

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4346/P	Ian and Susan Trackman	19/11/2020 13:46:58	OBJ	<p>The Heritage Appraisal in support of the application acknowledges (section 1.9) that LB Camden's view is that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ¿ The 1930s extension is subservient to the 1720s building. ¿ The proposed raising of the ridge of the 1930s extension would cause harm to the listed building. The existing 1930s extension reads as a subordinate element to the original 1720s house. ¿ The current height of the 1930s extension therefore should be maintained in order to preserve the significance of the Grade II* building. <p>The application alleges, without justification, that LB Camden's views have been overtaken by the granting of planning application 2019/3223/P. We say that is not the case and that LB Camden's views should continue to be respected.</p> <p>The application acknowledges (section 2.8) that ¿The 1930s side extension lacks the special architectural and historic interest of the 1729 pair of early Georgian houses¿. The proposed development would serve only to exaggerate the impact of the 1930s extension on the integrity of the 1720s building.</p> <p>The application ignores the deleterious effect of the proposed increase in height of the 1930s extension as seen from the rear of the premises, increasing, as it would, the mass of the 1930s extension in comparison with the 1720s building. The application claims that ¿Raising the roof of the kitchen wing would not affect or harm its historic or architectural interest ¿ there would be no disruption to the balance between the 18th century house and the early 20th century addition.¿ We say that a 20% increase in the height of the 1930s building will have exactly the opposite effect and will significantly alter the balance between the two buildings. Any increase in the size of the 1930s extension will only serve to enhance the impression that a third, architecturally incompatible, house has been tacked onto the side of the original 1720s building.</p> <p>We oppose the application.</p>