

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6726/P	Mr Tom Symes and Beth Noakes	79 LAWN ROAD Nw32xb Nw32xb	04/02/2018 16:54:03	OBJ	<p>We live at no 79 Lawn Road NW32XB, four houses along Lawn Road from the application for extension and other works at 75 Lawn Road (LPA ref:2107/6726/P1.</p> <p>We object to the application on a number of grounds.</p> <p>Two Storey Rear Extension is contrary to the Council's residential design and amenity policies contained within Camden's Local Plan 2017, Supplementary Planning Guidance CPG1 – Design and CPG 5 – Amenity, and the Guidance in the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>The property forms an important part of the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. The very unusual linked terrace of red brick houses dating from the 1920s has been largely unaffected by alterations over the years and it has a special character and appearance which is recognised in the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and is also recognised in a number of authoritative studies of the architectural heritage of Belsize Park including 'Streets of Belsize'. This building forms part of an important designated heritage asset. Any proposed changes to buildings that make a positive contribution to conservation areas are extremely sensitive. Policy D2 of the Camden Local Plan states that conservation areas are heritage assets and the Council will not permit the loss of or substantial harm to any designated heritage asset, including conservation areas, unless it can be demonstrated that substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve significant public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. This application has not demonstrated any public benefits at all and therefore should be refused because the changes proposed will result in substantial harm to an important part of the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned at the proposals to have a full height two storey extension at the rear which is contrary to the Council's residential design and amenity policies contained within Camden's Local Plan 2017, Supplementary Planning Guidance CPG1 – Design and CPG 5 – Amenity, and the Guidance in the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal. The proposed two-storey rear infill extension will be detrimental to the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area since it will be overbearing, out of proportion in mass and scale compared to the original house.</p> <p>The twinned houses numbers 74 and 75, and the other paired houses of similar design in Lawn Road currently have a rear symmetry, which remains largely intact at roof and first floor levels.</p> <p>The proposal for a two-storey rear extension conflicts with Camden's planning guidance and Local Plan Policy D1 and the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy since it does not consider the character, setting, form and scale of neighbouring buildings, the character and proportions of the existing building, or the impact on the "existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape". The applicants' image of the new rear of the house shows how it will completely dominate and overbear both the house and the garden and the adjoining properties. The current line of gardens at</p>

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

the rear of these houses has never been affected by an extension of this kind and will change the entire townscape of the whole row of houses, not just its immediate neighbours.

Even for one-storey rear extensions, height has been an important planning issue. For example, our own renovations at 79 Lawn Road (2016/0313/P)) included erection of single storey extension and replacement of existing infill extension to rear. The architect for our application for a single storey, ground floor, rear extension has confirmed that Camden Planning required the overall height of that extension to be lowered. The original application had an extension height of 3695mm above the patio area. The extension height was amended to 3150mm in order to satisfy Camden's concerns and to have permission granted.

The height of a one-storey infill extension is a sensitive issue in the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area and therefore it would be inconsistent to permit a two-storey infill rear extension on the same style of staggered L-shaped rear dwelling. The existing two-storey projection at the back of number 75 Lawn Road, a legacy of cheaply rebuilt bomb damage after 1945, should not be used as a reason to allow a further irreparable disruption of the style and symmetry of the historic design of this important terrace.

If the application is allowed as it stands it would create the only two-storey extension at the back of any of the twinned 1920s Arts & Crafts style houses with a width that is two-thirds of the width of the whole house. The recent permission for a two-storey rear extension at number 77 is not a precedent because it will measure only 2.8m in width compared to the 6m width proposed for number 75. The original design of Nos 77 and 78 Lawn Road is different to the 'twinned' houses at Nos 74 and 75 and Nos 79 and 80, which have a staggered rather than a flat rear design, and would be much more adversely affected by any element of two story extension beyond what exists at the moment. There have been no two storey extensions on the staggered L shaped backed twin dwellings in Lawn Road since the early 1950s, and then only following wartime bomb damage.

The application is not in accordance with Camden's design principles for rear extensions and is contrary to Local plan Policy D1.

#### Design and Materials

The planning application also proposes that the redeveloped rear of number 75 Lawn Road will be in red brick rather than the traditional white render/pebbledash that still exists for this row of 1920s Arts & Crafts style houses benefitting neighbours and the houses in Downside Crescent at the rear.

Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 Design, Extensions, alterations and conservatories. Section 4.7, Good practice principles for external alterations, Materials: states "Wherever possible you should use materials that complement the colour and texture of the materials in the existing building, see also CPG3 Sustainability (Sustainable use of materials chapter). In historic areas traditional materials such as brick, stone, timber and render will usually be the most appropriate complement to the existing historic fabric; modern materials such as steel and glass may be appropriate but should be used sensitively and not dominate the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>existing property." "Original surface finishes should be retained or replicated wherever possible, as they are usually central to the architectural design /character treatment of a building."</p> <p>CPG1 is clear that extensions must be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation. It is obvious from the images in the application that the two storey extension is not subordinate to the original building but dominates it completely. The applicants seem to have completely disregarded this Guidance. The development at number 75 Lawn Road should maintain the original and still existing design style of a white render rear façade, in keeping with the other houses in the terrace at Nos 72-82 Lawn Road (as we did with our renovations last year).</p> <p><b>Demolition</b> The Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy defines Numbers 70-75 Lawn Road as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and states: "The Council will not grant consent for the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area." This follows Policy D2 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>.</p> <p>The application seeks consent for the demolition of a very substantial part of the original 1920s building at the rear of the property (see the red marked area for demolition in the applicants' "Section B-B as existing" – from Floor Plans Sections and Elevations (existing)). As stated above it is clear that 75 Lawn Road makes a positive contribution to the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>This clearly conflicts with the Conservation Area Strategy. It is not acceptable -- and entirely unnecessary for the renovation of these houses – to demolish a large section of the original house.</p> <p>There is no precedent in Lawn Road for any such substantial demolition</p> <p>The planning application also seeks consent for the demolition of the post-World War 2 side extension, which was constructed between 1945 and 1953; this would be in line with permitted demolition at number 81 Lawn Road ((2015/4039/P and 2016/0879/P) and we would have no objection to this element of the application.</p> <p><b>Sustainability</b> The application is not in conformity with a number of sustainability and environmental policies given the extensive demolition of the existing buildings that is proposed. For example:</p> <p>GLA Sustainable Design and Construction SPG 2014 , Section 2.7.8: Design Stage,</p>

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

Managing existing resources which states “Developers should always look for options to sensitively reuse, refurbish, repair and convert buildings, rather than wholesale demolition.” Here the extent of the proposed demolition of the original 1920s building is akin to wholesale demolition. There is no element of sensitivity in the proposals.

Camden Local Plan (Adoption Version), June 2017. Policy D2 Heritage: Section 7.49: “The Council will resist the total or substantial demolition of buildings which make a positive contribution to a conservation area unless circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention. Applicants will be required to justify the demolition of a building that makes a positive contribution to a conservation area, having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, Camden’s conservation area statements, appraisals and management strategies and any other relevant supplementary guidance produced by the Council.” Here it is clear that the building does make a positive contribution to the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area and there is no such justification for the substantial demolition that is proposed in the planning application.

Alterations to the front of the house – facing onto Lawn Road

The application would introduce changes that do not exist on any of the other 1920s paired red brick houses and which would create a precedent for the appearance of these houses:

- The proposed ground floor front extension at the top of the driveway, creating around 18 square metres of additional accommodation, would create the only example on any of the twinned 1920s paired houses in Lawn Road where the ground and first floor facades at the top of the driveway do not form a single vertical plane (apart from a much smaller misalignment of about 1.4m at number 72). The applicants argue that they are matching the existing 1966 garage front extension at 76 Lawn Road (adjacent to 75 Lawn Road). However, number 75 is twinned with number 74, and this extension will break the current overall sense of design symmetry between 75 and 74.
- The proposed new front dormer window at first floor level on the garage extension would be the only front dormer window at the top of the driveway of these (originally two-storey) 1920s twinned houses (nos 72-82). We are aware of a number of applications historically for similar dormers in Lawn Road that have been refused because of the impact of the design of these historically important houses.
- The proposal bringing forward the front façade at first floor level at the top of the driveway by about 2 metres so that it is no longer flush with the 1st floor at number 76, to which it is joined should be rejected because of its impact on the overall design of this terrace of houses in Lawn Road. A smaller projection – of about one metre - exists at No 72 which looks out of keeping with the 1920’s Arts and Crafts design of the rest of the road and should not be repeated.

