

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED)
PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS & CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990

SITE AT 20 PERRIN'S WALK, LONDON NW3 6TH

HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPLICATION BY MRS E.GOODMAN

PLANNING & HERITAGE STATEMENT

October 2020

CHRISTOPHER WICKHAM ASSOCIATES
Town Planning Consultancy

35 Highgate High Street, London N6 5JT t: 020-8340 7950 e: cmwickham@aol.com

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Planning & Heritage Statement forms part of the planning application submitted to Camden Council ("the LPA") by Mrs E.Goodman for the '*construction of single storey side extension, replacement ground floor rear lean-to extension, first floor rear extension, and 2no. side dormers and side roof extension; associated elevational changes, and associated repair and replacement of external fabric; following demolition of existing lean-to side & rear extension and sections of garden wall*' at 20 Perrin's Walk, London NW3 6TH.

1.2 This statement should be read in conjunction with the following documents:-

- The block and location plans;
- The existing floor plans, elevations and sections (including, within the Design & Access Statement) a set of drawings indicating the likely extent of required demolition of the existing structure and associated structures;
- The proposed floor plans, elevations and sections; and
- The Design & Access Statement.

2. THE APPLICATION SITE AND THE SURROUNDING AREA

- 2.1 Perrin's Walk, which is a private no-through road, leads downhill from Heath Street, Hampstead. The north side of the road is fronted by two and three storey terraced residential properties (numbered 20-28 Perrin's Walk). A detached house, known as 'The Cottage', is situated at the end of the road, and the southern boundary of the road is formed by the side and rear boundaries of properties in Heath Street and Ellerdale Road respectively.
- 2.2 The application site is the most westerly plot on the north side of Perrin's Walk. The site is occupied by a nineteenth century, two storey cottage with a gabled roof covered in red pantiles, and featuring a tall chimney to the side elevation. The upper floor is partly contained within the roof space. The property, which is currently unoccupied and in poor condition, has a roughly rectangular plan form, and its ground floor, front elevation incorporates a main entrance door and a large bow window facing onto Perrin's Walk. A single storey lean-to extension of very basic construction, and featuring a corrugated roof, projects from the main rear elevation. The building, which is not listed, is faced in a mixture of brickwork and tile-hanging although large sections of the upper floor tile hanging have been removed at some stage. Fuller details of the existing dwelling, including a number of photographs, are provided in the Design & Access Statement.



Front elevation of 20 Perrin's Walk with 21 Perrin's Walk to the right

- 2.3 The eastern side of the property abuts the tall flank wall of 21 Perrin's Walk which is a modern town house. The main western flank of the property faces the access path leading to the property's secondary entrance door which is located towards the rear of the building within a single storey entrance hall. Land to the side of this access path is set at a lower level, and forms part of an open garden area (defined by garden walls and by an outbuilding associated with the adjacent site), and a further area of garden is located at a higher level immediately to the rear of the property. The rear boundary of the application site adjoins the rear gardens of eighteenth century terraced houses in Church Row. A private right of way, linking the rear gardens of properties in Church Row to Perrin's Walk, exists over the application property's side garden. Beyond the side garden, to the west of the application site, an extensive detached house is currently under construction at 22 Frogna Way.
- 2.4 The application site is located within the Hampstead Conservation Area, and land on the south side of Perrin's Walk forms part of the Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area. The application site is subject to an Article IV Direction that removes various permitted development rights relating to the alteration of the building and its curtilage. There are a number of designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the application site including the Church of St John in Church Row, the terraced houses at 15 to 28 (even) Church Row, the mews house at 24 Perrin's Walk, and the extensive properties at 2 and 6 Ellerdale Road. Fuller details of these and other heritage assets are set out in Section 6 of this statement.
- 2.5 The application site is located within the Hampstead (Tier 2) Archaeological Priority Area, and lies within Flood Zone 1.

3. PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 A planning application (ref: 2006/5810/P) for the '*demolition of existing building and the erection of a building comprising basement, ground and two upper floors with integral garage and balcony at front second floor level for use as a 3-bedroom single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3)*' was withdrawn.
- 3.2 An application for conservation area consent (ref: 2007/0160/C) for the '*Demolition of existing single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3)*' was withdrawn.
- 3.3 No other relevant planning history has been identified.

