

London Borough of Camden  
Development Management  
5 Pancras Square  
London  
NIC 4AG

2 October, 2018

FAO: Jaspreet Chana and Camden Planning

Dear Jaspreet Chana,

**Response to ‘Response to Consultee Comments’ on 75 Lawn Road, NW3 2XB  
(Application ref: 2018/3114/P) (‘App 3’)**

We write in response to the documents from the applicants that appeared on the Camden Planning website on 1 October 2018.

All our previous comments submitted to Camden Planning still hold. Here we respond specifically to new points made by the applicants in their 1 October 2018 documents.

**1. Extent of proposed demolition**

**(Here we reiterate comments made in our response today on 2018/2136/P ‘App2’ )**

None of the surveyor’s findings justify the plans to demolish the whole of the house apart from the front façade and part of the side façade by the driveway. In February, when they already had the surveyor’s report, they said they would *reduce* the demolition from a much lower starting point. Why have they changed their minds?

- Before the September 2017 purchase of the house: Malcolm Hollis wrote the building survey report that is now being quoted by the applicants on the existing property condition.
- December 2017: App 1 (2017/6726/P) was submitted to Camden. This included the proposed lesser demolition of: a) the 1950s rebuilt side extension and b) just the part of the rear of the house delineated by the rear kitchen.
- February 2018: In response to comments, the agent told Camden that **the applicants are willing to reduce the overall scope of demolition** to retain existing side [rear] flank wall and **the applicant is prepared to reduce the amount of demolition ...** ( see <http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/7040470/file/document?inline>).
- July/Aug 2018: Three applications (2018/2136/P; 2018/3114/P; 2018/3428/P) appeared that proposed much greater demolition of the whole of the house apart from the front façade and part of the side façade by the driveway.
- 1 October 2018: The applicants continued to describe this demolition/rebuild project as a ‘refurbishment’ and stated that: ‘The parts of the building which are proposed to be demolished are of poor-quality construction and unsuitable for repair or restoration’ and that ‘much of the building fabric is currently unsuitable for re-use’.

Thus in February 2018 the majority of the house, apart from the 1950s rebuilt side extension, was considered by the applicants to be appropriate for restoration and re-use, rather than demolition. Why did they change their minds by July 2018?

In this row of twinned Arts & Craft style 1920s houses, Nos. 73, 78, 79, 81 and 82 have all been extensively renovated in recent years without substantial demolition, meeting all building regulations and standards.

## **2. Impact of the front/side extensions upon street scene and conservation area (Here we reiterate comments made in our response today on 2018/2136/P ‘App2’ )**

**Para 2.1:** We don’t understand why the applicants continue to mention only two linked pairs of houses in this row, especially as Nos. 79&80 are of an identical staggered back design to No.75. To repeat again, there are 10 dwellings in five linked pairs (Nos 72&73; 74&75; 77&78; 79&80; 81&82). In addition, No.76 was uniquely originally built as a detached house because it sits at the bend in Lawn Rd.

All our comments on the front appearance of twinned houses in this row still stand and are confirmed by the applicants’ photographs.

## **3. Impact of the rear extension upon the character of the property and conservation area**

**Para 3.1:** The 2-storey extension is not secondary or subordinate to the existing building. The diagram is misleading: only the single storey projection (depth 1.41 metres) should be marked with diagonal green lines (proposed single-storey extension). Instead, this green shading at ground floor level has been superimposed on the yellow shaded 2-storey extension, giving the impression that the single-storey extension goes all the way back to the original house.

**Para 3.2:** The extension will be visible from other neighbouring houses and gardens apart from No.74 Lawn Rd.

**Para 3.3:** Why are the applicants here ignoring the preserved core 1<sup>st</sup> floor/roof historic symmetry between Nos. 74 and 75? No. 75 is twinned with No. 74, not with No.76. Using the architect’s plans and our photographs, we demonstrated in our earlier comments that the existing core symmetry at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level between Nos. 74 and 75 will be destroyed by this planning proposal.

**Para 3.4:** When the applicants talk about No.77 they do not mention that there are two different styles of these twinned Arts & Crafts style houses, as described in our original objection.

- Nos. 77 and 78 have flat-backs and form a pair.
- Nos. 74 and 75 have staggered L-shaped rears, with historic outriggers, and form a pair.

The proposed redesign of No.75 Lawn Rd will create a 2-storey plus pitched roof mass with a flank wall next to No. 74 with a depth of 7.24m from the principal rear façade. This compares with 4m for the equivalent depth at no. 77. Building a 2-storey rear extension onto an existing outrigger has a very different impact to building onto the back of a flat backed house.

