

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		24/06/2004	
(Members Briefing)		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		18/06/2004	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Faye Tomlinson				2004/0711/L			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
14 Gainsborough Gardens London NW3 1BJ				2245/01, 05, 10, 11 rev F, 14 rev F, 15 rev F, 17 rev F, 20 rev F, OS Site Plan (un-numbered)			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
OT						A O'Healy	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a single storey side extension to the existing dwellinghouse, with minor internal alterations at ground floor level.							
Recommendation(s):		Grant Listed Building Consent subject to Conditions.					
Application Type:		Listed Building Consent					

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	15	No. of responses	05	No. of objections	04
Summary of consultation responses:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The side extension would damage the special architectural and historic interest of the building. The façade of the proposed side extension is totally out of keeping with the main façade of the building and is fussy and unsympathetic to the character of the house. • The extension would extend much further forward than the side extension for which planning permission was previously granted (ref: 2003/0609/L), nearly doubling the size of the permitted planning permission. • It is the neighbours understanding that listed building consent was previously granted for the rear extension and internal alterations on the undertaking that the previous permission for a side extension was withdrawn. • The proposed skylight on the side extension is ugly and inappropriate, particularly when seen from the side by anyone entering Gainsborough Gardens and from the rear from houses in Well Walk. • The design is impractical, there appears to be scant provision for an area from which maintenance and window cleaning can be carried out. • The increase in the size of the glass roof light which would be clearly visible from the houses behind. The planning permission and listed building consent granted on the 15/12/2003 was for a rooflight that was angled away from the house behind with the intention of reducing the light pollution from the neighbours. Light shining through this window would cause light nuisance for many hours, esp during autumn and winter. There will also be additional lights shining from the new study windows in the north wall. • The extension would erode the privacy of the residents of No 42 Well Walk • There is an obstacle to the forward development of the side extension in the shape of a tree. The owners were required to plant this tree in the early 1990's to replace one that they cut down without permission. It stands just in front of the proposed side extension. 					
SAAC/Local groups* Comments: *Please Specify	<p>The Heath & Hampstead Society – the proposal would be damaging to this fine example of Arts and Crafts style architecture. The application gives little indication in fact that architecture has been considered. Planning permission has recently been granted for another extension to the property, the applicant's plainly believe in the 'nibble nibble' policy of asking for many small additions which might individually not be considered damaging. This proposal would be very conspicuous and is just not good enough for this important part of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Hampstead CAAC – No objections.</p>					

Site Description

Gainsborough Gardens is a late C19th residential development around a landscaped garden, off the south east side of Well Walk. No. 14 is on the west side of Gainsborough Gardens, next to the Lodge, (a two storey residential building at the entrance to Gainsborough Gardens) and backs onto the rear gardens of a terrace of five-storey buildings along Well Walk, most of which are listed. The ground slopes upwards from Gainsborough Gardens to Well Walk. The building is a two-storey dwelling house with dormers and rooms in the roof, designed by Horace Field for his mother and developed between 1893-1895. A single storey side and rear extension was added later. The site is within the Hampstead conservation area and the property has been recently spot listed Grade II.

Relevant History

- 020/7/1998 - planning permission was granted for the erection of a two storey side extension and bay window at rear first floor level (PW0703122R3)
- 11/02/1999 - planning permission was refused for the detailed design of the elevations and facing materials of the proposed side extension (two schemes-both refused) pursuant to condition 1 of planning permission dated 02/07/1998, ref. No. PW9803122R3 (PW9802626R2).
- 15/07/1999 - the above application was allowed on appeal and the foundations were laid on site.
- 07/09/2000 - planning permission was refused for the erection of a two-storey side extension and bay window at rear first floor level.
- 31/01/2000 - the above application was dismissed at appeal.
- The building was Grade II Listed on the 28/04/2003. As a result the implementation of the permission granted on appeal in 1999 would now require listed building consent.
- 15/12/2003 – Planning Permission and Listed Building consent was granted for the erection of a two-storey rear extension, external alterations, including the removal of a roof light, the replacement of a roof light and the installation of a staircase window with pitch roof art the rear, and internal alterations (PWX0302134 & 2003/0609/L)

Relevant policies

EN1 General Environmental Protection and Improvement
EN13 Design of New Development
EN19 Amenity for Occupiers and Neighbours
EN21 Alterations to Existing Buildings
EN22 Extensions to Existing Buildings
EN31 Character and Appearance of Conservation Areas.
EN38 Preservation of Listed Buildings
EN40 Restoration of Listed Buildings.
SPG 2002 - Section 2.7
Hampstead Conservation Area Statement:

Assessment

The Planning Permission for the construction of a two-storey side extension and bay window at rear first floor level, granted on 02/07/1998, is still valid by virtue of the fact that a start has been made on its implementation (the drawings indicate the position of the foundations already in place, for this building). However, following the Grade II listing of the property on the 28/04/2003, further implementation of this permission cannot proceed without Listed Building Consent and the applicant's have been advised that such consent is unlikely to be forthcoming (on account of the first floor element).

