



I could not find my response on the planning website. Also I want to make it clear that this 'comment' is an 'objection'.

> On 14 Nov 2019, at 16:35, [planning@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planning@camden.gov.uk) wrote:

>

> 1 No side extension should be allowed. This is the end cottage in a simple terrace of pretty stuccoed mid-Victorian cottages, characteristic of an early period of Hampstead's development and reflected in its conservation status. This end of the terrace is particularly visible as it is also on the corner of Willoughby Road.

> Any side extension would detract from both the character of the building and the terrace.

>

> 2 The proposed extension is visible - it is only partly below ground level at the front. The roof is over a meter (about 1.3m) above ground level and the top of the hood around the roof lighting is probably 2.00m above ground level.

>

> 3 There are many incongruous features which jar with the mid Victorian architecture, due to an attempt to use a 'St Ives and Barbara Hepworth style'. These include the obliquely-cut cylindrical roof-window hoods, the textured cast iron cladding around the hoods and over the terrace doors and the railings. Although I can see the attraction of this style of architecture in its place, this is not an appropriate setting.

>

> 4 Loss of garden. The proposed plan shows that approximately one third of the current garden will be lost. This will detract from the neighbourhood (a conservation area) and reduce the area available for rainfall absorption.

>

> 5 View of listed property from the street. It is a characteristic feature of this terrace that the houses and their front gardens can be seen from the street and enjoyed by everyone.

> Boundary wall too high. In an attempt to reduce the visibility of this style of extension a boundary wall, 10cm higher than the piers of the existing wall, is proposed. It is high, featureless and oppressive. The existing wall needs repair, but nevertheless has some attractive features. The piers break up the monotony of the wall, whereas the lower stretches of wall between with wooden trellises allow creepers to growing through softening the effect and allow glimpses through.

> Double gates modern and out of place. The proposed replacement double gates looks modern, out of place and very opaque. A photo in the Heritage Statement (page 51) is said to be dated 1986 shows the wall being knocked down and gates being installed for car access but there seems to be no planning permission for this.

>

> 6 Green roof- anything but sustainable. The wild flower green roof sounds attractive but would be transient. It would become replaced with weeds, subject to droughts, difficult to resow, require hand weeding, watering and vigilant maintenance. After planning permission is given there is little control over what it would look like.

>

> 7 The terrace is 150 years old and brittle. For the proposed work the side wall would be compromised in that the ground currently at the base would be excavated for the new room and parts of this wall removed at basement level to enable access from the adjacent living room. A solid

floor is going adjacent to a wooden floor. It may be difficult to predict what effect this might have on this house and structure of the adjacent cottages of the terrace.

>

> 8. Photos of other buildings - no reasonable excuse. In this application photographs are shown of other buildings nearby which have obtrusively modern features. These are not listed buildings. They should not be regarded as the rationale or precedent for similar developments on this terrace.

>

> 9. Conflict of designs - the railings. Another point of incongruity between the proposal and the terrace. A photo looking up the terrace from the entrance of 33 (Design and Access. page 2) shows simple railings down the sides of the front steps and around the front light-wells, which are uniform along the terrace. The proposed front elevation does not show these but does show two rows of railings in the new extension, one along the edge of the roof 'concealing top of side extension', and a second in front of the light-well. These are of a different design with rounded tops. Are the older ones, possibly the originals and certainly the ones present at the time of the listing, going to be replaced or is there a point at which the differing designs of old and new meet? Also on page 7 of the Design and Access it is suggested that the design of the new railings might (alternatively?) recall the 'St Andrew's Cross design' (Heritage Statement page 13), quite a different design, appearing on the 1856 drain plans and which were never used when the terrace was built.

>

> 10 In conclusion, I heartily concur with Gideon Whittingham in his response to the PRE-APP that this planning proposal should be turned down.

>

>

>

> Comment Type is Comment