At No.77, the width of the 1<sup>st</sup> floor projection is 4m, representing 37% of the total 10.8m wide full width of the house. In addition, the pitched roof does not span the whole 4m rear extension width, thus greatly reducing its impact.

In comparison, at No.75 the transformation of the back comes about because there are already two 2-storey outriggers, one containing the existing kitchen and one containing the existing garage. The proposed additional 2.19 metre deep 2-storey plus pitched roof rear infill extension will be built onto the existing kitchen outrigger, with the remaining 1.41 metres extended at one-storey (height 3300mm) to complete the infill. It is the *totality* of the rear projection that creates excessive mass, scale and overbearing development.

At No.75, most of the proposed two-storey rear projection will be around 6.4m wide, which is approximately 60% of the total house width, compared with 37% at No.77.

No. 75 will also have an additional 2-storey 1.41 metre deep by 2.7 metre wide projection positioned at the existing garage side of the house.

**Para 3.5:** Our original comments submitted to Camden included a number of figures and images that demonstrated how the bulk, scale and mass of the App 3 roofscape will be significantly greater than the existing. On the proposed rear extended kitchen overtriggeer, the main 2-storey roof gutter line for the pitched roof will extend out 7.24 metres from the principal rear façade, compared with 5.05 metres currently at both Nos. 75 and 74.

We assume that the clarifications of the glazing height and the parapet height of the single storey element that was provided for App 2 (2018/2136/P) also apply to App 3. Similarly, our comments submitted today on these dimensions in regard to App 2 also apply to this application (App 3).

#### **4. Impact of rear extension upon the amenity of 74 Lawn Road**

**Para 4.1:** The applicants seem to quote guidance when they feel it strengthens their arguments, but dismiss it when it undermines their proposals.

**Para 4.7:** The 2-storey rear extension under this hybrid proposal is not modest. The totality of the flank wall on the overtriggeer nearest to No.74 will be increased to create a wall 7.24 metres in depth from the principal rear façade of the house and 7.8 metres high in total, including the roof. The introduction of the 1-storey flat roof section thus reduces the total overtriggeer depth at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level by only 16% (from 8.65 metres to 7.24 metres), compared with App 1, which was refused by Camden on both design and amenity grounds.

The 45-degree test is an assessment of daylight (CPG 6 Amenity) and provides a guide for when a BRE daylight and sunlight study may be warranted. It is not a definition of, or test for, assessing the impact of an extension on neighbouring amenity in terms of overbearing, poor outlook, or sense of enclosure. Drawing a 45 degree line out from one window does not guarantee that there will be no loss of amenity to the neighbouring property as it takes no account of the broader context of the proposed development.

In any case, the proposed rear extension fails the 45-degree test when drawn from the 1<sup>st</sup> floor main rear bedroom window.

**Para 4.8:** Again the BRE daylight tests are a test of daylight, they are not tests of overbearing, poor outlook, or sense of enclosure.

**Para 4.9:** As shown in our original comments, the applicants' visualisations demonstrate the significant negative impact on No.74's outlook, sense of enclosure and sense of overbearing.

**Para 4.11:** As shown above, comparisons with No.77 are not relevant because of the different design of the rears of the houses. In addition there is a very different juxtaposition of No.77 in relation to No.76 (compared with Nos 75 and 74) because of the bend in the road and the way No.76 was constructed as a standalone detached house to fill the space between two terraces. When this row of houses was built in the 1920s No.76

was positioned very close to No.77 (see applicants' image) and has always been overshadowed by the north side wall of No.77.

In contrast, the design of the carefully proportioned rears of the paired staggered back-twinning houses in this row were originally laid out precisely to create a sense of openness and to avoid any sense of enclosure and overbearing for the paired, symmetric house next door. The impact of no. 77's rear extension on no. 76 is minimal compared to the impact of no. 75's proposed rear extension on no 74.

## **5. Conclusion**

The applicants state: "Proposed elements at the front and the rear of the property have been reduced in size and given a more sympathetic appearance, to protect the amenity of neighbours and preserve and enhance the conservation area." This is disingenuous given that application 2018/2136/P included a wholly 1-storey rear infill extension. In addition, application 2018/3428/P includes a full 2-storey plus pitched roof rear infill extension of the same dimensions that was refused by Camden Planning in March 2018.

Richard Tomlinson and Teresa Poole, 74 Lawn Road.