4. THE APPLICATION PROPOSAL

- 4.1 This planning application seeks consent for the construction of a single storey side extension, a replacement ground floor rear lean-to extension, a first floor rear extension, and 2no. side dormers and side roof extension. The scheme also proposes associated elevational changes, and the associated repair, restoration and replacement of external fabric. The works would follow the demolition of existing lean-to side and rear extension and sections of garden wall, and various other demolition works. These works are proposed in connection with the continued use of the application property as a single dwelling (Use Class C3).
- 4.2 The single storey side extension would be set back from the building's front elevation by approximately 4 metres. It would have a maximum width of 4 metres but this would reduce to approximately 3 metres towards the rear. This staggered width, which would follow the general alignment of the plot's southern boundary, reflects the need to retain acceptable access along the private right of way in this part of the site. The proposed side extension would have a flat (sedum) roof (with roof light), and would incorporate a slightly lower 'link' section where it would abut the existing house. This 'link' would include a glazed roof, and largely glazed front and rear walls. The construction of the side extension would also involve the removal of the existing side path and the demolition of the associated walls and steps.
- 4.3 The proposed side extension would marginally overlap, and would be linked to, a replacement rear lean-to extension which would be largely glazed on its elevation and roof. A small section of patio, set at a slightly lower level than the main garden, would be provided to the rear of the replacement lean-to extension. A section of wall, located between the original and side plots, would be removed.
- 4.4 The works to the rear elevation would also include a 2.5 metre deep, first floor extension which would terminate in line with the adjacent house at 21 Perrin's Walk. This first floor element would extend the pitched roofed form of the existing house rearwards, and would provide a replica rear elevation with gable and window, albeit the latter would be set at a slightly lower level than existing so as to provide a better proportioned rear elevation.
- 4.5 The roof, as proposed to be extended, would include two side dormer windows on the western roof slope, and a section of flat-roofed extension on its eastern side slope. The two side dormers would each be approximately 2 metres wide, and set well below ridge level. On the eastern slope, and connecting onto the tall flank wall of 21 Perrin's Walk, the roof

would include a low level extension that would be set in from the building's front and rear elevations. The proposed roof level works would be finished in appropriate materials.

- 4.6 The building's front elevation, and the retained exposed sections of its side elevation, would be subject to restoration using matching materials. A new roof covering is also proposed, and all windows would be replaced. Further details on all the proposed works, including the likely extent of demolition, are provided in the Design & Access Statement.
- 4.7 The applicant has undertaken consultation on the proposed scheme with neighbours in Perrin's Walk and Church Row. The consultation also included an alternative option showing a wider side extension. Some concerns were raised regarding the width of the retained private right of way, and in this regard, the overall response from neighbouring occupiers was positive on the basis of the proposed staggered side extension, the subject of this planning application. There was also widespread support expressed for the proposed restoration and beneficial re-use of the property. The comments received from neighbours were without prejudice to any further comments they may wish to make during consultation on the planning application.

5. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Revised February 2019)

5.1 The revised NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development which is defined to comprise economic, social and environmental dimensions. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and planning decisions should ensure that developments function well, are visually attractive, are sympathetic to local character and history whilst not preventing innovation or change, and optimise the potential of the site whilst providing a high standard of amenity.

5.2 Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states as follows:-

'In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.'

5.3 Paragraph 190 of the NPPF states as follows:-

'Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.'

5.4 Paragraph 192 of the NPPF states as follows:-

'In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.'

5.5 Paragraph 193 of the NPPF states as follows:-

‘When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.’

5.6 Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states as follows:-

‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.’

5.7 Paragraph 197 of the NPP states as follows:-

‘The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.’

5.8 The term ‘*Significance*’ (as relating to heritage policy) is defined in the NPPF as follows:-

‘The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the cultural value described within each site’s Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.’

5.9 The term ‘*Setting of a Heritage Asset*’ is defined in the NPPF as follows:-

‘The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.’

The Statutory Development Plan

5.10 The statutory development plan for the area comprises the consolidated London Plan 2016 (incorporating Early Minor Alterations 2013 and Further Alterations 2015/16), and the Camden Local Plan which was adopted in June 2017. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications and appeals to be

determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The London Plan

- 5.11 Policy 7.4 states that development should have regard to the form, function and structure of an area, place or street, and the scale, mass and orientation of buildings. Design should be a high quality and human scale that has regard to existing context. Policy 7.6 states that development should protect residential amenity, and should be of the highest architectural quality including details and materials that need not necessarily reflect local character. Policy 7.8 states that development affecting heritage assets should conserve their significance by being sympathetic to form, scale, materials and architectural detail

The Camden Local Plan

- 5.12 The following policies of the Camden Local Plan, as summarised, are considered to be relevant to the issues raised by this appeal:-

- Policy A1 seeks to ensure that development contributes towards strong and successful communities by balancing the needs of development with the needs and characteristics of local areas and communities. The policy states that the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours will be protected by minimising impact of residential amenities in respect of various factors including privacy, outlook, daylight, sunlight, artificial light, noise, and fumes;
- Policy D1 states that high quality inclusive design is required which respects local context, preserves or enhances heritage assets, is of sustainable construction which uses high quality complementary materials; and
- Policy D2 states that the Council will preserve heritage assets and their settings.

Camden Planning Guidance

- 5.13 *Camden Planning Guidance (Altering and Extending Your Home)* was adopted in March 2019. The document, which provides detailed design guidance in support and clarification of Local Plan policies, states that the Council is committed to excellence in design throughout the borough. Good design should always positively enhance its surrounding context. This is particularly important in conservation areas.

5.14 The guidance lays down a series of good practice principles for the rear and side extensions. In summary, these should:-

- (a) be secondary to the host building in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
- (b) be built using materials that are sympathetic to the host building where possible;
- (c) respect and preserve the original building's design, proportions and style;
- (d) respect and preserve existing architectural features;
- (e) respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area;
- (f) not cause a loss of amenity for adjacent properties (see CPG Amenity - below);
- (g) allow for the retention of a suitably-sized garden;
- (h) retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity; and
- (i) allow for the retention of wildlife corridors.

