

Kate Henry
Senior Planning Officer
London Borough of Camden
Planning - Development Management
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND

20th July 2017

Dear Kate,

Re: 2017/2471/P - 15 Lyndhurst Terrace, London NW3 5QA

On behalf of the applicants I can provide the following in response to matters raised during public consultation upon this application.

1. The applicants and their intentions

The applicants, Mr and Mrs Mond, wish to re-iterate that the proposed development is a dwelling for them to build, inhabit and enjoy, and that they are not commercial developers. A self-build CIL exemption form was submitted with the application, confirming that this is a self-build proposal by and for the applicants.

2. The existing building

A number of assertions have been made in relation to the age, architect, quality, and current state of the existing dwelling, in particular:

- That the house was completed on the 2nd August 1968
- That the house was definitely designed by Ted Levy
- That the current owners have allowed the building to fall into disrepair
- That the building contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area

Evidence from published Ordnance Survey plans for the area show the site being occupied by a previous historic structure in the 1970 edition plan, and then the current house appearing on the 1971-1979 edition plan. In the absence of any documentary evidence to the contrary it has therefore been taken that the house did not exist in 1970. In Sir Nicholas Serota's comment (13th June 2017) it is noted that

his parents lived in the house from 1976-2004, yet others have claimed Baroness Serota lived there in the late 1960s during her 'career glory'.

Following the previous planning application, the applicant has made a series of attempts to contact Sir Nicholas Serota and Mrs Judith Serota to find out more about the existing dwelling and to share emerging proposals for that proposed. No information was provided to the applicant and unfortunately the Serotas did not have the time available to engage with the applicant. The applicant's consultant team have researched all available sources and have not found any documentary evidence that identifies Ted Levy as architect of the dwelling (see Heritage Assessment section 4.17).

The applicants purchased the building in 2015 and have maintained the building in the condition that it was in at the time of purchase. It is strongly denied that there has been any neglect of the building by the present owners. Indeed, the owners have invested in a number of improvements to the condition of the building, including re-wiring of the internal electrics.

As set out in detail in the Heritage Assessment submitted as part of the application it is considered that the existing building at the site does not contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

3. The design and scale of the proposed building

A number of comments focus upon the scale and appearance of the proposed dwelling, including:

- The full width of the plot is occupied by the proposal and it is excessively bulky
- The proposal breaches Camden's new 'only 50% of the site can be developed' policy
- The proposal results in the loss of an important gap and loss of views to trees beyond
- The proposed development will not enhance biodiversity

The design of the proposed dwelling (including scale and massing) and its relationship with the receiving townscape is fully explored and assessed within the Design and Access Statement and Heritage Assessment documents submitted, and found to be appropriate and beneficial to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The applicants find the suggestion by some commentators that they effectively forced Sergison Bates architects to design a building that they would never ordinarily design outrageous. The design has arisen from a process of engagement and dialogue between the owners, the architects, and the wider professional team, and has also been the subject of extensive peer review by recognised experts as reported in the Appendix to the Design and Access Statement. It is also important to note that the proposed house is 22% smaller in floor area than the previous application.

There is no 'only 50% of the site can be developed' policy in Camden's Local Plan.

It is disappointing that many have suggested that the proposed development will not enhance biodiversity. On the contrary, where there are current largely barren and hard surfaced front and rear gardens there is proposed rich and diverse planted landscape, and a significant green roof area that will provide habitat for a range of species.

4. Parking

It has been claimed that provision of off-street parking is contrary to Camden's planning policies.

There are three existing off-street parking spaces at the site. The proposed development seeks to reduce this to one off-street space, enabling significant enhancements to the landscape area within the front garden of the site. The reduction in off-street parking is a positive attribute of the proposed development and the development accords with the relevant parking policies of the adopted Camden Local Plan. The applicant has agreed with Camden to enter into a legal agreement to remove access for the occupants to on-street parking permits.

5. Arboricultural / landscape

A number of responses claim that the proposed development will have an unacceptable adverse impact upon the horse chestnut tree in the front garden of the adjacent property, and will lead to a loss of landscaped garden area at the front of the application site. Further it is claimed that the owner has 'repeatedly ignored' the Council's requirements to replant trees felled by a previous owner.

The horse chestnut tree in the adjacent property has been carefully considered throughout the design process. Site investigations (air spade dig) to establish the presence of roots within the application site were undertaken by professional arboricultural advisors and observed by the Council's Tree Officer. The Arboricultural Report submitted with the application reports the findings of those investigations and confirms that the horse chestnut is in decline and the proposed development will have no adverse impact upon it. The Council's Tree Officer agreed with the findings of that report at the pre-application stage.

The applicants / owners would like to stress that they have not removed any trees or plants from the front or rear gardens.

The applicants / owners have had no correspondence from the Council during their ownership of the property regarding any requirement to re-plant trees which were allegedly removed by a previous owner.

The proposals seek to transform what is an existing barren and largely hard-surfaced and gravel covered front garden area into a rich and well-stocked planted garden (including trees) with one parking space sensitively located within the landscape design.

6. Structural / drainage impacts of proposed basement

Many responses claim that the proposed basement will have adverse structural impacts upon neighbouring properties and / or the drainage regime in the area.

Matters of structural stability of neighbouring property and drainage in the area have been fully considered within the design development of the proposals, and the relevant submission documents (Structural Engineers Report / Basement Impact Assessment) demonstrate how those matters are dealt with to ensure no unacceptable impact. Camden Council has instructed an independent specialist audit of the Basement Impact Assessment, and it has been found to be acceptable.

7. Boundary with 17/19 Lyndhurst Terrace

The Hampstead CAAC make comments suggesting ‘terminal damage to the Victorian wall of no.17’, and the Reddington Froggnal Association state ‘it is likely to necessitate the wall’s demolition’

The proposed basement and associated underpinning of the wall forming the boundary between the application site and 17-19 Lyndhurst Terrace has been designed to established normal parameters for edge of site conditions and will secure the stability of the retained wall, as detailed in the Structural Report and Basement Impact Assessment submitted, which has been independently audited for the LB Camden and found to be acceptable.

8. Construction Management

Various comments have been raised regarding the potential for disturbance to the neighbourhood during the construction process.

A Draft Construction Management Plan has been submitted with the application and sets out how the process of construction will be managed to minimise any disturbance to neighbouring occupiers. Preparation of and adherence to a final version of the Construction Management Plan will be required pursuant to a specific obligation within the proposed S106 agreement.

9. Letters of support

A number of consultation responses from residents in the local area have offered support for the proposals (10 at the time of writing), with the following themes consistent across responses

- The existing house is of low architectural merit
- The existing house detracts from the local townscape and the character of the conservation area
- The proposed dwelling is of high quality design and will contribute positively to the character of the area
- The scale and form of the proposed dwelling respects the surrounding context

We would be grateful if you would please publish this letter on the online planning register to ensure that the above responses can be reviewed by those who have commented upon the application.

Yours sincerely



Martin Harradine MRTPI
Director