

PD11370

email: edward.kitchen@montagu-evans.co.uk

04 December 2017

Mr David Peres da Costa
Senior Planning Officer
Regeneration and Planning
London Borough of Camden
5 Pancras Square
London
N1C 4AG

Dear David

**12 GLOUCESTER GATE, 12 & 13 GLOUCESTER GATE MEWS, NW1 4AD
REVISED DRAWINGS - 2017/4111/P AND 2017/4133/L**

Following our meeting at your offices on Wednesday 1 November, we have undertaken a review of the proposed amendments to the consented scheme, taking account of our discussions and your subsequent email providing more detailed comments.

We have now omitted those elements of change to the consented scheme where we have not been able to reach agreement. The revised drawings show:

- Retention of the timber stair between the first and second floor in its existing location;
- Retention of the mews elevation without further change;
- Relocation of the kitchen into the main house as requested;
- Retention of the courtyard area in its consented form; and,
- Retention of the twentieth-century extension to the rear of the house.

In previous correspondence, you confirmed that while the relocation of the lift was likely to be acceptable in principle, it may not be appropriate for this element to incorporate extensive glazing. We have therefore revised the design of the lift, to incorporate a solid rear wall.

The other changes retained on the revised drawings are consistent with the detailed comments we received from you on 3 November, items – 01 - 23. For ease of reference, the architects have prepared an addendum Design and Access Statement, which annotates the changes now proposed for determination on a floor-by-floor basis, as items 01 - 16.

You will recall that Historic England provided their formal comments on the applications in August, raising just one concern regarding the relocation of the timber staircase. As we are now proposing to retain the staircase in its current location, we hope you would agree that their comments have been addressed in full.

I appreciate that Antonia Powell will need time to review these details against her previous comments, but we are making the revisions on the understanding that each element has either been omitted in accordance with advice, or retained where the principle has been accepted. If there are any outstanding concerns, I would be grateful if you could advise me accordingly at the earliest opportunity.

For clarity and ease of reference, I have prepared a table listing those drawings which we are now submitting for formal substitution.

Drawing	Originally Submitted 18/07/17	Substitution 04/12/17
Proposed Lower Ground Floor	PD1999 06	PD1999 07
Proposed Ground Floor	PD2000 03	PD2000 04
Proposed First Floor	PD2001 04	PD2001 05
Proposed Second Floor	PD2002 03	PD2002 04
Proposed Roof Plan	PD2003 03	PD2003 04
Proposed Section A	PD2202 03	PD2202 04
Proposed Section B	PD2201 04	PD2201 05
Proposed Section C	PD2203 02	PD2203 03
Proposed Section D	PD2205 07	PD2205 08
Proposed Section F	PD2204 04	PD2204 05
Demolition Lower Ground Floor	PD1499 02	PD1499 03
Demolition Ground Floor	PD1500 02	PD1500 03
Demolition First Floor	PE1501 01	PE1501 02
Demolition Second Floor	PD1502 01	PD1502 02
Demolition Roof Plan	PD1503 01	PD1503 02

I trust these changes are clear, but please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information in respect of the applications.

Yours sincerely



**EDWARD KITCHEN
PARTNER
MONTAGU EVANS LLP**

cc. Ms Antonia Powell, Senior Conservation Officer, LB Camden