These proposed changes disregard the character of these historic properties as described by the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy and will alter the streetscape.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6726/P	Sanya Polescuk on behalf of Belsize a Residents Association	8a Belsize Court Garages nw35aj	04/02/2018 14:06:37	OBJ	The massing of the proposed rear extension competes with the main building, creating an appearance of two independant buildings - the 'garden house' and 'street house'. Instead, the rear extension should be sculpted in more gradual a manner.
2017/6726/P	Frederick and Patricia Jackson	80 Lawn Road London NW3 2XB	04/02/2018 10:25:07	OBJ	<p>This proposed development principally comprises a massive red brick extension at the rear. This would extend much further to the rear, wider and higher than other houses and extensions in the vicinity and, at two stories, would loom over the back of the properties on either side. The extension would reduce the sense of openness at the rear of the neighbouring houses, blocking their view across the adjacent gardens while increasing the extent to which they would be overlooked. The overall effect, particularly in the absence of the white render elsewhere on this property, would be overbearing and completely out of character with the Arts and Crafts style of the local conservation area.</p> <p>We urge the Council to refuse this application in its present form.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6726/P	Joseph Zarfaty	83 Lawn Road Belsize Park London NW3 2XB	02/02/2018 17:47:27	COMMNT	I write as the owner and occupier of 83 Lawn Road, which is in the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. I have seen the application for development at 75 Lawn Road (2017/6726/P) and I have various comments to make regarding the extremely large two storey extension and other aspects of the proposal.

Firstly, the size of the proposed rear two-storey extension is out of proportion to the original building. Its excessive mass and scale conflicts with the heritage style of these 1920s houses. The rhythm and symmetry of the backs of these twinned pairs of houses are key design features, which are fundamental to why this row of twinned houses is judged to contribute positively to the conservation area. The guidance in the Camden Local Plan calls for the Council to expect developments to consider the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed. That has clearly not been the case here as the back of 75 Lawn Road will be completely transformed by the very bulky new rear, ruining the core symmetry with its twin neighbour (number 74) and dominating both its own garden and those of its neighbours.

Secondly, the proposed implementation of the development seems extraordinarily destructive of the original building. The applicants are proposing to demolish a sizeable section of the main part of the original 1920s house, from ground to roof level, something that, to the best of my knowledge, has never happened before along this row of Arts & Crafts style properties. This contradicts the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy which states: "The Council will not grant consent for the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area." There is no explanation or justification in the application for why this demolition is thought necessary. Overall, the application is insensitive to the need to preserve heritage and to protect the integrity of a conservation area from inappropriate development. In this context the Local Plan states that the Council will not allow substantial harm to a heritage asset unless there is a significant public benefit, which there clearly is not in this case.

For these reasons the Council should reject this application in its current form.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6726/P	fiona neill	73 lawn road london NW3 2XB	05/02/2018 19:40:10	OBJ	<p>For Camden Planning Objection to Planning Application at No. 75 Lawn Road, NW3 2XB (2017/6726/P)</p> <p>We are the owners of 73 Lawn Road and are writing to object to this planning application on the following grounds.</p> <p>1. Excessive scale, mass and bulk of the proposed two-story rear extension:</p> <p>The applicants' plans and drawings show that the proposed two-storey extension would be totally out of proportion with the original 1920s house and would be detrimental to the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. This row of houses has been judged to make a "positive contribution" to the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>There is no precedent along the row of 1920s Arts &amp; Crafts style houses on Lawn Road for a rear two-storey extension of this dominant scale, which we estimate would be about 6 metres in width i.e. two-thirds of the width of the whole house.</p> <p>The scale, mass and bulk of the proposed extension at 75 Lawn Road conflicts with various planning guidelines, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1), which states that extensions should be clearly subordinate to the main property and visually subordinate to the host garden</li> <li>• Camden Local Plan Policy D1, which requires all developments, including alterations and extensions, to consider the form, scale, character and proportions of existing and neighbouring buildings.</li> </ul> <p>2. Destruction of prevailing symmetry of twinned houses at 74 and 75 Lawn Road:</p> <p>Our house (number 73) is of the same architectural style as number 75, with a staggered rear L-shaped footprint and inset lower side terrace. This is the prevailing pattern and rhythm of this style of twinned houses at the back. This pattern and rhythm will be destroyed for the pair at 74 and 75 Lawn Road if permission is granted for the proposed two-storey rear extension. A one-storey rear infill extension is the norm for this style of twinned house.</p> <p>It is understandable that the applicants wish to rebuild the post-WW2 side extension, which was set back further from the street than the original bomb-damaged extension and therefore disrupts the symmetry between 75 and its 'pair' at 74. However, replacing the post-war extension should not be used as a pretext to cause irreparable disruption to the core original style and symmetry of the historic design, which remains intact at roof and first-floor level.</p> <p>The proposed two-storey rear infill extension is contrary to Camden Local Plan Policy D1, which states that developments, including extensions, must consider the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape and the composition of elevations.</p>

