

Penny Davis
29 Briardale Gardens
London NW3 7PN

4th January 2017

Ms C Meynell
Junior Planning Officer
Regeneration and Planning
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor
5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG

Dear Ms Meynell

APPLICATION 2016/6483/P 31 BRIARDALE GARDENS

Thank you for your recent help with the planning application for 31 Briardale Gardens. Thank you also for explaining that this is a new application and previous documentation (including objections) do not apply. I therefore wish to object as follows:

Incomplete Planning Documentation
Negative impact on a Conservation Area of changes to the facade
Design and Environmental Damage
Inappropriate Arboricultural Assessment

Planning Documents

The documents included with this application are confusing and incomplete. Examples are given below:

- Plans are headed **"Proposed Basement, Ground Floor etc"** however the detail of the plans do not show a basement – is this an error, would be implication agreement to these plans constitute agreement to a basement (without proper consultation or BIA)
- The assumptions about the Party Wall boundaries are incorrect
- The exterior side elevation on the side of 33 is not shown, or if they are shown then it would appear that a window is being proposed.
- The Design and Access statement, does not take into account the Conservation Area, local context or the style of neighbouring extensions. There is no explanation as to how the design style works with the host building
- The Design and Access statement does not describe the type of materials that will be used, these should be **"like for like"** on the front of the house (contravenes CPG 1 2.12)
- The plans should clearly show what is changing and what is not, however they do not for example an external staircase at the rear of the property is shown on the existing and an unmarked box on the proposed. All changes should be clearly marked
- Final plans have still not been posted this cannot be consistent with a proper consultation process. We are being asked to consult on proposals we have not yet seen.

Negative Impact on a Conservation Area

The Quennell designed houses in Briardale all feature attractive multi paned windows and the proposal to replace these with plain glass should be refused.

The original design and a major feature of the street is the consistency of the houses – agreeing to these changes would have a lasting negative impact on the neighbourhood and the sense of place. It is small changes that erode the special nature of the Conservation Area. No justification for making this change has been provided. Camden Guidance and the Redington Froggnal Conservation Area management statement specify **like for like** replacements and the developers should be required to respect and comply with these.

It is unclear from the plans if the developers are proposing to use a different materials to cover the facade of their property (e.g. these are shown differently in the existing and the proposed plans)

Design and Environmental Damage

The modern architectural style of the extension, seems to take its inspiration from the Barratt new build properties on the Finchley Road rather than the Arts and Crafts style of a Quennnell House. The design does not promote the distinctiveness of the local area. The previous proposals (2014/3668/P) for an extension agreed by Camden were more respectful to the style of the host building and more consistent with the extensions of neighbouring properties. Indeed the Planning Officer's response to Councillors concluded

The design of the extension has been assessed on its own merits both in the context of the preservation of the Conservation Area and Camden's design standards, and the design is not considered to be harmful to either the conservation area or the house itself. The extension bears resemblance to aspects of both adjoining extensions, including the flat roofed form constructed in brick (Nos. 29 and 33), the parapet (No.33), the bay window (No. 33), and the replication of original window style (No. 29). The extension would be proportionate to the dwelling, would be built of matching materials and incorporates architectural details of the original dwelling. Like the extensions at both adjoining properties, the extension is flat-roofed and its style does not represent a design incongruous with the character of the Conservation Area. (Formal Response to Councillors - Emily Whitteridge February 2016)

If the previous more traditional design was consistent with the Conservation Area, the host building and neighbouring properties, how can the current modern architectural proposals which has none of the features endorsed by the Planning Officer also be consistent?

The Design which includes a large amount of glass is environmentally damaging . NPPF Guidelines attach equal importance to design and sustainable development – these proposals do not. The applicants have not described in detail how they will improve energy efficiency of their property or reduce the heat loss through the extensive glass roof, panels and windows.

Since the last proposals we have documented evidence of bats using Briardale Gardens as commuter routes and foraging areas. The additional light pollution which will result from the proposed extension will be damaging to their habitat .

The light pollution from the glass roof panels will also effect the use of my balcony and bedroom. I **request that the glass panels are etched to avoid light trespass.** This was part of the previous proposals. I will also be able to see directly into the developers living space.

Inadequate Arboricultural Assessment

The assumption made in the application that the same arboriculture assessment will apply to this proposal as with the previous extension proposal is flawed. This proposal includes excavating the level of the garden by .6 m and will therefore have a more extensive impact of the Magnolia Tree.

The tree survey was done in May 2014, if the project is approved it will be out of date when the work is done. The implications for this will be that the trunk diameter of the tree is larger due to annual ring growth and extends the tree root protection zone more. We have had three summers' growth since the survey was done and research indicates younger Magnolias put on about 0.2 inches of diameter growth per year. Assuming this is the case then the RPZ radius increases by about 7 inches.

The assessment does not cover protection for trees in neighbouring gardens.

The application should be referred to the Tree Officers to ensure that the Magnolia is protected.

The lasting legacy of these proposals is environmental and architectural damage. I request that the complete and proper documentation is submitted and the proposals are modified as specified.

Yours sincerely

Penny Davis