

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1025/P	Simon and Virginia Kirsch	27/03/2020 15:48:22	OBJ	<p>OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF JAMES GOWAN'S GRADE II LISTED SWIMMING POOL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A condition agreed as part of planning consent (2017/4549/ L) required the developer to repair and maintain the pool. The proposed roofing over and disappearance of all the listed features apart from the dome – clearly a less expensive option than 'repair' - is an attempt by the developer to renege on this condition of consent despite Camden Councils very substantial allowance to increase the size of his property. • Permitting the roofing-over of this unique and striking circular pool which is lined with white Sicilian marble and has two bull's-eye rings of black marble on its floor and using the pool's cavity as 'underground storage', would not be fulfilling the protection granted by its listing. • Using the pool as a platform for dining, erodes the pool's authenticity and intended function, reducing its significance, facilitating the way for future modifications by developers with no appreciation of the nation's heritage. A 'dining platform' is not a swimming pool. • Allowing the space to be altered in this way makes it less likely that it will be used as a swimming pool in the future. • The poolside wall is lined with six-inch square blue glazed tiles divided by a double band of white tiles split by a row of red tiles which align with the outside ground level. Widening the 2 existing entrances and the creation of a third entrance will further denigrate the listing's structure and will result in loss of these tiles – this constitutes 'demolition', not 'repair' as suggested by the developer. • The tiles are part of the listing and are a key feature in the design of the swimming pool. If they are covered, they will be forgotten, not maintained and will fall into disrepair. • The developer states that "existing metalwork" will be "cleaned and repainted". These well documented chrome elements are part of the listing. They require restoration, not painting. • The developer's statement "the pool can no longer be filled due to leaks caused by inherent failures in the structural concrete" is untrue - the pool has been in use by the developer for the past 2 summers. The developer has provided no meaningful description of inherent failures in the structural concrete as was noted by the 20th Century Society in their submission during his last attempt to move the pool. • None of the proposed changes for the pool constitute a public benefit. Flouting the listing in this way makes a mockery of the entire listing process.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1025/P	Simon and Virginia Kirsch	29/03/2020 15:38:07	OBJ	<p>OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPEMENT AT 35 TEMPLEWOOD AVENUE</p> <p>SIZE AND POSITION OF THE PROPOSED DWELLING</p> <p>The developer wishes to increase the size of the building on the plot from 685 square metres to 1,131 square metres, an increase in size to this already large property of over 80%. The main part of this development will be above ground; the developers 2017 application granted by Camden Council was for a development of similar size, however over 80% of the structure in the previous application was to be subterranean. The proposed design is too large for the plot, especially as the building is so close to its boundaries. This proposal is inappropriate given its important and sensitive position within a Conservation area directly opposite the Heath.</p> <p>The box massing of the upper floors will make the property a lot more visible and disproportionately large in comparison with the adjacent listed Schreiber House.</p> <p>Trebling the footprint (current: 34m2 proposed: 106m2) and raising the height of the top floor as proposed, would create an unwelcome, overbearing structure in a 'green corridor', where there is currently minimal visual impact from buildings.</p> <p>Increasing the footprint and height on South East Corner is out of keeping with all the other properties on Templewood Avenue and West Heath Road which are set much further back from the road.</p> <p>OVERLOOKING AND PRIVACY</p> <p>In the Design Access Statement, the developer states that all windows face North or East. This is not the case. The developer also proposes a new West facing window that will directly overlook the terrace area of Schreiber House, which is currently not overlooked. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>The impact on the Templewood Avenue Flats is obviously significant and unacceptable.</p> <p>IMPACT OF INCREASE IN HEIGHT</p> <p>The proposed increase in height of the new building will have a direct impact on the amount of light available to the terrace area of the Schreiber House. The existing building already occludes direct sunlight on much of the terrace area before midday. The proposed increase in height will impact this further and is not acceptable. In the Daylight and Sunlight report submitted by the developer, the consultant suggests that because the windows on the rear elevation of Schreiber House would have an oblique view of the site, they should be excluded from their analysis. This is not the case. The proposed height will impact the light levels of all windows on the East end of the Schreiber House. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>IMPACT OF UNDERGROUND WORKS ON LOCAL HYDROLOGY</p> <p>The area is known to be hydrologically complex and the impact of the proposed extensive underground excavations will have an unknown impact on both the adjacent Templewood Avenue Flats and Schreiber House.</p> <p>CONCLUSION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed building is inappropriately large for this sensitive site • The proposed building is inappropriately high for a conservation area which is also directly opposite the Heath. • The proposed height will negatively impact adjacent neighbours.