[redacted]

From: williamsilver [redacted]
Sent: 09 July 2017 14:31
To: Marfleet, Patrick [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] Sophie.Watson [redacted] Ben Ingham [redacted] Jeremy McDonald [redacted] Lewis, Oliver (Councillor) [redacted] Rae Fether [redacted] Gimson, Sally (Councillor) [redacted]
Subject: Grove End House 150 Highgate Road NW5 - 2017/2381/L and 2017/2383/P

Dear Mr Marfleet,

Summarising the comments received on the Camden website in respect of these two applications - one for listed building consent for demolition and one for complete redevelopment of this significant building in the Conservation Area - there are 29 in support and 28 against, with a half-hearted response from Historic England and several non-committed responses.

You and your colleagues will note that:

1. many of those in support do not live in close proximity to the proposed development site;

2. some of them are so keen that they have written in twice;

3. that many in support praise the apparent generosity of the applicants in restoring the existing Georgian building by adding a contemporary additional storey;

4. that for some reason the proposal is viewed as an act of altruism while the applicants are actually seeking to
double the size of their flat;

5. that support from fellow residents of Grove End House has been garnered by the financial contribution the
applicants are making to improving the common parts on the front elevation;

6. that the drawings as presented are misleading entirely as to the visual impact on the neighbourhood;

7. that the important principle of maintaing the Conservation Area is absolutely neglected in all of the supporting
responses, including that from the past RIBA president (seemingly because his daughter attends Parliament Hill
school);

8. an expert on John Soane ridicules the pretentious comparison and aspiration the applicant claims for his scheme;

9. the Green Party councillor supports the energy efficiency of the proposal - even though any modern structure
HAS to achieve a range of energy efficient parameters - without any thought of the visual appearance this proposal
will make and seems not to have considered that ANY structural changes to Grove End House, no matter how modest,
will be an improvement to the existing structure. There is absolutely no need to double the size of the flat to achieve any
energy efficient gains;

10. all the neighbours who can actually see the building in its current form are unanimously against the proposal, that
the CAAC and local residents association oppose it too, as does our local councillor;

May I suggest to you that while we all acknowledge the absolute priority to provide more housing in our very densely
populated part of London, it is the job of you and your colleagues to protect this and all other conservation areas in
the borough from inappropriate and intrusive interventions such as the proposal submitted to the Council.

If you and others let this application slip through I must tell you that I have the gravest doubts as the the continued
protection of this and other conservation areas and I fear that the floodgates will be open to any future assault from
those who would fling the word 'precedent' in your face as any future second-rate proposals are submitted.

I hope you will consider these points as you and your colleagues clarify the position to the planning committee.

Yours sincerely,

William Silver
Katrina Silver

3 Chetwynd Villas
Chetwynd Road
London NW5 1BT