From: Paul Evans [redacted]
Sent: 17 August 2018 17:02
To: Planning [redacted]
Subject: 5 Gainsborough Gardens London NW3 1BJ

Paul Evans, Heath Lodge, Heath Side, London NW3
Tel: 078 4000 7000

Development Management
Camden Council
6th Floor, Camden Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

15th August 2018

Dear Ms Constantinescu

5 GAINSBOROUGH GARDENS LONDON NW3 1BJ
LPA REF NO'S: 2018/3493/L;2018/2969/P;2018/2891/L2018/2344/L

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING REAR CONSERVATORY AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH PATIO ETC. AND MINOR ALTERATIONS AND REFURBISHMENT ETC.

Response to Consultation

Dear Sirs,

I [redacted] have lived here since 1995.
I object to the grant of planning permission for the demolition of the existing conservatory and the erection of a single storey extension in its place, on the following grounds:

The proposed rear extension to 5 Gainsborough Gardens will adjoin the south west facing side wall [redacted] Heath Lodge dates from the late 18th century and is a Georgian two storey low built house with elevations of London stock brick below shallow pitched slated roofs. It is Grade 2 –star- Listed.

5 Gainsborough Gardens was built much later, I believe around 1900. The rear garden to this tall three story house extends along the south western side elevation of my property as mentioned, of which the major part of the length has a rendered finish and incorporates a large ,sash window at first floor level overlooking the back garden of the application site and a smaller 2nd window. The major window is for a bedroom. I do not know the circumstances under which 5 Gainsborough Road came to be built in such juxtaposition to Heath Lodge but rights to light to these windows exist

to the benefit of my property. The remainder of the Heath Lodge side wall is London Stock brickwork with no windows.

The existing conservatory with its cone roof design and lead covered domed cupola is an attractive feature. It is not contemporary with the house (it is stated in the application to have added in 1980), but it was sensitively built to a design and employs materials which makes it appear entirely compatible with the period and aesthetics of the house. The conservatory is not directly in front of [redacted] window and currently my view is mainly over the garden of 5 Gainsborough Gardens and beyond. I doubt that it was ever intended to be a habitable room with regard to thermal insulation etc. and was constructed as a true conservatory with maybe occasional dining use in summertime. The proposal is to build an extension giving additional habitable accommodation, which will presumably comply with Building Regulations as heated space.

While I cannot reasonably object to a replacement extension in principle, I do believe that the conservatory demolition will be a palpable loss to the character of the conservation area.

My objections to the extension now proposed in these applications can be summarised as follows:

1. The proposed extension is substantially larger than the building it replaces and will negatively impact on the outlook from my window, notwithstanding that it is proposed to have a flat roof. It will create an additional feeling of enclosure to what is an open aspect.

2. The flat roof will reduces security by easing burglar ingress. Retro-fitted measures to discourage intruders may make the extension even more visually intrusive than drawn.

3. The gazebo feature with its vane screens will have the same visual impact as a building seen from above. The proposed gazebo section will obstruct maintenance access to the rendered wall and windows of Heath Lodge.

4. The external sitting area within the gazebo structure will ,being that much larger in size, be immediately below the window of my property and there is a risk of disturbance and noise nuisance. This could be avoided by planning the outside space to the side of the extension – towards the centre of the garden.

5. The extension overall is out of scale in the context. Architecturally it employs a cladding material (Corten Steel) which seems totally incongruous against the architecture of the house and the aesthetics of Gainsborough Gardens as whole. I think the argument that it acts as counterpoint to the original architecture of the house is entirely spurious in this instance.

6. The extension will obviously be visible from the south west side and is seemingly slightly elevated above road level. While I appreciate that the architects have intentionally adopted the approach of a modernist design rather than a pastiche, I do not consider this design philosophy to be supportable in the context of this unique locality and conservation area. It is entirely contrary to the Council's conservation policies. I would urge the applicants to consider a redesign.

7. Taking the extension and gazebo as one structure (which it effectively is), the garden space of the property is reduced with corresponding permanent loss to the amenities of the applicant's property.

8. The architects elevation drawings of the south western elevation misrepresent the size of trees which are shown to be higher than the wall/hedge along the pavement boundary. They may appear to soften and reduce the visual impact of the extension but do not in fact exist at the size shown. The vegetation above the pavement boundary wall is mostly ivy and is not an established hedge. The ivy could be removed at any time outside of planning control and the extension and its demerits fully revealed.

My feeling is that the existing conservatory could be retained with suitable re-glazing and possibly structural alteration to improve utility of the space. If this is not acceptable to the applicants I would hope they would be prepared to consider a redesign that took account of the above points and made their proposal more neighbourly and less prominent.

For these reasons I request that the proposed extension be refused because by its design, it would fail to preserve and enhance the Hampstead Conservation Area contrary to policies D1, D2 in the Camden Local Plan which requires the council to ensure that development: respects local context and character; preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with Policy D2 Heritage; and comprises materials that complement the local character.
Please include me in your recipient list for decisions made and general progress updates with respect to the proposal.

Yours sincerely

Paul Evans

Paul Evans
Chairman

[redacted]