5.15 In addition to the above general principles, the guidance states that a rear extension is often the most suitable form of extension to a house, and that single storey extensions are preferable to those at higher level. The width of a rear extension should be designed so that it is not visible from the street, and in a manner that respects the rhythm of existing rear extensions on neighbouring sites. Side extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of height and scale. They should also be set back from the main building. Side extensions should also not compromise significant views or gaps between buildings, and should not harm architectural symmetry or impair original architectural features. Access to the rear of the property should not be lost. In conservation areas, reference should be made to conservation statements and appraisals which may identify important gaps between buildings which it would be inappropriate to infill.

5.16 In respect of roof alterations including dormer windows, the guidance states that these are likely to be acceptable where:-

- There is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings, and where continuing the pattern of development would help to re-unite a group of buildings or townscape;
- Alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building

and retain the overall integrity of the roof form; and

- There are a variety of additions or alterations to roofs which create an established pattern and where further development of a similar form would not cause additional harm.

5.17 A roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable where there would be a harmful impact on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street-scene. Regard should also be paid to any advice contained within a conservation area statement or appraisal.

5.18 The guidance states that dormer windows should be designed sensitively so that they do not dominate the roof plane. This means that they should sit within the roof slope so that the overall structure of the existing roof is maintained. To do this, the following circumstances, as summarised, should be met:-

- (a) The pitch of the existing roof is sufficient to allow adequate habitable space;
- (b) Dormers should be appropriately designed and subordinate in size to the main roof of the host building. They should not cut through the roof ridge or edge of the hip but are sufficiently far below (usually by way of a 500mm gap) the ridge or hip;
- (c) Dormers do not interrupt an unbroken roofscape;
- (d) Dormers are separate small projections which relate to the façade below;
- (e) Dormers are located below the parapet line (where applicable); and
- (f) Complimentary materials are used.

5.19 *Camden Planning Guidance (Amenity)*, which was published in March 2018, lays down a series of principles and tests which are intended to ensure that development proposals do not harm living conditions by virtue of a loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy, or by virtue of increased noise disturbance. Proposed extensions should not project beyond a line drawn at 45 degrees from the centre of the nearest window on the adjacent property. This figure should be applied in both the horizontal and vertical planes. In addition, new development located opposite an existing window should not obstruct a 25 degree angle taken from the centre point of the lowest window in an existing building.

The Hampstead Conservation Area Statement (HCAS)

- 5.20 The HCAS describes the area as having considerable quality and variety which combine to create a special character. The application site is situated within Sub Area 4 (Church Row/Hampstead Grove), and within the Holly Hill and Church Row Character Zone of this Sub Area. The HCAS describes Perrins's Walk as follows:-

'Perrin's Walk is a distinctly tranquil cul-de-sac off Heath Street. The properties on the north side were built as the coach houses for Church Row in the tradition of a mews and the road is paved in setts and cobbles. As a private road it has a detached and secluded air. There are various building types and it is mostly residential, although there is a garage and office use. The overall appearance is tied together by the scale and rhythm of the terrace of mostly three storey buildings. Some have been rebuilt since the 1950's.'

- 5.21 In common with the majority of other buildings in Perrin's Walk, including The Cottage, the application property is identified as a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the conservation area. However, the adjacent house at 21 Perrin's Walk is identified as a neutral contributor.

- 5.22 The focus of this part of Sub Area 4 is Church Row which is situated to the rear of the application site. The HCAS describes Church Row as follows:-

'Church Row is a street almost entirely lined with handsome early 18th century houses of brown brick with red dressings. Many have cast iron railings forming the front boundary. The street widens towards the west, focusing on St John's Church forming a well-proportioned and attractive urban space, marred at times by the traffic. The graveyard set in a mature landscape provides a beautiful backdrop to the Church. The Church was rebuilt in 1747, designed by John Sanderson (listed grade I). On the north side of the Church is the Graveyard Extension running up the hill beside Holly Walk. Together the graveyards contain 20 listed graves. At No.21a Heath Street there is a garden wooded private open space on backland adjacent to the cemetery. The two parts of the churchyard are designated a borough Site of Nature Conservation Importance by the London Ecology Unit.

The houses are generally three storey and three bays wide and some have semi-basements, although a couple on the north side are particularly small and narrow. Many houses have been discreetly modified over the years and No. 15 dates from 1924. Between Heath Street and St John's all except Gardnor House are listed, and eight of those are grade II*. There are clear views of the rear elevations of the south side from the lane leading to Frogna Way. The main exception to the streets 18th century character is Gardnor Mansions (1898) that relates in style and scale to the north side of Heath Street, although built after it.'

Historic England's Advice Notes (HEAN)

- 5.23 HEANs provide advice on a range of issues that arise in the context of the protection of the historic environment through the planning system. HEAN 2, entitled '*Making Changes to Heritage Assets*' advises as follows:-

'The main issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets, including new development in conservation areas, aside from NPPF requirements such as social and economic activity and sustainability, are proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, durability and adaptability, use, enclosure, relationship with adjacent assets and definition of spaces and streets, alignment, active frontages, permeability and treatment of setting. Replicating a particular style may be less important, though there are circumstances when it may be appropriate. It would not normally be good practice for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting. Assessment of an asset's significance and its relationship to its setting will usually suggest the forms of extension that might be appropriate.'

- 5.24 HEAN 3, entitled '*The Setting of Heritage Assets*', sets out a 5 step approach to the protection of the setting of heritage assets, as follows:-

- 1. Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected;**
- 2. Assess the degree to which these settings and views make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated;**
- 3. Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on the significance or on the ability to appreciate it;**
- 4. Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm; and**
- 5. Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.**

6. HERITAGE ASSET IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Identified heritage assets and their significance

- 6.1 The Heritage & Conservation pages of the Council's website and the National Heritage Gateway have been consulted, and, in addition to the application property itself, a number of heritage assets have been identified in the vicinity (approximately 60 metres) of the application site.

The Application Property

- 6.2 The application property, 20 Perrin's Walk, is a non-designated heritage asset that, in its current form, would appear to date from the mid to late nineteenth century. Although Newton's *Map of Hampstead* (1814) indicates that there was a building of some kind in the position of the current house, albeit as part of an indistinct group on this side of Perrin's Walk, it seems likely that the current structure is of early to mid-Victorian construction.



Map of Hampstead 1814

- 6.3 The land on which the building is situated was originally part of the curtilage of 20 Church Row, and the building in this location was therefore likely to have originally been used as a stable or coach house. This curtilage link with 20 Church Row is evidenced by the plot boundary shown on the 1894-96 Ordnance Survey map.



OS Map 1894-96

- 6.4 Following use as a drawing office and workshop, the current property was acquired during the 1920s by the writer Eleanor Farjeon who used it as her home, and who later acquired additional land to the side in order to provide a larger garden. The 1953 Ordnance Survey map (see below) shows that, by this time, the link with 20 Church Row had been severed. It is understood that Ms Farjeon lived at the property until her death in 1965, and since her death, the property has fallen into relative disrepair.



OS Map 1953

- 6.5 The property is of simple construction and modest size but its gabled roof form, use of tile

CWA.1406.PHS.20 Perrins Walk.10.2020

hanging, tall chimney and generally attractive fenestration (including its ground floor bow window to the front elevation), result in some limited architectural significance in heritage terms. That limited significance has, however, been eroded by the general deterioration in the condition of the building and the loss of various external features, including some external tile-hanging. The covering and condition of the main roof, and the corrugated roof to the rear lean-to extension, are additional features that detract from the appearance of the building. The corrugated roof, due to its high pitch, obscures a section of the building's rear elevation up to first floor cill level. The building's occupation by Eleanor Farjeon, along with its original functional link with 20 Church Row, result in a degree of historic, including cultural, significance. On balance, the building is also considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area.



Rear elevation with lean-to extension

- 6.6 The building's setting is defined principally to the front by the intimate and enclosed character of Perrin's Walk, and to the rear and side by the large areas of open garden land between Perrin's Walk, Froggnal Way and Church Row, which in turn are enclosed by the Church of St John and the rear elevations of the taller residential buildings in Church Row to the north.

Statutorily Listed Buildings

- 6.7 The following statutorily listed buildings have been identified in the vicinity of the application site, and all can be considered to be of *high significance* in heritage terms. The settings of these buildings would be affected to limited and varying degrees by development at the application site.
- 6.8 The house at 24 Perrin's Walk is located a short distance to the east of the application site. The property, which was listed Grade II on 14th May 1974, was originally the coach house to 24 Church Row. The property dates from the early nineteenth century but its front façade was altered in the late nineteenth century, and its rear elevation is of inter-war origin. The setting of this listed building includes the entire length of Perrin's Walk and the long and open rear gardens between Perrin's Walk and Church Row. Within this setting, the front elevation of the application property is of some importance in views along Perrin's Walk.



24 Perrin's Walk

6.9 The Church of St John is situated to the north-west of the application site, and was listed Grade I on 11th August 1950. The church was constructed between 1745 and 1747 to a design by John Sanderson. Later modifications include a rebuilt steeple in 1759, the addition of a spire in 1784, and various extensions and alterations during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The church includes numerous internal and external features of architectural and historic importance. In terms of setting, the church plays a key townscape function in the closure of westerly views along Church Row, and also dominates views from Frogna Way and from the rear gardens of the houses on the south side of Church Row. The setting of the church makes an important contribution to its significance. Various gates, tombstones and bollards within the church yard are subject to separate listings. The application property is visible in glimpse views (largely filtered by established tree planting) from the church yard and from the public alley way that runs along the eastern boundary of the church yard, and in the context of a separation distance of some 60 metres and its modest scale, the property therefore has some limited impact on the setting of the church.



Church of St. John

- 6.10 The detached house at 15 Church Row (with attached railings) was listed Grade II on 14th May 1974. It is a two storey house, with basement and attic levels, constructed in the 1920s in the neo-Georgian style. Its elevations are decorative and finely detailed. The setting of the house includes views along the eastern section of Church Row, to the east of the Church of St John, and views of the extensive open rear gardens which separate development in Church Row, Frognal Way and Perrin's Walk. The application property is visible from the rear garden and upper floors of 15 Church Row, and both 15 Church Row and the application property are visible from the public alley adjacent to the church yard. The application property therefore has some limited impact on the setting of the house, albeit this impact is moderated by a separation distance of approximately 50 metres, by established tree planting, and by the lower elevation of the application plot.
- 6.11 The terraced house at 16 Church Row (with attached railings and lamp holder) was listed Grade II on 11th August 1950. This four storey, plus basement, house was constructed in circa 1720 but was much raised, extended and re-fronted in the late nineteenth century. The house is constructed from yellow stock brick with red brick dressings, and is finely detailed. The setting of the house includes views along the eastern section of Church Row, to the east of the Church of St John, and views of the extensive open rear gardens which separate development in Church Row, Frognal Way and Perrin's Walk. The application property is visible from the rear garden and upper floors of 16 Church Row, and both the rear elevation of 16 Church Row and the application property are visible from the public alley adjacent to the church yard. The application property therefore has some limited impact on the setting of the house, albeit this impact is moderated by a separation distance of approximately 40 metres, by established tree planting, and by the lower elevation of the application plot
- 6.12 The terraced house at 17 Church Row (with attached railings to front and garden walls to rear) was listed Grade II on 11th August 1950. This house dates from the 1720s, and is constructed over three storeys (with Attic and basement) in the Georgian style, but was altered during the early and late nineteenth century. It includes a slated mansard roof and a rear bathroom addition. The house was the home of H.G.Wells between 1909 and 1913. The setting of the house includes the eastern section of Church Row, to the east of the Church of St John, and views of the extensive open rear gardens which separate development in Church Row, Frognal Way and Perrin's Walk. The application property is visible from the rear garden and upper floors of 17 Church Row, and both the rear elevation of 17 Church Row and the application property are visible from the public alley adjacent to the church yard. The application property therefore has some limited impact on the setting of the house, albeit this impact is moderated by a separation distance of approximately 40

metres, by established tree planting, and by the lower elevation of the application plot

- 6.13 The terraced houses at 18-28 Church Row (with attached railings and rear walls) are all listed Grade II*. The separate listings relate to nos. 18 & 19 (combined), 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 to 28. The listings were made on 11th August 1950. The properties, which all date from circa 1720 but were re-faced during the nineteenth century, are 3 and 4 storeys with basements and mansard roofs. The setting of the houses includes the eastern section of Church Row, to the east of the Church of St John, and views of the extensive open rear gardens which separate development in Church Row, Frogna Way and Perrin's Walk. The application property is visible from the rear gardens and upper floors of these Church Row houses, and both the rear elevations of the Church Row houses and the application property are visible from the public alley adjacent to the church yard. The application property therefore has some limited impact on the setting of these houses, albeit this impact is moderated by a separation distance of at least 35 metres, by established tree planting, and by the lower elevation of the application plot.



View of the rear of 15 to 28 Church Row

- 6.14 The detached property at 2 Ellerdale Road (including entrance gates) is a two storey detached house with an attic storey and semi-basement. The house, which was listed on 14th May 1974, was constructed by a local Architect/Developer in circa 1890. It has an asymmetrical design with a tall hipped and gabled roof, and a striking rectangular tower on

CWA.1406.PHS.20 Perrins Walk.10.2020

its right-hand front elevation that rises to roof level and includes a canted three light oriel window at first floor level. The setting of the building is defined principally by its frontage location between closely-spaced adjacent within Ellerdale Road. The upper parts of the property are also viewed from the north and west, including from the western end Perrin's Walk in the vicinity of the application site. In these views, the application property is a minor element in the setting of 2 Ellerdale Road.



2 Ellerdale Road (above) and 6 Ellerdale Road (below)



6.15 The detached property at 6 Ellerdale Road, known as the Institute of St Marcellina, was

listed Grade I on 11th August 1950. It is currently in use as a convent, having previously been used as a hotel. It was constructed by R. Norman Shaw in 1874-76 for himself, and a northern rear extension was added in 1885-86. This three and four storey, brick-faced building, with a gabled roof, is designed in the Queen Anne style, and its setting is defined principally by its frontage location between closely-spaced adjacent within Ellerdale Road. The upper parts of the property are also viewed from the north and west, including from the western end Perrin's Walk in the vicinity of the application site. In these views, the application property is a minor element in the setting of 6 Ellerdale Road.

Locally Listed Buildings

- 6.16 No locally listed buildings have been identified in the vicinity of the application site.

The Hampstead Conservation Area

- 6.17 This part of the Hampstead Conservation Area, centred upon Church Row, is characterised by a concentration of elegant eighteenth century terraced houses in brown brick, with the Church of St John closing off the westerly view along the road. The scale of Perrin's Walk is clearly subordinate to that of the Church Row, signifying the historic coach house linkage with these large houses. The character is further reinforced by the extensive and landscaped open areas that form the spaces between the buildings. Frognal Way, to the west of the application site, is an un-adopted road which is linked to Church Row by an alleyway that offers views of the churchyard and of the rear elevations and gardens of the houses in Church Row. The house at 20 Frognal Way is a striking, Spanish colonial-style house that adds architectural contrast.
- 6.18 Perrin's Walk itself has a more intimate and secluded character formed by (i) the scale and rhythm of the two and three storey 'mews style houses on its north side, (ii) its gentle slope down towards the west, and (iii) its surface treatment of setts and cobbles. The properties at 22, 23, 25, 27, and The Cottage all make a positive contribution to the conservation area.



