



Conservation comments	
Application reference	22/125363
Site Address	46 Jerningham Road
Proposal	Side extension
Officer	Joanna Ecclestone
Date	14.03.2022 Rev 22.08.2022

Comments:
<p>No 46 is one half of a symmetrical semi detached pair on the end of a group, at the corner with Ommany Road.</p> <p>It is within Telegraph Hill CA, character area 1, comprised of the original Haberdashers Estate development characterised by strong uniformity of design, a restricted materials palette and a high level of architectural detailing. The front gardens provide a verdant setting to the setting of the houses. No. 46 is identified in the CA Appraisal as making a positive contribution to the CA, hence it is considered to be a NDHA.</p> <p>The proposed extension has three levels – basement, ground (which corresponds with the lower ground floor of the host building) and first (which corresponds with the raised ground floor of the host building). The basement will not have a visual presence other than through glazed lightwells to the rear. The (lower) ground floor will be set beneath the existing garden level at the front, and open out onto the garden level at the rear. The first floor will sit above the garden level to front and rear and be the level that is principally visible from the street.</p> <p>Pre-app advice advised that the proposed development must retain the existing symmetrical semi-detached nature; be subservient to the host dwelling; positively address Ommaney Road; respond to the predominantly pitched hipped roofs of the CA; position the extension so that the semi-detached form retains its predominance in some views; use brick as the principal material.</p> <p>The proposal has responded positively to the pre-app advice; the footprint is set back from the front building line and springs from the front edge of the chimney stack; it sits one storey below eaves level and so appears subordinate to the building. Its orientation addresses Ommaney Road, and visually demarcates it as a contemporary addition. Its set back building line allows the envelope of the semi detached pair to still be read in views from the south, until one gets closer to the junction with Ommaney Road.</p> <p>I have the following specific comments on the proposal: Basement and (Lower) ground floor element –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Building right out to the side boundary will result in reduced scope for planting along this boundary, to the detriment of the street scene. A green roof is welcomed but can larger scale planting be accommodated along the side boundary? This would require a deeper planting substrate and possibly loss of floor-ceiling height at this side of the (lower) ground

floor. **Rev- this has now been addressed to add planting.**

- Infill of vehicular entrance on side wall – no objection but it will need a closely matched, brick type, bond & mortar joint.
- Fence on top of wall – where this wall is screening the (lower) ground floor structure it would be preferable if it read honestly, ie as a brick flank elevation. **Rev – this has now been amended to an extension of the brick boundary wall.**
- Is the boundary wall being demolished and rebuilt? This should be clearly shown on the plans. If so, existing brickwork should be re-used.

Garden setting -

- The large lightwell in the front garden is not in keeping with the prevailing character. It will be minimally visible other than across the front garden of the host building because of the height of the boundary wall at this corner. However the loss of planting space will have a visual impact on the CA as a result of loss of existing and potential front garden soft landscaping and will erode the garden setting of the host property.
- I advise that the lightwell should be reduced to a minimum and the majority of the garden should be retained to allow planting to contribute to street scene and prevent an incongruous view across the host building's front garden or over the boundary wall
- A significantly smaller lightwell would be more responsive to the local context and the prevailing form of lower ground floor openings should be the cue for this elevation.
- Removal of the fence between the main house front garden and the extension would help to unify the garden setting and prevent the extension appearing as a separate dwelling. This will make the (lower) ground floor elevation more visible so the points above will need to be addressed.
- A large tree in the front garden was felled a few years ago and new planting has been provided. A proposal to retain/re-site the existing trees would be welcomed.

(Lower) ground floor elevations-

- Rear – no objection.
- Front – not in keeping with the character of the CA, which is of small punched openings in brick or rendered elevations, clearly subordinate to the elevations above. The dominant door opening appears too large for a secondary entrance. The wide opening doesn't respond to the scale or character of lower ground floor openings in the CA. **Rev – this has now been amended to be more in keeping with the character of the host building.**

First (upper ground) floor elevations -

- The three windows refer to the tripartite bay on the host building, but my opinion is that this might be more successful if they were grouped more closely, leaving a wider area of brickwork either side. This may also be preferable for the blind windows on the northern, (flank) elevation. **Rev – this has now been revised and is more in keeping with the host building.**
- The brick detailing is not wholly successful in responding to the CA context, nor is the asymmetrical fenestration detailing. I consider that the detailing needs more consideration to help preserve the existing character and appearance.

Roof scape –

Whilst clay tile and the pitch are a positive response to the roofscape of the CA, the lack of eaves overhang and gutters looks out of keeping. **Rev- the roof form and gutter has been revised and is now more in keeping with the host building.**

Cumulatively these points result in a proposal that would not adequately preserve the character or appearance of the CA, and would cause a degree of harm (low, less than substantial) but I consider that the proposal could be revised to address these concerns.

Relevant Policies:

Section 72 of the Act states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

NPPF 8 and 9 Public benefit - state that economic, social and environmental gains are to be sought jointly and simultaneously in order to deliver positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment.

[This may involve the examination of alternative designs or schemes that might be more sustainable because they can deliver public benefits alongside positive improvement in the local environment].

NPPF Para 134 - Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents.

NPPF Para. 199 - requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and notes that significance can be harmed or lost through unsympathetic development.

NPPF 200 – Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification.

NPPF 202 – Less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use

NPPF 203 – Effect of proposal on non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account; a balanced judgement should have regard to scale of harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

NPPF 206 - Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

London Plan Policy HC1Heritage Conservation and growth.

CS15 - Design

CS 16 – Heritage

DM30 – Urban design and local character

DM31 - Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

DM36 – CAs and LBs

DM37 – NDHAs

Recommendation:

Revise

Rev – the proposed revisions have addressed a large number of the comments I raised previously and I consider that the proposal as a whole will now relate sensitively to the host building and will read as a high quality contemporary addition to the host building, that will preserve bot the setting of the NDHA and the character and appearance of the CA.

Potential revisions/amendments/conditions (if necessary):

A sample panel of external materials should be conditioned.