

Matthias Gentet
Planning Services, London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square
c/o Town Hall,
Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE

Our Ref: 16109_D01_005_AN

Edward Nash LLP

Registered Office: Bath
23a Sydney Buildings, Bath BA2 6BZ
01225 442424

Bristol Office
25 King Street, Bristol BS1 4PB
0117 332 7560

mail@nashpartnership.com
www.nashpartnership.com

Registered in England and Wales
Company Number OC 301 974

03 February 2017

Dear Matthias,

STUDIO DEVELOPMENT AT 53 GONDAR GARDENS – GREEN ROOF

We understand that it is your tree officer's aspiration that a green roof is installed on the proposed studio building at 53 Gondar Gardens. Policy DP22 provides that development should incorporate green or brown roofs and green walls wherever suitable, and advice in CPG3 provides that the Council expects development to incorporate these unless it is demonstrated this is not possible or appropriate.

The building has been designed as a light-weight structure, so that the depth of the foundations can be kept to a minimum in order to avoid any impact on future roots from the trees adjacent to the site, and the height of the building has been kept to a minimum in order to limit the visual impact on neighbouring properties. The depth of the foundations and the height of the building would both need to be increased in order to accommodate a green roof.

Installation and upkeep of a green roof would be very expensive for our client, taking into account the cost of the roof itself, advice from a structural engineer, and ongoing drainage and maintenance costs. As you are aware, our client is a householder, whose proposal is small scale. She is a designer, and the studio will allow her to carry out special projects, and her own personal work, from home.

The additional and ongoing expense of the installation and maintenance of a green roof is considered to be an unreasonable and inappropriate expense for such a small scale, household development.

The labour and time associated with the maintenance and upkeep of a green roof will also cause our client issues. Green roofs require ongoing maintenance, irrigation and waterproofing, and access to the roof is required for carrying these tasks out. Our client would be unable to maintain the roof herself, therefore would require assistance from a gardener. This would incur a further additional expense, which is also considered to be inappropriate for the scale of development.

Weighing up all of the issues, it is considered that the installation of a green roof on the proposal is inappropriate, and on balance it is considered that a green roof is not necessary in order to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms.

Please feel free to give me a ring if you have any queries regarding the above.

Yours Sincerely,



Alice Nunn

Planner

anunn@nashpartnership.com

cc. Client

Members Edward Nash BA DipArch RIBA (SCA) AABC • Robert Locke BSc (Hons) BArch (Hons) RIBA RMApS • Daniel Lugscen BA (Hons) DipArch RIBA
Associates Kevin Balch BA (Hons) DipArch RIBA • Jon Cheek BA (Hons) DipArch ARB • Bruce Clark BSc BArch RIBA (SCA) ARB AABC EASA
Mel Clinton BA (Hons) MRTPI • John Everett BA (Hons) DipArch ARB RIBA • Mike Fox BA (Hons) MTP DipUD PG Cert MRTPI • Amanda Taylor BA (Hons) DipArch ARB

■ ARCHITECTURE ■ PLANNING ■ URBAN DESIGN ■ CONSERVATION ■ ECONOMIC REGENERATION ■