

Printed on: 19/05/2017 09:10:02

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1841/P	Nigel Fulton	20 Platts Lane London NW3 7NS	16/05/2017 11:51:15	OBJ	<p>The proposed changes to the windows on 1 Briardale Gardens clearly go ahead the conservation area guidelines. Any window replacements should be wooden, original style and in keeping with the period of the house. Powder coated aluminium that are not of the original style of the period should not be allowed. In addition, removal of casement windows at the back of the house and replacement with fixed pane larger windows will destroy the intact uniformity of the houses from the rear. Ripping out the feature bay window will also take away from the house and it seems like it will also block light from the neighbour at no3. This house needs to be respected, not ripped apart with no consideration for it's period status.</p>
2017/1841/P	Pamela Wood	2 Briardale Gardens London NW3 7PN	17/05/2017 23:00:20	OBJ	<p>I object to this application.</p> <p>Number 1 Briardale is in a conservation area and is a excellent example of Arts and Crafts architecture. The proposed changes to the windows will have both a negative impact on the house itself and to the overall look of the street. The original window sizes and positions should be retained at both the front and rear of the property.</p> <p>In accordance with the Redington and Froggnal Conservation area statement the windows should be restored in original materials (e.g. wood) not aluminium with a powder coated finish.</p> <p>Please refuse this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1841/P	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	16/05/2017 14:48:27	OBJ	<p>I object strongly to this application for a number of reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Briardale Gardens is in a conservation area and no 1 is one of the finer examples of Quennell and Hart architecture on the street. It deserves special protection. The proposed changes take no consideration of the conservation status nor of the period of the house. The house should be respected, not ripped apart.</li><li>2. The proposed replacement of the windows to the front and back with powder coated aluminium is completely at odds with Camden conservation guidelines. Any replacement of the windows must be original style and wooden. Modern aluminium windows would look terrible on this house.</li><li>3. The existing rear extensions on Briardale Gardens for the most part fall into a regular and consistent pattern. This creates a uniformity that is pleasing to the eye. In nearly every case, the Quennell and Hart feature Bay Window at the rear is maintained as this is the most defining feature of the character of the house from the back. Most owners respect this and have built their rear extension on the other side. This serves dual purposes - it maintains the character of the house by retaining the feature bay but it also means that the extensions are 'back to back' and don't take away any light from the neighbors house. Effectively, there is extension, extension, space, space, extension, etc. Looking at the back of the houses from no 1 down to no 7 this is entirely consistent. Each house has maintained the feature bay window intact and each has an extension that does not take away any light from the neighbour. The proposed plans for No 1 take no regard for this. They plan to rip out the Quennell and Hart feature bay window and replace it with an extension right beside No 3's bay window. Not only will this destroy the character of No1 but it will 'block in' the bay window at No3 and make their dining room darker. This should not be allowed to happen. It would be far more appropriate for their extension to be on the other side of the house, for them to maintain the Quennell and Hart bay and not block any light from No 3.</li><li>4. There is a significant error in the design and access statement. In section 6, it states that the existing bay window protrudes 3 meters from the back of the house. This is incorrect and misleading.</li></ol> <p>Please reject this proposal.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>