

---

**From:** Stephen coe [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 29 September 2021 15:18  
**To:** Kate Henry  
**Subject:** My 2021/3409/P submission of Comments.. as promised

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Assuming the basement proposals, are no longer hanging over from the past into the future.. at least during next 3 years of this 2021/3409/P.

I consider this plan vastly more attractive in it's present configuration, leaving out the sub-optimal basement bedroom, and providing a much better interior floor-plan with a much safer and more practical staircase - harking back to the original design - (which preceded - what was actually 'built' in 1999) - (but sadly then - with such inadequate vehicle access, comprising a dis-functional garage - too narrow to actually get out of any car, parked in it.! - This factor was a disappointment to both the two previous (car) owners of No.17. But had been required and approved by Council to meet a policy, (bound into the local plan) - before quite understandably, being re-purposed as a third bedroom in 2009.

The overall appearance is much improved - by mounting the 'so called' timber 'FINS'? without the unsightly metal brackets used to attach these similar 'ribs' in the Swains Lane example. This has been obviated by the previously \*louvred fins\* - overall, being replaced (except over the 'flank' window) by more compact but directly outward facing - 'RIBS.'? which protrude somewhat less - but lack the previous more elegant Louvred appearance. (Shown under 4756/P - in 2017.)

However, in Swains Lane, that showed that covering the timber 'fins' or 'ribs' - in an unsuitable Lignosil paint - wouldn't benefit the different 'design context', in this situation:-

A DARKER EXTERIOR COLOUR - PREFERRED - BY ALL SURROUNDING NEIGHBOURS including No.16. Please note the PREVIOUS comments by Yv. T. - in 4756/P - THESE DETAILS - & I QUOTE.. those remarks from 2017/4756/P BELOW:-

#### X Cladding

2.1 We like the proposed wooden fixed louvre cladding but are not happy with the chosen colour as it contrasts too much with the other properties within the conservation area. Speaking with numbers 1, 3 & 5 Lupton Street, all agree that a different colour would be preferable.

A wood colour would be much more in keeping with the colours used within the area. We would like to ask the applicant to consider alternative natural wood colours more suitable for use in a conservation area. In our opinion this could be a win-win scenario as it would also enhance the beauty of the property and still make it "stand out from the crowd".

For example the Keim Lignosil-Verano colour 4863  
or if a grey effect is more desired Keim Lignosil-Verano colour 4831

XX

Comment by No 5 Lupton. Yv.T.

THIS factor also applies to the juxtaposition of extreme contrasts between front elevations of No.16, as it stands, next to No.17.

AS No.17 - is simply 'far too bright' and is too much in contrast to the vintage London stock brickwork of No.16 Railey Mews - and all the other many surrounding buildings in this Mews & elsewhere in the area. But 17, always was a 'design error' from '98.

Seeking to emulate the "white cube" style - on such a confined site & whilst appearing semi 'attached' - where the lack of it's own surrounding garden site, precludes that situation here, and where it would impose projecting \*fins\* - directly over another neighbour's garden. This is understandably unpopular, as a 'one-off' infill, siting 'experiment' in this confined traditional setting.

The admirable Rick Mather's much lauded "white house in Hampstead" of some repute - should not be attempted - referenced or exemplified - in this very different setting - in a confined Mews of terraced nearby neighbours. - (& Also a Planning 'error' in 1998).

This is why taking inspiration from an attractive close timbered fascia of a self-coloured wooden style house in rural Germany - makes little sense - when compromised by - 'Slapping on white paint' here - disguising the fact - These 'RIBS' - even made of wood!  
Offenbach's splendid example, in it's garden site, showed a tonality of rich wooden tones, and not from a 'white' paint-brush.

It will be laudable & most desirable if the Applicants may now reconsider this most critical point, to achieve a strong effect & better reception both locally and throughout the neighbourhood. Another 'white building' is not an answer to this style clash.!

The better move now, would be to correct previous mis-judgements; arrived at - during a less informed design age - in 1998 -

& look more exciting too.. & preferably with an open-minds approach, to improve by agreement, wherever possible.

SC