Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2846/L		33 Arlington Road	27/05/2017 23:12:01	OBJ	The applicant has paid an experienced heritage consultant to advocate for the alterations, however experience should not override the need to advocate for the listed building.

The early plans shown make clear that the side extension is original, end of terrace usually providing side entry to optimise the ground floor plan. Existing rustication and arched sash windows are not photographed in the heritage report to avoid showing how they would be utterly compromised by the proposal. This is a deceit - a proper balanced report should face up to the reality of the alteration proposed rather than avoid clarity.

The presumption should be to maintain and repair a listed building rather than alter - alteration is a result of overriding need such as safety or universal access - not the optimisation of resale value by adding a bedroom. Section 2.14 states that as alterations have been made, that further alteration is acceptable. Not so, the rear alterations are unseen from the street/conservation area, the proposal is large, has bulk and is at first floor. As noted on the historic lans, the existing side extension is not one of the 20th Century alterations section 2.16 refers to, so the ability to simply add is not proven to be desirable or acceptable.

Policy documents such as NPPF and the London plan clearly refer to a neighbourhood scale and usually relate to new buildings in historic contexts. 3.12 is particularly mis using Policy intention - point 1 quoting NPPF para 131 talks about putting Lsted buildings to viable/sustainable use - this is nonsense as the property is a viable dwelling already and will remain so. Point 2 discusses sustainable communities - is this a reference to adding value by giving a second bedroom? Point 3 mentions a new development making a positive contribution to local character - again referring to a new building in a streetscape and not adding an extension to an already characterful and historic building. This is objectionable rhetoric that does not justify significant external alteration of a listed building.

The only really relevant policy that relates to the scale of a side extension is Camden''s own - particularly DP25 point f) quoted on page 24 of the heritage statement. In this regard the proposal obliterates the first floor with well proportioned blind windows that enliven the end of terrace and ad considerably to the quality of the terrace.

Retaining the detail behind a conservatory is simply not an adequate strategy, along with the associated cutting in of waterproofing and fixings into the brickwork is a significant visual degradation of the quality of this terrace. The proposal neither "preserves" nor "enhances" (obliterating fine detail on the first floor) and building out beyond the original finely detailed porch), as such the justification for alteration is not proven.

Regarding the examples of such extensions, there are no such extensions in Camden Town, and that is the area of character we need to be discussing. the examples are from Belgravia and Maida Vale - simply not relevant.

Lastly the "balance of "harm" versus benefit" page 29 claims the proposal will sustain the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

optimum viable use as a residential property. this is an astonishing statement by a heritage consultant desperate to justify the indefensible. The property os a perfectly viavble dwelling, it would simply make someone more money with a massive conservatory at first floor. Is that the justification for altering a listed building? For Camden to decide.

Heritage value should be determined both objectively and with judgement, however the process of developers paying for heritage statements to support the scheme regardless of the real value of the listed building is commonplace and unfortunate.