

Dear Charlotte,

With reference to the comments made by the Highgate Society and by the CAAC, I would like to reinforce the client's comments in response to these, and also point out some contradictions in their statements.

1. Regarding the front elevation and the new garage door:

The CAAC gives an interesting introduction in their policy document "Character Assessment for the part of the Highgate Conservation Area situated in LB Camden. The relevant part of the CA is included below: "...Sunbury is a particularly well kept-example of 1930s Modern or Art Deco architecture, with **horizontal bands of glazing** wrapping around the sides of the house."

The horizontality is clearly seen as an important feature defining the Art Deco Style of the house. Our design proposal takes this on as a key architectural concept for the garage door.

However this is seen differently by the CAAC and Highgate Society in their recent objections.

CAAC: "The new door to the garage is out of character with its **new fashionable horizontal boarding** and unbalances the facade of the home."

Highgate Society: "We agree with the comments by the CAAC that the new door to the garage with the **proposed horizontal boarding is out of character** and unbalances the facade of the house."

We object to these comments, which in our opinion only represent the taste of the writers, and even contradict their own above policy ('Character Assessment').

2. Regarding the side extension:

The client, Mr Barber, mentioned in his comments that the existing extensions were added in 1995. We are rebuilding the wall to the garage in the same position and moving the single door adjacent to the garage door, both with horizontal boarding. This clarifies and simplifies optically the appearance of the adjacent structure to the main façade, and therefore improves it.

3. Regarding the rear extension:

The CAAC summarises the design of the proposed rear extension positively: "**We feel that the extension to the rear respects the house and its architecture**". A different viewpoint is taken regarding the dimensions of the supporting structure which I will respond to below.

However, the Highgate Society contradicts the above generally positive view of the CAAC.

Referring to the architect's Additional Design and Access Statement which states: "*The architectural elements of the new extension are based on the simplicity and clarity of the principles of Modernism of the early 20th Century. The Art Deco style of the original building is a "sophisticated" version of the original Modernist style*". The Highgate Society writes: "Yet looking at the existing rear elevation and the proposed elevation it is immediately clear that this proposal has stripped this building of its original refined design integrity. **The proposal is unacceptable to Highgate Society as it does not complement the architectural style of the host building**".

I also reiterate what the client, Mr Barber, mentioned in his response to the Highgate Society's comments, that the rear elevations referred to, show the existing building with the 1995 extensions. It is therefore difficult to follow the Highgate Society's comments that the existing rear elevations have a "refined design integrity".

Regarding the dimensions of the pillars and the beams I am attaching two sketches Drwg.no 31.24.1 (Horizontal section of pillar) and Drwg.no 31.24 (Vertical section of front facade).

The pillars are 200x320mm and 2800mm high, free standing on the natural stone of the terrace. The elevation of the attica is 530mm. All elements are clad in zinc.

I hope this information clarifies the design concept.

Kind regards  
Claudio Novello