

London Borough of Camden  
Development Management  
5 Pancras Square  
London  
N1C 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: 2018/2136/P) (‘App 2’)**

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. Statements regarding the existing property’s condition and 2. Demolition extent and sustainability of the development**

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.

## **5. Set back of rear lightwell from boundary with No.74 Lawn Rd.**

Para 5.2: These patios are not 'service yards', as pointed out in our comments on Applications 2018/3114/P and 2018/3428/P. It is the area that the main reception room of No. 75 looks out onto, and where most of the 'staggered back' style of houses in this row have their garden dining table and chairs, including at No.74.

Para 5.6: The garden boundary wall is wholly on our property and is 1550 – 1620mm high but only 100mm thick (the thickness of one brick) all the way down to the bottom. It does not appear to have a proper footing or foundations. It is not acceptable to make assumptions about footings and roots without any evidence.

Para 5.7: The set back of the rear lightwell from the property boundary is about half the width of that proposed for the front lightwell and is too narrow. The setback at the rear should be at least as wide as the setback for the front lightwell. Please see diagrams included in our original comments on 2018/2136/P.

## **6. Impact of the front/side extensions upon the character of the conservation area**

Para 6.1: 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.

## **8. Clarification on scale of rear extension (including eaves line and parapet heights)**

Para 8.2: We note the glazing height is 2600mm, in line with that permitted at No.79 Lawn Road.

Para 8.3: No.75 has clarified they are proposing a single storey infill extension height of 3300mm. It is only two years since No.79 was told that the maximum allowed height for the perimeter of their rear infill extension was 3150mm. Our house is a mirror image and the existing ceiling height in the rear reception is 2760mm, meaning that the proposed parapet height will be 540mm above the existing internal ceiling height. Camden needs to clarify what is an appropriate height of a single storey rear extension for these houses.

Para 8.5: The situation at No. 77 Lawn Road is not relevant because, as stated several times before, No.77 has a 'flat back' whereas Nos. 72&73, 74&75, 79&80 have 'staggered rears' with existing rear outriggers. Building onto an existing rear outrigger is very different to building onto a 'flat backed' house.

## **10. Conclusion**

The applicants state: "The elements of the design which will be visible (above ground) 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 there have been two subsequent planning applications (2018/3114/P and 2018/3428/P) that revive all or most of the 2-storey plus pitched roof rear infill extension that was refused by Camden in March 2018.

Richard Tomlinson and Teresa Poole, [REDACTED]