

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 January 2020 20:45  
**To:** Farrant, Ben; Planning  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Further comment re: Planning Application #2019/5817/P & Listed Building Consent #2019/6239/L

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mr Farrant,

Thank you for allowing this comment following review of the FOI request from Camden Council re: Application #2019/1103/P.

From that documentation, I understand that the council objected *'in principle'* to the previous application, recommended refusal and would not accept amendments.

I would like to highlight some of the comments which were shared by the council with the Applicant prior to the recent application (#2019/5817/P) and are quoted below:

Under the heading, **The Significance of the Rear Elevation:** 9 Pilgrim's Lane (Cossey Cottage) *'was built as a service wing to' 7 Pilgrim's Lane, is 'largely unchanged', 'is the sole surviving service wing to the primary building. Its significance includes its historical association with Sidney [House], its architectural character and its association with prominent people.'* (Please note: our heritage report contains clear physical evidence of a sealed doorway that connected the two properties.)

*'It is typical of a service building of its period with simple proportions and detailing and is built with stock brick. The fact that the rear elevation is largely unchanged and well preserved commands a greater onus on the local authority to preserve and protect this precious character.'*

From the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan: *'It is important that any proposals for further extensions or alterations respect existing important fabric and surviving internal features to ensure an appropriate relationship is maintained between the main house, rear extensions and the original extent of the yard or garden.'*

*'According to Para 192 of the NPPF (2019), local planning authorities are required to place an onus on 'the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets'.'*

Under the heading **The Impact of the Proposal:** *'visually over-bearing and dominant on the rear elevation. The bulk, mass and volume of the proposal affects the proportions of the existing building and undermines the significance of the rear elevation. The proposed design seems to occlude and modify an existing historic window which is considered to cause harm to existing historic fabric. Moreover, it creates harm to the proportions and symmetry of the rear elevation by way of its form and positioning, form and bulk ... The depth of the proposed extension is very deep in relation to the existing building. The design seems to create asymmetry in a very symmetrical setting, and does not relate to the sensitivities of the existing context.'* (Please note: the new proposal is very similar to the previously withdrawn proposal, but is both taller and deeper. As explained in our Right of Light report, the scale of the proposal would affect multiple habitable rooms in our property.)

*'Vegetation cannot be used to screen design which can be obtrusive.'*

The proposed kitchen extension 'will be a highly used utilitarian space. During the day and particularly at night this

will be a very visible, highly lit occupied living space, which will detract from the character and appearance of the listed buildings and will impact on neighbouring visual amenity.'

*'It is typical of service wings of historic houses to contain the kitchens. Moving the kitchen to an upper floor and moreover into the extension will harm the building's historic plan form at ground floor level, which will undermine its significance. The function of the proposed extension as a kitchen will be detrimental to the setting of the heritage assets- the listed building/s and the Hampstead Conservation Area and harms the significance of the heritage assets.'*

Under **Visual Impact**: *'The proposed development will cause visual harm to the rear of the listed buildings. The rear of Cossey Cottage will be visible from the inner grounds of the grade II listed Rosslyn Chapel and will cause harm to its setting.'* (Please note: this has not been mitigated by the Applicant erecting wooden planks to obscure views to and from the chapel.)

I endorse the council's comments above which are especially relevant considering the new proposal is both very similar, and also taller and deeper, being more substantial in bulk, mass and volume. This would make it even more detrimental to the character of the building and would cause demonstrable harm to both properties and to the Conservation Area.

This proposal remains contrary to Policy D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan, as well as H26 of the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement, which states that '*extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group of properties by insensitive scale*' and '*Some rear extensions, although not widely visible, so adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached that the character of the Conservation Area is prejudiced.*'

I appreciate your attention and would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt.

Kind regards,