Proposal

This current application for the erection of a single storey side extension originally formed part of the previously approved (2003) application for the construction of a part ground floor rear extension and a full width first floor extension, covering a narrow area at the rear, some 2.3m wide, between the building and the site boundary. The single storey side extension element was withdrawn, by the applicant, from this previous application, and is now subject to this separate application.

This new proposal relates solely to the north east facing side elevation of the property where a single storey predominantly glazed extension is proposed. This would entail the remodelling of the existing post-war side extension, which is considered to be of no merit, with an addition projecting forwards by 3.0 metres in front of the existing side extension front building line. This new extension would be set back 2.0 –3.0 metres from the building line of the projecting bay-windowed frontage wing of the property.

The extension would be of brick construction with a pitched glass rooflight spanning the full depth of the extension, with timber glazed doors to the front, and an additional window within the north facing elevation. The extension would provide an enlarged kitchen area for the property.

Main Issues:

- Whether the proposed extension would harm the appearance of the building and its status as a listed building,
- Whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area
- Whether the proposed extension would have a detrimental effect on the amenity of neighbours.

Conservation, Design & listed Building issues.

The property is Grade II listed and was completed in 1895 by Horace Field Architect, comprising red brick tiled roof, two storeys and attic. The property was one of the last houses to be built in Gainsborough Gardens and one of the earliest neo-Georgian style dwellings indicating the beginnings of a move away from the more decorated art and crafts movement.

Although the Council does have concerns that this proposed addition would conceal the base of the side chimney stack and would be clearly visible from the public realm as one turns into Gainsborough Gardens from the Well Walk approach, it is considered that the architect has considered the extension very carefully and by employing the device of an all glazed roof, sympathetic massing and complementary design (matching red-brick and neo-Georgian detailing/fenestration), he has produced a design that minimises this impact. The proposed extension would also be an improvement to the existing unattractive side extension and would remove the existing clumsy upstand walls. Given the design, it would appear more as a conservatory adjunct rather than a solid extension and would introduce a new staggered rhythm to the existing over-long 1-2 storey elements which link this property with its neighbour to the north east.

It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the property as a listed building or the character and appearance of the wider Conservation Area. The Council's Conservation and Design Team raise no objections to the development. However it is considered that conditions should be attached to the permissions, if granted, requiring the submission of glazing bar details for the new French windows, roof-light timbers and side window, and approval of a sample panel erected onsite indicating the selected bricks, pointing and brick bond. It is also recommended that an informative be attached to the consent, if granted, stating that it is the view of the LPA that the maximum development potential for this property has now been reached and further proposals for extensions are unlikely to be favourably received.

Residential Amenity

The proposed extension would not be higher than the existing single storey side extension and would not increase the height of the existing wall to the rear of the property, which forms the boundary with the properties to the rear in Well Walk. Therefore the proposed extension would not affect the amount of light reaching the rear windows of the properties to the rear on Well Walk.

The proposed extension would project forward from the existing side extension by 3.0 metres and would consequently also project forward from the front elevation of the neighbouring property, the Lodge, Gainsborough Gardens, by 3.0 metres. It is considered that the proposed extension may slightly reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight reaching the adjacent ground floor window within the front elevation of this neighbouring property, however daylight and sunlight would still be received from north and east and over the top of the proposed extension from the south and therefore it is not considered that this slight reduction in daylight and sunlight would not be significant enough to warrant refusal of the application on amenity grounds.

The neighbouring residents in Well Walk are concerned that the proposed roof light within the roof of the extension would result in an excessive amount of light nuisance to their properties, which are situated on a higher ground level than the application property. Whilst it is acknowledged that light would emanate from this roof light which would be visible during the hours of darkness, it is considered that the properties on Well Walk are situated at a far enough distance away from the proposed extension, minimum 13 metres away, that any light emanating from the proposed extension would not be detrimental to the amenity of the resident of Well Walk, and that the application could not be refused on this basis.

Trees

The applicant's do not propose to remove the tree that currently exists within the front garden of the property when the proposed extension is constructed. If the applicant's did wish to remove this tree in the future then Conservation Area consent would be required from the Council.

Recommendation – Grant Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent.