

**Judith Serota OBE 112 Gilbert House Barbican EC2Y 8BD**



London Borough of Camden Planning Department  
14 June 2017

Dear Kate Henry,

**Ref 2017/2471/P**

**Ref 2015/6278/P (refused)**

**Proposal to demolish**

**The Coach House, 15 Lyndhurst Terrace, NW3 5QA**

I am writing to object to the latest proposal to replace the existing Coach House. Given the sensitive nature of this Conservation Area, I am concerned it will still result in significant overdevelopment of the site. While it is evident that the clients have commissioned plans from far more experienced architects, nevertheless the clear intention is still to cram a large building onto an unsuitably small site.

In their submission AZ Urban Studio Limited states,

“4.1 The client brief for the project is to replace a house of low architectural merit, poor layout, and poor energy efficiency, **that fails to make efficient use of the site**, with one of high architectural merit, providing outstanding internal spatial qualities, high levels of energy efficiency, **that maximises efficient use of land** whilst also delivering an enhanced contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.”

I would suggest that this final assertion is in fact entirely undermined by the determination to 'maximise efficient use of land'.

The previous application clearly showed the floor areas. These are not easy to find on the new plans for the current application, though it is very clear that the current proposal occupies the majority of the site, stretching from the North to the South boundary of the plot and taking over much of the former front and back gardens. The height of the front elevation of the existing building is also extended right across the entire footprint of the proposed building, adding substantially to its bulk.

#### **Existing building**

Gross internal area     94.48 square metres

3 bedrooms

2 bathrooms

parking space for more than 2 cars since the garden was removed, 2 cars prior to the removal of the garden after 2004

#### **2017 Proposed building**

3 bedrooms

3 bathrooms

parking space – one car shown in plans

new basement development with a footprint extending beyond that of the existing building, potentially impacting on significant neighbouring trees.

My family lived nearby from 1950 to the mid 1970s when my parents moved to the Coach House. They lived there for nearly 30 years, almost until my father's death in 2004. They told me that this modest, discrete house, with beautiful gardens, front and back, was built on the footprint of the coach house for Elm Bank, no 17 Lyndhurst Terrace. The trees in Elm Bank were always a feature in the neighbourhood, not least for the fine crop

of conkers from the horse chestnut tree, which I believe to be under threat if this proposal, which includes a very large basement, occupying some 80% of the site, goes ahead.

The front garden, which won prizes in local competitions for its distinctive planting, was carefully designed to provide off street parking for 2 cars, retaining the original coach house pavements. The mature birch tree beside Lyndhurst Terrace was felled by the previous owner, I believe, without permission. It is clearly shown in the photograph (C) already sent, taken in 2011.

The back garden planting also included mature trees, all of which have now gone. It screened the boundary with Elm Bank to the north and the garden of the Language School to the west. It is shown in photograph ( ) illustrated in the sales particulars for the property from 2003.

A view of the garden also appears in photograph (B), through the windows at the end of the 4.88mx3.89m reception room.

The current plans talk about lack of privacy – the existing house is set so far back from the road that privacy need never be an issue. The upstairs room was partially screened by the mature birch tree and others that have now been felled.

Though there are plans to plant a garden, the area left for planting is tiny compared to the gardens carefully tended for a great many years. While the 'green' roofs are to be welcomed, they cannot provide a proper substitute for the gardens that have been removed.

I believe the proposed plans are intrusive to neighbours and, given the huge increase in floor area, amount to substantial over-development of the site. If permission is granted I have no

doubt it would encourage further detrimental developments in other Camden conservation areas.

Given the high quality of the architect's work, had they foregone the oversized basement, while retaining the original footprint and varying heights of the current building, I am sure I would not be writing this objection.

Yours,

Judith Serota

Notes:?????

Emails sent with photos 19 Jan 2016 8.23am

1.Brochure for sale of property in 2004 by fpdsavills.co.uk – 2 sides, A4, colour

2.Photo of front of house showing mature birch tree taken June 13 2011