View west along Perrin's Walk

- 6.19 In overall terms, the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area is of high significance in heritage terms.

The Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area

- 6.20 The northern part of this conservation area, formed by the properties on the north side of Ellerdale Road, abuts the south side of Perrin's Walk. The road falls steeply westwards from Fitzjohns Avenue, and is fronted by a variety of large properties dating from the 1870s, including the two listed building identified above. The character and appearance of the conservation area is of high significance in heritage terms although, with the exception of the setting of the listed buildings at 2 and 6 Ellerdale Road, that character and appearance is not likely to be impacted by development at the application site.

The Proposal's Impact on the Identified Heritage Assets

Legal Framework

- 6.21 Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Area) Act 1990 require authorities considering applications for planning permission or listed building consent for

works which affect a listed building to have special regard to certain matters, including the desirability of preserving the setting of the building. Section 72 of the Act requires that special attention is paid in the exercise of planning functions to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. The NPPF requires that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Summary of Context for Assessment of Impact

- 6.22 Within this statement, the property has been assessed to be of heritage significance, and to be within the setting of a number of nearby listed buildings, as identified above. In its existing form, the property has also been assessed to be, on balance, a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area.
- 6.23 The retention and restoration of the property, which contrasts with the earlier planning application to demolish and replace the building with a much larger dwelling, would as a matter of principle be beneficial to the setting of nearby listed buildings and to the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area. However, the existing appearance of the property, in particular the dilapidated rear lean-to extension (with its high corrugated roof) and the missing tile-hanging to the front elevation, detracts from the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area, and therefore causes some harm to the setting of the closest listed buildings. Furthermore, the existing building falls far short of providing an acceptable contemporary standard of residential accommodation. Subject to the grant of planning permission, the applicant is intending to make a substantial investment in the property to remedy the current shortcomings.

Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Application Property

- 6.24 The proposal involves a limited degree of demolition which is considered to be justifiable in the context of the overall retention of the main structural and other elements of existing fabric, and having regard to the substantial heritage benefits that will be delivered by the scheme as a whole. This approach is considered to be consistent with the requirements of paragraph 197 of the NPPF, and having regard to case law in Dorothy Bohm v SSCLG [2017] [EWHC 3217 (Admin)] which involved a legal challenge to an appeal decision relating to a proposal for the full demolition of a non-designated heritage asset which was a positive contributor within the Hampstead Conservation Area. The case clarifies that just because a non-designated heritage asset makes a positive contribution, the decision maker should not automatically conclude that its demolition and redevelopment would be

harmful, and that it is necessary to reach a balanced judgement of the scheme's overall impact in heritage terms. Nathalie Lieven QC, sitting as Deputy High Court Judge, concluded (in part) as follows:- [N.B. NPPF paragraphs numbers refer to previous version of the Framework]

'However, when considering the impact of the proposal on the CA under s.72 it is the impact of the entire proposal which is in issue. In other words the decision maker must consider not merely the removal of the building which made a positive contribution, but also the impact on the CA of the building which replaced it. She must then make a judgement on the overall impact on the CA of the entire proposal before her.

Secondly, the Inspector also had to apply the policy test in para 135 of the NPPF. Unsurprisingly, given that an NDHA does not itself have statutory protection, the test in para 135 is different from that in paras 132-4, which concern designated heritage assets. Paragraph 135 calls for weighing "applications" that affect an NDHA, in other words the consideration under that paragraph must be of the application as a whole, not merely the demolition but also the construction of the new building. It then requires a balanced judgement to be made by the decision maker. The NPPF does not seek to prescribe how that balance should be undertaken, or what weight should be given to any particular matter.

This is the analysis that the Inspector undertook in the decision letter. She considered the significance of the NDHA in its own right in paras 3-11. Her conclusion in para 10 was that the building had some limited local heritage interest, but that did not weigh significantly in favour of retention. At para 11 she weighed up the loss of the building with the construction of the new building, which she said would be acceptable and would promote and reinforce local distinctiveness. She concluded that there would not be an adverse impact from the loss. This was precisely the "balanced judgement" that she was required to do under para 135.

In respect of s.72, she considered this issue in paras 12-17. She said at para 16 that the existing building made a limited positive contribution to the CA, and the net effect of the new building would at worst be neutral and that the CA would not be harmed. Again in my view this was an entirely correct approach. Section 72 requires the overall effect on the CA of the proposal to be considered. There is no requirement for a two stage process by which the demolition part of an application has to be considered separately from the proposed new development.'

- 6.25 The likely extent of necessary demolition associated with the proposed extension and restoration works to the application property is indicated on annotated drawings within the Design & Access Statement. Unlike the previous application which proposed the full demolition of the property, the current owner/applicant seeks to minimise the extent of demolition, and to retain and repair fabric wherever possible, and consistent with the objectives of securing the future of the building and up-grading it to contemporary living standards. Importantly, it should be noted that the scheme retains, in full, the building's

east flank wall, front elevation, roof structure and internal first floor, and the majority of its west flank wall. It will be noted that the proposed areas of demolition are confined principally to the building's subordinate rear ground floor section, specifically the existing and architecturally unremarkable rear lean-to extension and associated side entrance projection. This part of the existing structure includes an unsightly and crude corrugated roof, and is generally in a poor condition and dilapidated condition. In addition, the proposed rear and side extensions require the removal of those parts of the existing external walls to which the extensions would be attached, as would always be required where a building is subject to any form of extension.

