pheasant and heron preserved in and about his hono at his palace of Westminster for his own disport and pastime, that is to say, from his said palace of Westminster to St. Gyles in the Feildes and from thence to Islington to our Lady of the Oke, to Highgate, to Hornsey Parke, to Hamsted Heath and from thence to his said Palace of Westminster," he commands that no person shall hunt or hawk within the said precinct.

on 7th July 1545 that any hunting on the land be reserved for his sole right (a privilege known to have extended to Edward VI and James I).

The Cavendish family's involvement with the Court of Exchequer of Henry VIII is on record as is their generous reward from the King during the Dissolution of the Monasteries. The view was that the land on which [REDACTED] had been received by the family long before the construction of the existing properties.

The involvement of the Cavendish family in Hampstead is also well documented through the second Duke of Devonshire's membership of the notorious Kit Cat Club that met during the summer months at the Upper Flask Tavern in Hampstead (and later at an address in Heath Street).

Other members of the family were also known to have taken country houses in Hampstead including the noted scientist Henry Cavendish, grandson of the second Duke of Devonshire, who occupied a family-owned property in Church Row in the 1780s.

Consultation and Renovation

Prior to considering the works to be carried out, we carried out extensive consultation with English Heritage, the London Borough of Camden and [REDACTED] over what would comprise acceptable restoration and development.

During searches carried out on the acquisition of the property our attention had already been drawn to a [REDACTED] dating from the [REDACTED]. The Deed made clear that no development was to take place that would breach the height of a new wall to be constructed between them.

Given that the covenant was considered to be recent history, we agreed that it should be taken into account.

Throughout consultation [REDACTED] (including the Victorian extension [REDACTED] that comprises part of that property's listing in the 1970s) was considered to be as important as that at the front. Emphasis in this respect was added from the setting alongside the listed Rosslyn Chapel from which both houses are within plain sight. The thoroughfare on that side of the chapel is regularly used by the public not only as a cut-through to Kempsey Road but also by many tourists visiting Hampstead (including as part of the organised Hampstead walks).

Planning Considerations

The planning regulations, locally and nationally, have of course changed since our recent ownership of the property but they are no less significant now than they were then. If anything, greater clarity on the protection of conservation assets has been provided through the National Planning Policy Framework, revisions to the Camden Local Plan and the revised Hampstead Conservation Area statement.

The Proposed Extension

In my view, the proposed extension is not in keeping with the designated features of the house and it detracts from the classic symmetry of the existing building. Two historic and

architecturally important windows will be obscured which is an unacceptable price to pay for a development that adds nothing to the property nor to the conservation area as a whole.

The “glass link” between old and new does nothing to improve on the original, now withdrawn, proposal and will clearly cause light pollution - particularly given the over-ambitious height of what is quite obviously an obtrusive extension.

At greater than 3 metres, it significantly extends above the party wall of which the existing foliage does not form part of the structure. Furthermore, the scale of this vegetation has been misrepresented on the plans and no account been taken of the possibility of this dying back in the future. In the event of this happening an intrusive and juxtaposed extension would be highly visible from 

The proposed 45 degree roof slope – in whichever direction it is angled – would do little or nothing to mitigate the loss of light or harmful impact of this development.

There is no evidential justification for the argument that this extension improves accessibility or fire safety through relocation of the kitchen – this is clearly a nonsensical attempt to grasp some benefit where none exists. Many London houses of this period have their kitchens in the basement without any such issue.

No public benefit whatsoever has been demonstrated that outweighs the harm caused by this proposed addition. Whilst internal renovation may be needed this cannot be conflated with adding benefit to a such a poorly justified extension, the bulk and massing of which is clearly at odds with national and local planning policy.

I would strongly urge that this application is refused by the LPA in order to prevent harmful and lasting damage to an important and historical set of Hampstead residences.

Yours faithfully,

