

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/6266/P	Peter Cassidy	04/03/2022 21:30:58	OBJ	<p>HCAAC's comments on 2021/6266/P in respect of 33 Hampstead Lane, London</p> <p>These are Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee's objections to the above application for the demolition of existing garage and erection of a one storey (with full basement below) two-bedroom dwelling in the gap between Numbers 33 and 35 Hampstead Lane.</p> <p>Members of HCAAC made a site visit to Hampstead Lane. Having done so, the first thing that struck us was the gap between 33 and 35 which provides an unobstructed and big sky view along with the trees behind the properties. The existing garage is low and does not inhibit that view.</p> <p>It is vital that the gap between the imposing pairs of buildings at 31/33 and 35/37 is maintained. There is large gap too between 39 and 41. These gaps provide a great sense of openness.</p> <p>Talking of openness, 33 and 35 are within Metropolitan Open Land ("MOL"). HCAAC notes from the pre-application advice that the significance of this fact is recognised by the Council. The Council made it clear that it was concerned to ensure that the development would have no greater impact on the openness of the MOL than the existing garage.</p> <p>In commenting on the second iteration of the proposed development, the Council concluded that the revised proposal was more discrete than the previous scheme. However, the Council went on to say that the proposal should be revised yet further to incorporate a set-back from the neighbouring properties so that it appears recessive and subservient to the large Victorian buildings.</p> <p>The applicant has said, in respect of the proposed development submitted with the application, that the front line of the proposed building has been set-back further. Having said that, upon review of the documents, the extent of the set-back is in fact minimal. As a result, the proposed development is not recessive and subservient to the neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Further, the proposed development, as viewed from the lane, is wider than the existing garage. As a result, the sense of openness is diminished.</p> <p>We note that the building constructed between 29 and 31 is relied upon by the applicant in support of its proposed development. That building is wholly incongruous with its neighbours and does nothing to maintain the harmony of the run of impressive buildings. That building does not enhance the Conservation Area and should not be used as a satisfactory benchmark against which this application should be judged.</p> <p>By contrast, there are examples of earlier houses/cottages further up Hamstead Lane (towards the village) which are set well back from the line of the main houses on the lane.</p> <p>It is vital, therefore, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) any proposed development is recessive and subservient to the neighbouring properties; and (ii) the openness of the skyline in the gap between 33 and 35 as viewed from the lane, the general openness of this stretch of the lane, the harmony of the pairs of buildings and the character of the Conservation Area are

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

fully preserved.

The proposed development does not achieve those objectives in that:

- a) as seen from the lane, it is wider than the existing garage;
- b) it is set too far forward; and
- c) the glass box appearance, as depicted in the front elevation drawing, is completely out of harmony with the fenestration and fabric of the impressive neighbouring properties.

Whilst writing, we should point out that at Section 8.3 of the BIA (Hydrogeology and Groundwater Flooding) the writer confusingly concludes that “there are impacts/no impacts to the wider hydrogeological environment”.

In addition, despite what the applicant says at pages of the design and access statement, the proposed development does not meet Building Regulations “Optional requirement Part M4(2) – Category 2 - Accessible and adaptable dwelling standards” (“the Requirement”).

The following aspects of the proposed design does not meet the Requirement:

- a) In the gap between the main house and the proposed house, as depicted on drawing no. 291: upper ground floor plan (UGL), there is a footpath with sections marked 1.10 max (which should read 1:10 maximum i.e. a ramp of 1 in 10). To achieve compliance with 2.10 of the Requirement, the ramp must be between 1:20 and 1:12. That ramped footpath leads to a secondary entrance at the upper level which is the entrance for people with disabilities.
- b) The design of the “disabled” entrance door does not meet the dimensional requirements set out at 2.20 of the Requirement. There should be a “nib” of 300mm minimum at the leading edge of the door so that people can reach the door handle.
- c) At the UGL there is a bedroom and a WC with wash basin, but no shower.
- d) The internal doors also need nibs to comply with 2.22 of the Requirement.
- e) The width and layout of corridors may not comply with 2.22 of the Requirement.
- f) There needs to be access to an amenity space. There is possibly an amenity space between the bicycle store and the secondary front entrance
- g) The person occupying the bedroom at the upper level has to go downstairs to reach the bathroom, the kitchen/dining living room and the main amenity space. To achieve compliance with 2.23d of the Requirement, the stair must have a clear width of 850mm to allow for the installation of a stairlift. The drawings state one must not scale from the drawing, but the width of the stair between handrails as drawn is only 800mm

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
-----------------	------------------	-----------	----------	-----------

For all the above reasons, HCAAC objects to this application.
