

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 & 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"> Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1), which states that extensions should be clearly subordinate to the main property and visually subordinate to the host garden 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. <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 conservation 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	Tom Symes and Beth Noakes	79 LAWN ROAD london NW32XB	07/02/2018 09:52:46	OBJNOT	<p>In addition to the comments we made on 4th February in objecting to this application we have noted that none of the houses in Downside Crescent whose gardens back onto the Lawn Road gardens have two storey extensions. These properties also form an important part of the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area and have been largely unaffected by alterations over the years and have 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. Collectively they form 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 in addition to the points we made in our comments of 4th February, the changes proposed will also result in substantial harm to the houses in Downside Crescent which is also an important part of the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. A precedent would be set which might mean that other properties could be altered in a way that harms the Conservation Area. It should be noted that where alterations have been given consent, for example at 10 Downside Crescent 2016/4413/P this is for a single storey rear extension, not a two storey extension.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned at the proposals to have a full height two storey extension at the rear of 75 Lawn Road 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 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 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 in Lawn Road and the houses in Downside Crescent, not just its immediate neighbours.</p> <p>The application is not in accordance with Camden's design principles for rear extensions and is contrary to Local plan Policy D1 and should be refused.</p>

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:
					<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The application is not in accordance with Camden's design principles for rear extensions and is contrary to Local plan Policy D1.</p> <p>Design and Materials</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Camden Planning Guidance CGP1 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</p>

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>Demolition 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>Sustainability 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>

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	Mr B Kingsley	24 Downside Crescent	06/02/2018 09:29:22	COMMNT	<p>I am the owner of 24 Downside Crescent, which looks over the proposed development site at 75 Lawn Road (Ref: 2017/6726/P). I wish to make three comments for the committee to take into account.</p> <p>1. Development in a conservation area: All of the 1920s houses on Lawn Road have as a design feature a white rendered rear facade. This is a prominent feature of the view down the green corridor that runs between the backs of the Downside Crescent and Lawn Road houses, of which we have a clear view. The application to rebuild the back of the house at 75 Lawn Road with a red brick finish will starkly contrast with the existing appearance of the 1920s Lawn Road properties, and I believe it will also conflict with the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area strategy, which states: "The appearance of all buildings of architectural or historic interest (listed and unlisted) within the Conservation Area is harmed by the removal or loss of original architectural features and the use of inappropriate materials." This would be resolved if the redeveloped back of 75 Lawn Road was instead finished in white render in keeping with the original style.</p> <p>2. Demolition works: The development plans at 75 Lawn Road (2017/6726/P) include not only the demolition of the post-1945 side extension, which is not a concern, but also the demolition of a substantial section of the original 1920s element of the house. Since this is a house that has been deemed to make a positive contribution to the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area, demolition of such a substantial part of the original house is plainly contrary to the conservation area 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." The partial demolition of the original 1920s house thus should not be permitted by the committee.</p> <p>3. Design features: I have noted also that the proposed two-storey extension includes a much larger pitched roof that would extend further into the garden at 75 Lawn Road than the pitched roofs of all neighbouring houses, thus disrupting the traditional symmetry of the rooflines of the row of houses. A development of this scale seems unnecessary and would I believe be unlike any previous or planned rear extension along the west side of Lawn Road. I therefore do not believe the proposed plans are consistent with the Camden Local Plan or the conservation area management strategy.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/6726/P	Spencer Fung and Teresa Roviras	20 Downside Crescent London NW3 2AP	06/02/2018 12:49:14	OBJ	<p>We strongly object to the new proposal.</p> <p>1.FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION. This extension projects far too much, overlooking our property, interfering with our privacy. We firmly oppose this first floor extension completely. No extension should be allowed at this height as, under Local Plan Policy A1, it will overlook and adversely affect our privacy.</p> <p>2.SECOND FLOOR EXTENSION. The dormer window will overlook our garden directly to our first floor and second floor bedroom windows. interfering with our privacy. We should be protected against this by Section 7 of CPG 6. We firmly oppose to this second floor dormer completely.</p> <p>3.The property is within the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. We feel that, under Local Plan Policy D1, the bulk of the proposed extension is out of character with the street and the design is too dominating. There is no precedent of a first floor extension on the road and it would be detrimental to the neighbourhood to allow one. An extension such as the proposed might even prompt others to follow suit, exacerbating privacy even further.</p>
