

11 May 2016
Our ref: 802

Kate Phillips
Planning Department
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square
c/o Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

CHRISTIAN
LEIGH

Chartered Town Planner

Leigh & Glennie Ltd
6 All Souls Road, Ascot,
Berkshire, SL5 9EA
Telephone: 01344 297094
Fax: 01344 628961
mail@christianleigh.co.uk

www.christianleigh.co.uk

Dear Ms Phillips

2016/1737/P: 77 Lawn Road London NW3 2XB

Further to my letter of 10 May, I write to provide some additional information on behalf of my client.

Front drive and access

It should be noted that the entrance to both drives of No. 77 (the application site) and No. 76 (my client's house) is not symmetrical. This means that my client is forced to swing over the drive at No 77 to get onto her drive

This is in fact reflected by the dropped kerbs and yellow line marking on the road. As can be seen on the attached photographs, the dropped kerb is more towards No. 77. Thus, with the proposed application showing a lowering of the drive to No. 77 and a change in levels between the two properties, my client would have no way to enter her drive at all.


Outlook and light at rear

Also attached are photographs at the rear of my client's house. This shows that the patio doors provide light and outlook for the main, habitable rooms at No. 76.

A photograph is included that shows the outlook towards No. 77, and the area of openness that would be reduced through the proposed two storey extension. This photograph also shows the trimmed yew tree on my client's land that is intended to be cut on the other side and, as explained, where there would be substantial incursion.

I trust this additional information is helpful.

Yours sincerely,



Christian Leigh



*Member of the Royal
Town Planning Institute*

Directors:

Christian Leigh BSc(Hons)
MPhil MRTPI
Jane Glennie BA(Hons)



Driveway to properties



Rear patio windows to No. 76



Outlook from rear of No. 76 to application site

10 May 2016
Our ref: 802

Kate Phillips
Planning Department
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square
c/o Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

CHRISTIAN
LEIGH

Chartered Town Planner

Leigh & Glennie Ltd
6 All Souls Road, Ascot,
Berkshire, SL5 9EA

Telephone: 01344 297094
Fax: 01344 628961
mail@christianleigh.co.uk

www.christianleigh.co.uk

Dear Ms Phillips

2016/1737/P: 77 Lawn Road London NW3 2XB

I act on behalf of the owner and occupier of 76 Lawn Road, adjoining the above application site. My client has concerns on a number of matters, and I write on her behalf to **object**.

Works to driveway and front of property

The proposed development would see the lowering of the existing sloped driveway to No. 77 to create access to a basement (nb it is not correct for the submitted drawings to refer to the new basement as the 'ground floor'). This would have a harmful effect on the appearance of the building when seen from the road due to the very great change in character to the front of the property and how it is seen as a pair with the neighbour. The pair of houses would then sit uncomfortably next to the other pairs of houses along the road. The scheme would see a large retaining wall in the front garden to the side of the drive. That would be a great intrusion into the street-scene and the conservation area.

The Council's Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal 2011 observes that *'The west side of Lawn Road was started by 1914 and completed in the inter-war years in the Garden Suburb style. The houses are built in a rich red stock brick, with a homely, picturesque character.'* The proposed works would damage such a homely and picturesque character: the creation of a basement whose presence is clearly visible from the street due to the lowered access drive is not consistent with such a description.

The application property, and its neighbours, are identified in the Appraisal as being 'Buildings that make a positive contribution' to the Conservation Area. The works would conflict with the guidance in the Appraisal, which specifically identifies harm arising due to *'The area's homogeneous character is being eroded where hedges are removed, mullioned windows are replaced with plate glass, side windows are replaced with large windows breaking eaves lines, inappropriate dormers, and ramped drives that damage gardens'* (emphasis added)

It should also be noted that the proposed works in reducing the access drive would also cause difficulties for my client in accessing their property. At present, the pairs of houses along Lawn Road utilise the adjoining open driveways to some degree to enable opening of car doors and convenient access. That would not be possible in the proposed scheme.



Member of the Royal
Town Planning Institute

Directors:
Christian Leigh BSc(Hons)
MPHil MRTPI
Jane Glennie BA(Hons)

Effect on trees

The proposals show work in the RPA to tree T10 in the front garden of the application property. The supporting information suggests this work would be by hand tools methodology, to minimise root damage. But the work in that area is to physically lower the ground level for the new ramped drive, so there is nothing that can be done to preserve roots, ie it is an area of removed ground. As the RPA for T10 is so constrained by existing landform, footways, etc, there is concern as to the long-term effect on this tree due to the degree of permanent incursion into the RPA. The loss or damage to that tree would be harmful to the character of the conservation area.

Tree T8 is a yew tree on my client's property. This is indicated as having work undertaken to reduce the crown spread (table 6.2 of the tree report) but the tree protection plan shows extensive building work within the RPA: around half the RPA area. Paragraph 5.3.2 of the report makes a presumption about the root spread of T8, but is not based on any evidence, eg a trial pit. My client is clearly very concerned regarding the effect upon the health of her tree.

Effect on light and outlook

The proposed works show a large extension to the property at the rear and side, rising to two storeys in height, and this would be to the south of my client's house.

This extension would come closer to my client's house than the existing building and would have a harmful effect on the outlook and levels of light to the house and the garden: as can be seen in the submitted drawing, No. 76 is orientated towards No. 77. There is an existing private patio area at the rear of No. 76 which has folding sliding doors providing light and outlook for the rooms in the house.

The proposed works would therefore be very intrusive to the living conditions of my client due to the height and position of the proposed extensions, to the south of her house.

Conclusions

The proposed extensions and work to the property would be harmful to the appearance of the property and so to the character of the conservation area, as specifically identified in the Conservation Area appraisal. There would be harm to trees, and also to my client's amenity. The application should therefore be refused.

Yours sincerely,



Christian Leigh