
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 October 2018 11:06
To: Chana, Jaspreet; Planning
Subject: 75 Lawn Road Planning Application 2018/2136/P

75 Lawn Road Planning applications 2018/2136/P

Dear Jaspreet Chana, we have read the statement from Nash Bond lodged on 1st October. We have some comments on some of the statements made which we would like to be considered, since they are incorrect or misleading.

Demolition and sustainability:

The applicants seem to be suggesting that it is necessary to demolish the whole house apart from the front façade and a short section of the side façade in order to comply with current building regulations and standards. We, like several other owners of these 1920s Arts & Crafts style houses, extensively renovated our house as recently as last year without any wholesale demolition, meeting all regulations and to a high degree of energy/thermal efficiency.

The level of proposed demolition is indeed wholesale – they are proposing to knock down almost everything except the front of the house. This is not a “refurbishment” – it is the building of a completely new house behind a retained front façade and part side façade.

The surveyor’s report that is quoted by the applicants is quite clear that only minor maintenance work was required to the property, principally some works to remedy a bit of damp, repair or replace some windows and some of the roof tiles and rewire. The extracts quoted demonstrate that demolition is not necessary. It is clearly just being proposed to allow for the replacement of the existing house and therefore conflicts with Camden’s very clear policies on demolition.

By the applicants’ own record, it is incorrect to say that “much of the building fabric is currently unsuitable for re-use.” In their original planning application (2017/6726/P) the applicants proposed far less demolition and in response to comments from neighbours in February 2018 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>). So the majority of the building fabric at that point clearly was suitable for re-use. Yet in this planning application and ‘App 3’ (2018/3114/P) and ‘App 4’ (2018/3428 /P) the applicants suddenly want to demolish almost the whole house.

Height of rear infill extension:

The Applicants have clarified that the parapet height of the 1-storey element of any proposed rear extension is to be 3300mm. It is only two years since [REDACTED] which is the same design as no.75,

were told by Camden Planning that we had to reduce the height of the external parapet height of our single storey rear extension from 3695mm to a maximum height of 3150mm. The applicants say this additional height is due to 'the necessary structural and thermal build up and the lowest possible parapet upstand'. At [REDACTED] we have had no difficulty in keeping within the 3150mm limit, complying with Building Regulations, with matched internal ceiling heights with the rest of the house, and notwithstanding the installation of underfloor heating with the associated thermal insulation required.

There should be consistency in decisions by Camden Planning about the allowable heights of single storey rear extensions along this row of houses. It is clear that from the recent consent for No 81 Lawn Road 2016/0879/P similar concerns over parapet height to the single storey rear extension were addressed.

Regards

Tom Symes and Beth Noakes
[REDACTED]