- 6.26 Other proposed demolition works relate to existing internal partitioning, and to existing sections of external garden/retaining wall with path and steps to the side and rear of the building. The proposed internal demolition does not amount to development requiring planning permission, and the proposed garden works would almost certainly be permitted development. In relation to the latter, it should be noted that a substantial section of the existing sub-dividing wall within the rear garden would be retained between the proposed rear extension and the plot's rear boundary.
- 6.27 Importantly, the proposed extent of demolition is also considered to be justifiable in the context of the sensitive design quality and detailing of each of the proposed extension elements, and having regard to the proposed restoration and sympathetic renewal of retained fabric, as described below. In the same way, the proposed extent of demolition can be regarded as causing no harm to the significance of designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the application site.
- 6.28 The proposed single storey side extension would have a subordinate scale and an architecturally subservient appearance. The subordination of scale is achieved by way of its limited height and recessed position in relation to the property's front elevation. The overall width of the extension would be less than that of the original house. The slightly lower roof profile of the 'link' section abutting the original house, would emphasise the respectful scale of the extension and the primary status and visual dominance of the retained house. The subservience in appearance would be achieved by the use of simple contemporary materials, including glass and render, which would not compete with the more decorative form of the original house. This includes the proposed widespread use of glazing on the roof and end elevations of the 'link' section.
- 6.29 The proposed replacement lean-to extension and first floor rear extension would effectively replicate the established form of the original building by 'extruding' the existing gabled roof

form (with window) northwards as far as the established building-line of 21 Perrin's Walk. The ground floor lean-to element would add only a small additional bulk, and its sloping glazed-roof form would allude to the existing ground floor structure. However, the lower 'starting point' for its sloping roof, when compared to the existing lean-to, would better reveal the upper parts of the building's rear elevation including the setting of the rear-facing first floor window, the level of which would be marginally lowered so as to create a better proportioned rear elevation. The glazed rear elevation of the new lean-to would emphasise its subservient form.

- 6.30 The other proposed alterations at roof level, which would facilitate the use of the upper floor in line with contemporary expectations, would include two small dormer windows on the west elevation. These modestly-scaled features would be set in from the front and rear elevations, and would be set well below the roof ridge level. The front faces of these dormers would align with the retained tall chimney which would be the dominant feature located midway between the dormers. On the east side of the roof, the new flat roof 'infill' extension would have the same roof height as the proposed dormers. This structure would also be set in from the front and rear elevations, and would be largely concealed against the tall flank wall of no. 21.
- 6.31 The repair and restoration of the original house would use matching or otherwise appropriate materials and detailing. This includes the use of clay tiles in place of the existing non-original roof covering, and the reinstatement of tile-hanging where appropriate. The replacement windows, including the main first floor 'five light' openings within each gable end, would be double-glazed within slim metal and timber frames
- 6.32 The impact of the proposed changes, including the limited degree of proposed demolition, on the significance of the host property would be neutral to positive, and in overall terms therefore beneficial from a heritage perspective. The changes would preserve the architectural scale, form and character of the house when viewed from both Perrin's Walk and from within the curtilage of the site, would be viewed as subordinate and respectful features. A significant proportion of the site would be retained as garden land. The proposal, including the proposed limited extent of demolition, would also allow for the beneficial re-use of the building, and assure its future as a private dwelling providing a contemporary standard of residential accommodation.

Impact on the Setting of the Listed Buildings

- 6.33 The application property currently has a limited impact on the setting of the identified listed

buildings. This is due, in the main, to the property's modest scale, and in relation to the Church Row listed buildings, to the separation distances and established landscaping to the north of the application site. The Church Row properties are also generally set at a higher land level than the application property.

- 6.34 The proposed renovation of the application property's front elevation would enhance the setting of 24 Perrin's Walk. The other proposed works would have little discernible impact on the setting of no. 24 although the proposed improvements to the rear elevation would be apparent as part of the wider view from the north of the rear of the Perrin's Walk terrace. The overall impact on the setting of 24 Perrin's Walk would therefore be positive.
- 6.35 When viewed as part of the settings of the various identified listed buildings in Church Row, it is principally the upper floor and gabled roof of the application property that is apparent. The application scheme proposes the full retention of the gabled roof form, albeit altered to a limited degree by the rearward extension of the roof and the addition of the dormers and a side extension. The important north-facing gable end would remain the principal architectural element of the elevation, and this feature would be better revealed as a result of the removal of the tall and unsightly corrugated roof to the existing lean-to extension, and the marginally re-positioned first floor window. The proposed addition on the east side of the roof would not be widely seen from the Church Row properties immediately to the north, and would not be seen at all from those to the east and west. The proposed west-facing dormers would appear as well-designed and minor additions, set within the refurbished roof, in the filtered views from the north-west, including from the church and church yard. The ground extension, to the limited extent that it would be visible from outside the application site's walled garden, would be viewed as a subordinate and low level feature, not dissimilar to existing rear extensions to other properties in Perrin's Walk. Its sedum roof would further limit its prominence. The retention of the side and rear gardens of the application property would preserve the general landscaped openness apparent to the rear of all the identified listed buildings in Church Row. For all these reasons, the impact on the settings of the listed buildings in Church Row would be positive.
- 6.36 Finally, in relation to the nearby listed buildings at 2 & 6 Ellerdale Road, it is considered that the setting of these buildings would be neutrally impacted, but arguably marginally enhanced, for the same reasons that apply to the listed buildings in Church Row. In the southerly and south-easterly views of (the upper parts of) 2 & 6 Ellerdale Road, the restored and extended form of 20 Perrin's Walk would be a positive foreground feature. From within Perrin's Walk, the rear and upper sections of 2 & 6 Ellerdale Road would be seen in the context of the renovated and enhanced appearance of the application property.