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

It would be especially inconsistent for Camden Planning to allow such a huge, visually disruptive rear extension given the following precedents regarding the preservation of symmetry for this row of 1920s Arts & Crafts style houses.

- In its pre-application advice for the development at 77 Lawn Road (2016/1737/P), Camden Planning advised the applicants to change the proposed rear dormer window in order to preserve the rear symmetry with 78 Lawn Road. Camden Planning said: “The height of the proposed rear dormer would no longer match the attached neighbouring property’s dormer, which would alter the symmetry of the pair of buildings to the detriment of their character and appearance.” If the symmetry of dormer windows matters surely the symmetry of the whole back of the house should be valued.

### 3. Proposed red brick finish

The applicants at 75 Lawn Road propose to finish the whole of the rebuilt rear of the house in red brick rather than the traditional white render used on the rear of all other houses on this row (72-82, though the render at 72 Lawn Road is currently unpainted).

- Camden Planning Guidance CGP1, Design, Extensions, alterations and conservatories. Section 4.7, states that “original surface finishes should be retained or replicated wherever possible, as they are usually central to the architectural design /character treatment of a building.”

The development at 75 Lawn Road should maintain the original and still existing design style of a white render rear façade, as all other renovations of these houses have done – and as Camden has required of all previous renovations of these 1920s houses.

### 4. Demolition

The applicants propose to demolish a substantial section of the original 1920s Arts & Crafts style house (in addition to demolishing the post-1945 rebuild of the side extension). This demolition of a large part of the original house is unnecessary and without precedent for renovations of this row of heritage properties (72-82 Lawn Road) which are deemed to make a “positive contribution” to the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area.

The proposed demolition conflicts with the following planning guidance:

- The Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, which states: “The Council will not grant consent for the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area.”
- Camden Local Plan, Policy D2 Heritage, which states: “The Council will resist the total or substantial demolition of buildings which make a positive contribution to a conversation area...Applicants will be required to justify the demolition of a building that makes a positive



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

contribution to a conservation area...”

No such justification has been given by the applicants at 75 Lawn Road.

5. Changes to the front of house

The application proposes that the rebuilt side extension will be much larger than the existing side extension, changing its appearance from the street significantly. The key changes are: extending forward significantly at ground floor level; extending forward at 1st floor level by about 2m; the addition of a 1st floor dormer window.

The footprint of the new side extension will be more than double the footprint of the existing side extension.

These changes to the street appearance would be contrary to the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Management Strategy as they would not be “subordinate to the design of the main building” and would not be “clearly read as an extension”.

We would also find it extraordinary if such extensive changes to the front of the 75 Lawn Road were permitted when in 2004 we were denied permission to install a second velux window at the front of 73 Lawn Road. How would it possibly be consistent?

For all these reasons, we ask that Camden rejects this planning application.

Thank you.

