



17 Bowling Green Lane
London
EC1R 0BQ

29 May 2015

Ian Gracie
Camden Planning

by email

Dear Mr Gracie

2015/2039/P

With regards to the concerns raised by the Conservation group about the loss of asymmetry, the proposals have been developed to enhance the principal façade, whilst incorporating improved internal access to the apartments.

The current building was modified in the past and the principal facade is now asymmetric due to the off-centre positioning of the front entrance, the introduction of the garage and the irregular fenestration. None of this will change and so retaining the sense of asymmetry. The proposals do indeed remove an *element* of asymmetry to the front of No. 55, but also introduce a restored facade. The proposal does not introduce a true mirrored symmetrical elevation thus retaining an element of asymmetry to the principal façade. The rear elevation with its bay also remains asymmetric. Figures 3 and 4 of the Design and Access Statement submitted with the application clearly show this.

As noted in the Design and Access Statement (see 7.7) the proposals have been designed to restore lost elements of the front elevation (i.e. the Dutch gables) and front boundary treatment, whilst extending and providing a more balanced façade. Currently, this non listed building can be described as having an aesthetic awkwardness in scale and form relating to the eastern gable wall and the chimney with its relationship to the single storey element of the building. The asymmetry would not be lost by the proposal, with the asymmetrical design of the east elevation and the retention of the entrance porch, when viewed from the east and north and particularly when approaching via Wadham Gardens to the north, which is the most significant view point for No. 55.

We also reiterate as noted in the Design and Access Statement (see 7.11-12) that a side extension at No. 64 was granted permission and is built. This property is on a corner site and similarly positioned to its neighbours as the proposals for No. 55. However, it is considered that our proposal is of a more appropriate and well considered design in terms of attention to detail and addressing the skylines and articulation of the footprint, resulting in a less monolithic structure than the resultant extension at No. 64.

The articulated elevations and receding footprint of the proposal will result in the lift element being largely concealed behind the stairwell extension and No. 53 Elsworthy Road, with only oblique views and small glimpses being obtained, i.e. with no full clear face on elevation be viewable as seen in the proposal drawing. The proposed roof to the lift and the stairwell has been designed to maintain a lower eaves line, whilst providing appropriate height standards at the landing and lift access point at second floor level and to avoid any oblique views to an alternative and unsightly flat roof or parapet treatment to the lift weathering enclosure.

I hope that this gives you the necessary assurance that the proposals will preserve and enhance the character of the conservation area.

Yours sincerely

B van Bruggen
Director,
van Bruggen Ltd.

cc. Zoran Obradovic
Wayne Derrick, ADAM Architecture