Self-evidently, the principal settings of these two listed buildings, when viewed from Ellerdale Road itself, would be unaffected by the application proposal.

Impact on the Character & Appearance of the Conservation Areas

- 6.37 The sympathetically restored appearance of the property, in association with the sensitive extension works and the retained open gardens to the side and rear, would preserve and enhance the character of this part of the Hampstead Conservation Area. Given the modest scale of the extensions, the proposal would have little discernible impact on the Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area or its setting.

Summary of Heritage Impact

- 6.38 The proposed extensions and alterations to the application property would preserve and enhance the setting of nearby listed building, and the character or appearance of the conservation area. The proposal thus complies with the relevant advice in the NPPF and HEAN with regard to considering the impact of proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage assets, and also meets the requirements of London Plan Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8, and Camden Local Plan Policies D1 and D2.

7. OTHER PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Living Conditions

- 7.1 The property currently falls well short of contemporary residential standards in terms of space, layout, and insulation. The application scheme would provide extended and improved living conditions within the property, including through the provision of enlarged ground floor living space and an additional bedroom. All habitable accommodation would receive satisfactory levels of light, outlook and privacy, and would also comply with national minimum size standards. The works would provide contemporary, family-sized accommodation of a high standard, and the scheme would retain substantial areas of well-screened and useable private amenity space to the side and rear of the extended dwelling.
- 7.2 The proposed extensions would not have a material impact on living conditions within the two adjacent properties at 21 Perrin's Walk and The Cottage. The single storey rear lean-to extension would project beyond the rear wall of 21 Perrin's Walk by approximately one metre, and the upper floor extension would align with the rear wall of this neighbouring building. The proposed single storey side extension would incorporate front and side facing windows, outlook from which would be constrained by existing and new boundary screening. The proposed west-facing dormer windows would be sufficiently separated from the new house at 22 Frognal Way, and any potential view from these dormers towards The Cottage would be at an acute angle. The proposed extension to the east roof slope would have no material impact on living conditions within any neighbouring property.
- 7.3 In respect of the impact on living conditions, the proposed extensions would therefore comply with Local Plan Policy A1 and associated Camden Planning Guidance.

Sustainability

- 7.4 Details of the proposed measures aimed at enhancing the sustainable performance of the application property are provided in section 6 of the Design & Access Statement. The proposals would substantially improve the performance of the property in terms of insulation and the efficient use of energy and other resources.

Use

- 7.5 The restoration and enlargement of the application property would substantially enhance its contribution to the stock of housing in Camden, including the provision of new family-sized

housing. The proposal therefore complies with all levels of planning policy that seek to increase the supply of good quality homes.

8. SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

- 8.1 The cottage at 20 Perrin's Walk, the subject of this planning application, is a non-designated heritage asset located within the Hampstead Conservation Area. The conservation area is a designated heritage asset of high significance. The property would appear to date from the mid-Victorian period, and to have originally been a coach house or stable associated with the large house at 20 Church Row. The property, which has fallen into disrepair and is in need of repair, renovation and modernisation, was once the home of the writer Eleanor Farjeon.
- 8.2 There are a number of statutorily listed buildings of high significance within the vicinity of the application site, and the setting of these buildings is affected to varying degree by the property at 20 Perrin's Walk. On balance, the application property is considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area although its condition and roof covering, along with the appearance and roof bulk of the existing rear lean-to extension, can be considered to be negative features.
- 8.3 The proposed extensions and alterations to the application property, comprising additions to the side and rear and at roof level, would, along with the proposed general renovation, preserve the architectural scale, form and character of the house when viewed from both Perrin's Walk and from within the curtilage of the site. A significant proportion of the site would be retained as garden land thereby preserving the setting of the building within its own plot. The associated demolition of the existing lean-to extension would be beneficial in heritage terms. Having regard to the relevant 'balancing' test set out at paragraph 197 of the NPPF, the impact of the proposed changes, including the limited demolition, on the significance of the host property would be positive, and in overall terms therefore beneficial from a heritage perspective. For the same reasons, the proposed works would preserve and enhance the setting of the nearby listed buildings.
- 8.4 The proposed works would have no material impact on the living conditions within the adjacent and nearby residential properties, and the extended and restored building would provide residential accommodation of good quality. The works would be carried out to a high standard of sustainable construction.
- 8.5 The proposal is therefore considered to comprise sustainable development that accords with the NPPF, the statutory development plan, and applicable national and local heritage

and design guidance.

CHRISTOPHER WICKHAM BA MRTPI
October 2020