Fiona Neill and Edward Simpson-Orlebar

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6726/P	Elizabeth Hoddy	Flat 2 18 Downside Crescent London NW3 2AP	02/02/2018 17:25:36	OBJ	<p>I write as the freeholder for 18 Downside Crescent, a property which looks across to the back of the proposed development site at 75 Lawn Road (planning application reference 2017/6726/P).</p> <p>Downside Crescent and Lawn Road are both in the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. Nos 2-12 and 16-26 on my side of Downside Crescent are identified by the conservation area strategy document as properties that make a positive contribution to the conservation area. While of an earlier vintage (Victorian), Downside Crescent also features pairs of twinned, symmetric houses, reflecting the prevailing historic style of development that is also a feature of the 1920s Arts &amp; Crafts style houses on the west side of Lawn Road. The preservation of these architecturally significant streets is central to the integrity of the conservation area.</p> <p>After reviewing the planning proposal for 75 Lawn Road I would like to make the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed demolition of a substantial part of the original 1920s house must surely conflict with what the conservation document says about demolition: "The Council will not grant consent for the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area".</li> <li>2. I've seen the applicants' image of how the back of the house will look after the two-storey back extension, plus much larger pitched roof, is built. I cannot see how such a departure from the original design of the 1920s house fits in with Camden's planning guidance given that the totality of the extension will be so out of scale and disproportionate to the original house. It will destroy the largely intact classic ebb and flow symmetry of this set of twinned houses (number 74 and 75). I know that the garage extension was built after the Second World War. However, given that this newer part of the building is to be demolished as part of the development, should Camden not be asking the applicants to rebuild in a way that echoes the original 1920s design, rather than allowing a development that completely departs from the historic design? A greater emphasis on restoring the original character of the house would be consistent with the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area strategy.</li> <li>3. Indeed, Local Plan Policy D1 says that the Council will also require all developments, including extensions to existing buildings, to consider the character and proportions of the existing building, the form and scale of neighbouring buildings and the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape. I cannot see that the proposed development at 75 Lawn Road meets any of these criteria.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for your attention,</p> <p>Elizabeth Hoddy</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6726/P	Ruth Tamir	82 Lawn Road London NW32XB	05/02/2018 20:34:25	OBJCOMP AP	<p>We are the owners of 82 Lawn Road and are greatly concerned by the proposed development for 75 Lawn Road (2017/6726/P).</p> <p>1. Two-storey rear infill extension:</p> <p>The visual images and plans submitted by the applicant show that they intend to build a very wide, two-storey rear extension (see 'before and after' images). This is completely unprecedented along this row of 1920s Arts &amp; Crafts style houses on the west side of Lawn Road, properties that make a "positive contribution" to the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>The planned rear extension:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Is of excessive scale, mass and bulk</li> <li>· Is not subordinate to the original building</li> <li>· Is overbearing in relation to neighbouring properties</li> <li>· Includes the unacceptable replacement of the historic white render rear façade by red brick. (When we fully renovated our house at 82 Lawn Road we preserved the historic style of white render to the rear).</li> <li>· Disrupts the historic design symmetry and rhythm of this row of 1920s Arts &amp; Crafts style houses</li> </ul> <p>All these aspects of the development conflict with guidance in Camden Local Plan (Policy D1) which states that all developments need to take into account: Character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; The character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed; The prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development; The impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape;</p> <p>2. Demolition of a substantial section of the original 1920s house</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The applicants want to demolish and rebuild not only the post-1945 side extension, but also a substantial section of the original 1920s house.</li> <li>· Demolition of such a large part of the original house is not acceptable and would be unprecedented along this row of houses.</li> <li>· The Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy states: "The Council will not grant consent for the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area."</li> <li>· It is also unacceptable environmentally and is contrary to policy on reducing construction waste e.g. Camden Planning Guidance CPG 3 – Sustainability. Section 8, Sustainable use of materials, Key Messages. "Reduce waste by firstly re-using your building ..."</li> </ul> <p>4. Front of house (top of driveway)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The changes to the front of the house, which will be very visible, will double the</li> </ul>

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

footprint of the side extension. This proposed side extension will not be “subordinate to the design of the main building” and will not be “clearly read as an extension” to the property (Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy).

A very large front ground floor extension is proposed that will greatly shorten the driveway; the proposed 1st floor front extension will bring forward that façade by about 2m, and an unprecedented 1st floor dormer window is proposed. Taken together this will amount to a significant change to the appearance of 75 Lawn Road from the street.

For all these reasons the planning application should be rejected.

Thank you for your attention,  
Ruth and Noam Tamir

---

2017/6726/P    Teresa Poole    74 Lawn Road  
London  
NW3 2XB    05/02/2018 17:37:43    OBJ

Dear Ms Chana (cc Camden Planning),

This message is just to alert you to the email sent on 5 February with 3 attachments presenting our objections to the application at 75 Lawn Road (2017/6726/P).

This is just in case those attachments resulted in the email going into a junk mail folder.

Please alert us urgently if you did not receive the email with our 3 attachments:

75 Lawn Rd\_2017\_6726\_P\_Poole\_Tomlinson Submission 1

75 Lawn Rd\_2017\_6726\_P\_Poole\_Tomlinson Submission 2

75 Lawn Rd\_2017\_6726\_P\_Poole\_Tomlinson Submission 3

Please take those three attachments into account when assessing this application.

