

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/3428/P	Elizabeth Hoddy	30/08/2018 14:18:26	OBJLETTE R	APP 4: 2018/3428/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 2018/3428/P). After reviewing the planning proposal for 75 Lawn Road I would like to make the following comments:

1. Design of rear 2-storey extension

The proposals for the extended rear of the house appear identical to those that were refused for application 2017/6726/P except for retaining the historic white render finish. Keeping the render does not address the design reasons from Camden for refusing permission last time. The proposed rear 2-storey extension is not secondary to the host building, is disproportionate, completely alters the roofscape, is bulky, and too big in scale. It should be refused again.

2. Principle of protecting amenity of neighbours

Retaining white render does not change the dimensions of the proposed rear extension or the negative impact on the next door house. The paired houses on Lawn Road and Downside Crescent were originally designed to avoid any sense of enclosure or overbearing for immediate neighbours and this principle should be respected. Camden's decision last time on amenity remains correct – the rear extension should be refused.

3. Demolition

I object to the scale of demolition proposed as part of the 75 Lawn Road development. The plans show that the existing house will be demolished apart from the front façade and part of the side façade facing 76 Lawn Road. This hugely exceeds what was proposed for App 1 - 2017/6726/P so it cannot be necessary. As stated in my objections to App 2 (2018/2138/P), such largescale demolition conflicts with the Camden Local Plan 2017 and the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy. Camden should refuse permission for such extensive demolition of this house.

4. Four planning applications

As of 2 August 2018 there have now been 4 separate planning applications from the new owner of 75 Lawn Rd. The applicants had already changed to the new front side dormer and the rear white render in their App 2 (2018/2136/P). Everything else in App 4 is the same as App 1 (2017/6726/P). What game are they playing?

This strategy of serial planning applications means that I have to resubmit my earlier comments to ensure they are also registered for this application, which wastes both my time and Camden Planning's time.

5. Reiteration of my objections last time on 2017/6726/P regarding negative impact of new rear extension

My other comments last time also apply to this repeat application (note to Planning Officer – these comments that follow are identical to my comments on Application 1 - 2017/6726/P):

I have 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 [re]built after the Second World War. However, given that this newer part of the building is to be demolished as part of the development,

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

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.

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.

Thank you for your attention,
Elizabeth Hoddy
