



## HAMPSTEAD NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

15 July 2020

Nathaniel Young  
Planning Solutions Team  
Camden Council

Re: 2020/2175/P, 94 South Hill Park, London NW3 2SN

Dear Mr Young,

This application seeks to expand a side extension both vertically and horizontally, with the principal aim of building a lift on the outside of a house that has already been subjected to significant over-development. The proposal gives rise to three sets of concerns, as it runs contrary to planning policies on grounds of design, restriction of views, and basement construction.

Firstly, the proposed lift shaft (including the lift well) would span five storeys of the house. It would widen the house from the first floor to the eaves. The resulting imbalance to the original design of the house can easily be seen in the architect's drawing of the proposed front elevation (page 39 of the Design & Access Statement.) In addition, at first floor level, the scale of the extension would grow significantly along the border with the public footpath.

The D&A Statement asserts that great consideration has been given to ensuring that the form and scale are in keeping with the Pembridge Conservation Area, 'as being an eclectic melange of building scales and typologies.' However, the house is in the South Hill Park Conservation Area. This area's Conservation Statement notes the 'architectural unity' of the Italianate-style houses at the northern end of South Hill Park. Like most houses in the street, No. 94 is deemed to make a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the area. The proposed large side extension would undermine this contribution. It would disrupt the symmetry with No. 92 and also with No. 96, unbalancing the whole terrace. The proposal is contrary to policies DH1 (Design) and DH2 (Conservation Area) of the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan. Policy DH1 states that designs should be 'sympathetic to established building lines' and in keeping with the proportion and scale of surrounding buildings. Policy DH2 states that proposals should protect or enhance buildings that make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.

The second set of concerns relate to the house's position. It is situated at an important connection point between Hampstead Heath and South Hill Park. The house, and the proposed extension, border a wide public footpath from the street through to Hampstead Heath, through which there is a view in both directions, from the Heath into the built-up area and vice versa. This two-way view would be significantly narrowed and curtailed by the proposed extension. Gaps with glimpses beyond (and this is a particularly large gap with views toward the Heath) are an important feature of South Hill Park. The Conservation Area Statement notes that the area offers 'many incidental and panoramic views into the Conservation Area.' It also notes that 'the siting, form and appearance of development on the fringes of the Heath and framing views from it are considered to be particularly sensitive.' This proposal would narrow the view in both directions. Camden Local Plan Policy D1 Design states that developments must preserve local views, and elaborates at paragraph 7.29 that the Council will seek to protect locally important views including 'views of and from large public parks and open spaces such as Hampstead Heath.' The proposal is therefore contrary to Camden's Policy D1.

The sensitive nature of the environment in this location is underlined by the fact that 94 South Hill Park borders not simply the Heath but also Private Open Space 207 in the Camden Policies Map<sup>1</sup> as updated at May 2020, but also Biodiversity Corridor E as designated in the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, a great deal is at stake in the consideration of this application.

Thirdly, the proposal would involve an expansion, albeit small, of the existing basement so as to house the lift well. The basement was constructed following a successful appeal against Camden's refusal of permission – and over substantial local objections. Since the construction of the basement, No. 92 has had to be shored up repeatedly. The proposed further expansion of the basement would be extremely close to the public footpath. No documentation of the proposed expansion is included in the application. Attention is drawn to policies in the Basements section of the Hampstead

Neighbourhood Plan, which note initially that Camden requires all proposed basement developments to include a Basement Impact Assessment.

Finally, we would ask Camden to consider the precedent that could be set in the Conservation Area and in the rest of the area covered by the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan if permission were given to build a lift shaft on the outside of the original design of a 19<sup>th</sup> century building deemed to make a positive contribution to the area.

The Forum recommends that Camden refuse the application.

Yours sincerely,

Alex Nicoll

Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum

---

<sup>1</sup> Camden Policies Map, May 2020:

<https://www.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/4820180/Camden+Policies+Map+2020+May.pdf/55566da0-7e3e-4c6a-c114-a7acbb3b307a?t=1588776006944>

<sup>2</sup> Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2033, Appendix 4, Open Spaces and Biodiversity Corridors:

[https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/hnf/pages/206/attachments/original/1568277343/27\\_July2018\\_Appendix\\_4.pdf?1568277343](https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/hnf/pages/206/attachments/original/1568277343/27_July2018_Appendix_4.pdf?1568277343)