Many thanks,  
Teresa Poole  
74 Lawn Road

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6726/P	Richard Tomlinson	74 Lawn Road London NW3 2XB	05/02/2018 17:39:34	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms Chana (cc Camden Planning),</p> <p>This message is just to alert you to the email sent on 5 February with 3 attachments presenting our objections to the application at 75 Lawn Road (2017/6726/P).</p> <p>This is just in case those attachments resulted in the email going into a junk mail folder.</p> <p>Please alert us urgently if you did not receive the email with our 3 attachments:</p> <p>75 Lawn Rd_2017_6726_P_Poole_Tomlinson Submission 1</p> <p>75 Lawn Rd_2017_6726_P_Poole_Tomlinson Submission 2</p> <p>75 Lawn Rd_2017_6726_P_Poole_Tomlinson Submission 3</p> <p>Please take those three attachments into account when assessing this application.</p> <p>Many thanks, Richard Tomlinson 74 Lawn Road</p>
2017/6726/P	Jeanne Katz	6 Lawn Road NW32XS NW32X	05/02/2018 21:50:55	COMMEM PER	<p>Walking past last week I noticed a planning application (2017/6726/P) for works at 75 Lawn Road, a building with which we were very familiar. Having lived in Lawn Road since 1984 I am concerned that the application might be at variance with the conservation area in which we live.</p> <p>Looking at the houses, it is clear that there are two pairs of twinned houses (72 and 73 and 74 and 75) which will be directly affected by these plans. Obviously as a detached house 76 has different issues. The proposed front of house plans for 75 appear to introduce quite different elements from its twin and also from the twins opposite our house (77 and 78). I wonder therefore that the extension and dormer windows actually contravene the conservation area rules in this area as well as introducing a rather ugly and inappropriate appearance.</p> <p>Although the rear plans do not necessarily impact the views of the streetscape nor the neighbours, the back extension will impact on the light and therefore the health of the gardens both at that point in Lawn Road and in Downside crescent. It also appears to be out of character with the other rear extensions that have been built along that part of Lawn Road.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6726/P	Ashley Summerfield	78 lawn rd nw3 2xb	01/02/2018 18:27:02	OBJ	<p>The attraction of the row of houses in which I live is the character and charm of these 1920s houses, built in matching pairs, very charming and because it is in a conservation area, I knew this was protected. However, these plans are taking one of the houses and substantially demolishing it, to be rebuilt so that it mismatches it's pair, and the rest of the row of houses in many ways:</p> <p>Bringing forward the front 1st floor, building a huge 2 floor rear extension, building the back of the house in red brick, introducing a front dormer window. All of this will substantially change the character of the street, and lose the 'matching pairs' effect of these semidetached pairs.</p> <p>Finally, the huge 2 floor extension will adversely affect no. 74 in terms of light - I would be furious if my next door neighbour were planning to ruin my light exposure both in my kitchen/dining and garden by building a huge extension.</p>
2017/6726/P	Prof David R Katz	6 Lawn Rd	04/02/2018 17:09:53	COMMNT	<p>Recently we have noted that there is a planning application (2017/6726/P) for development at 75 Lawn Rd. As long-standing Lawn Rd residents we have concerns that these plans are in conflict with Camden planning guidance.</p> <p>As far as we are aware there are two pairs of twinned semi-detached houses (72/73, and 74/75) on the west side of Lawn Rd directly affected by this application. 76 Lawn Rd is a detached house which is designed differently. If one looks at the proposed front of house plans for 75 there are several elements being introduced which depart significantly from the current position. For example, the ground floor extension and the first floor extension are not apparently in the same vertical plane, and the new dormer window is not in keeping with either 72/73, and 74 (there are also no dormers on 77/78 and 79/80). The feature window changes proposed could be easily achieved without the extension at either ground or first floor levels. Thus we believe that the extension and dormer window elements proposed disregard the conservation area appraisal and management strategy, and will have a very undesirable impact on the streetscape of the road.</p> <p>The rear of house plans are perhaps of lesser direct immediate impact on the external twinning symmetry of 72/73 and 74/75, and thus to those living on the east side of the road. However, there is the question that the bulk of the extension appears to be considerably greater than has been permitted to other developments, which was presumably part of the conservation area appraisal and management strategy.</p>