

Dear Ms Peck,

I write with regard to application 2013/6674/P. As a member of the Swains Lane Steering committee, I don't wish to re iterate design points that were picked up in Rob Schoenbeck's letter save to say I agree with them.

Since the existing building on the site is a named positive contributor to the CA, any replacement needs to enhance the CA to an appreciably greater extent than the existing building, under Camden Policy DP25.

Notwithstanding Rob's comments referred to above, I have read through posted objections to the current scheme which accurately describe a widely expressed combination of frustration and sadness with regard to the scheme as submitted which suggest that those who care don't feel that this policy is being complied with. I write to urge you to use your powers to ensure that the current design is not put forward for decision by committee until the design has been sufficiently evolved to the point where the consultation yields less frustration with the design, less sad acceptance, and more direct praise. Charles Rose is up to date with our concerns, as are the developers. To date the developers have not responded.

The Steering Committee has been negotiating with the architect for nearly 2 years to get to a point where representations include comments such as:

*'This isn't a scheme anyone in our community looks at and says 'this is what I pictured for the future of Swains Lane'*

*'A bare majority consider the basic architecture is, with tweaking,... just tolerable'*

*'people are feeling frustrated'*

*'most of us want the same thing... to keep the area as rural as possible, with as much character as possible'*

*'use recycled and reclaimed bricks'*

*'many people don't like the fact that the building is boring to look at with no lasting character'*

*'totally uninspiring in it's use of materials'*

*'we're being forced and bullied into agreeing with plans we don't want for fear of losing all together'*

*'another generic and boring street'*

*'beautiful views will be blocked by bright orange bricks and metal'*

*'A desperate, diluted, hotch potch of lame 'heritage' architecture containing nothing unique, bold, or contemporary, fatally lacking in character, and neither complements nor aesthetically contradicts its surroundings of tudor design and green landscape'*

*'The roof level doesn't currently work'*

*'The trellis is insubstantial'*

*'I'm not convinced the design has progressed enough (yet) to justify replacing the existing building'*

*'Blocky, institutional, over dominant, bland'*

*'...either the existing architect needs to continue working on the design, or a new architect needs to be found'*

*'the bricks are too bright'*

*'this is an open and sensitive area, development should be well considered'*

*'Another disappointment for an important site'*

*'this site needs a proper architectural competition to come up with the best possible ideas. So far, all the proposals submitted including this one have been utterly disappointing.'*

*'All the points (of the SLDP, DPAAC etc) are well raised, show great thought and consideration. It is important that they are adopted'*

*'such an important place deserves better'*

There is 1 letter of support. This letter refers to the above commentators as 'small minded residents who are resistant to change'. This is the only letter of support.

It's incorrect to suggest that most residents are small minded or resistant to change. There is a united atmosphere of love for the place, and a desire for Swains Lane to become a better version of what it is now with a wonderful piece of architecture that people travel to visit. People travel to come to Swains Lane right now, so this should happen more.

I'm aware that this isn't a typical planning objection letter but nonetheless, it's an appeal to keep evolving the design until such time as this malaise becomes enthusiasm.

Yours sincerely,

Julian de Metz  
2 St Anne's Close  
N66AR



26 Brookfield Park, NW5 1ER

PA 2013/6674/P 1-11A Swains Lane.

I object to the current proposals because:

1. The height is excessive, damaging the amenities of those living in Church Close and St Anne's Close.

2. The Proposals for the backs of the new buildings are thoroughly unsatisfactory:

\* The arrangements for refuse are completely inadequate, for both the commercial premises & the private residences.

\* Parking arrangements &c will not do. A zebra crossing is requisite (with these plans more than ever) close to the West Hill-Swains lane roundabout, and that would rule out a proposed loading bay at the west end of Swains Lane. The shops should be largely serviced from the back.

The new residences should be classed a no car zone.

3. The proposed treatment of the gap between the two new blocks, with a fence across the gap, would introduce a harmful feature to the Conservation Area. The gap should be retained fully at ground level to secure the view up the hill. Retaining it would also facilitate traffic management.

The developers should be required to amend their designs in light of the above.

Dr M.H.Port