
From: John Malet-Bates [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 September 2018 00:07
To: Constantinescu, Nora-Andreea
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 2018/2969/P: 5 Gainsborough Gardens NW3 1BJ

Dear Nora,

Hampstead CAAC Objects to the proposal as harmful to the character of the CA especially locally in this special setting.

The existing conservatory is an innovative although apparently not original asset in the location enhancing the CA also as visible from the street and the near edge of the Heath, regardless of its age and origin. The conservatory complements the existing building while remaining subservient to it, relating carefully to it. It does not compromise internal planning having been opened up at some time to ease any constriction.

The proposed replacement is not innovative, but a bland by now 'standard' format as replacement. It cannot be regarded as an asset in fact detracting from the locality rather than enhancing it. It does not 'refer' to nor respect the existing building, being an insistent addition crashing into the rear wall, ignoring the neighbouring building.

Such glass boxes have been proposed elsewhere and where carefully proportioned and scaled relative to existing buildings and mostly or often with a distinguishing 'link' they can be regarded as successful, enhancing the building and locality.

The modification of accommodation afforded by the proposal does not seem to justify the sacrifice, sudden, hasty selection of glass trimmed with unrelated timber, rammed against the enclosing walls, questionable relation to the existing window. This is not to say that the existing conservatory cannot be replaced if not originally with the house, but much more care and consideration should be used in any replacement.

Regards,
John Malet-Bates

[REDACTED]