



HAMPSTEAD NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

3 July 2020

Ben Farrant
Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

Re: 2020/2462/P and 2020/2553/L, 9 Pilgrim's Lane

This proposal is a further revision to the previous proposals 2019/5817/P & 2019/6239/L (and 2019/1103/P & 2019/1606/L before those) to which the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum objected as being contrary to the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) Policies DH1 and DH2, the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement and other national and local policies.

No. 9 Pilgrim's Lane is the former service wing of no. 7 Pilgrim's Lane, also listed, and any proposals merit consideration within the context of both properties.

Whilst the proposed extension has now been reduced in depth it still projects above the boundary wall to the adjacent property, which mars the setting of the listed property next door, contrary to HNP DH2. This is compounded by a glass link to the original property that stands yet higher. The plans imply that non-permanent vegetation along the top of boundary wall will provide a screen to the extension but this does not merit inclusion in consideration of the scale of the development.

The extension would harm the designated heritage asset through its scale and design and by virtue of its location it unbalances the symmetry of the rear façade to which it does not follow. Policy H28 of the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement clearly states that "rear extensions would not be acceptable where they would spoil a uniform rear elevation".

Local Plan Policy D2 states that Camden will resist proposals for extensions that would cause harm to the special architectural or historical importance of the building or the significance of its setting. This proposal does both. The proposed extension, by virtue of its size and design, would dominate the rear garden of no. 9 and degrade the setting of no. 7.

The proposed railings to the front of the property do not suit the character of building particularly when considered within the context of the setting of no. 7, no. 9 and surrounding properties, contrary to HNP Policy DH1. Policy H10 of the Conservation Area Statement makes specific reference to avoiding harmful development of this nature.

The proposal fails to demonstrate that some public good would offset the (less than substantial) harm that the extension would cause to the designated heritage asset and therefore conflicts with NPPF, paragraph 196.

Sincerely,

Guy Wingate
Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum