

**Parnjit Singh**

---

**From:** Cooper, Carol <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 31 January 2022 21:16  
**To:** Planning Planning  
**Subject:** Comment on planning application 2021/4884/P

Dear Officers

I write to object to the planning application 2021/4884/P (59 and a half, Netherhall Gardens, London NW3 5RE)

Firstly, I see no justification to demolish the existing building. The premises are in the **Fitzjohns & Netherhall Conservation Area, and subject to Local Plan policy D2 (Heritage)**. This policy *seeks to preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden's heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas... Any proposal for substantial demolition must be mindful of Policy CC1 (Climate Change Mitigation), in particular, points (e) and (f) which require all proposals involving substantial demolition to demonstrate that it is not possible to retain and improve the existing building*. However, the existing building clearly can be retained and improved, because **it has permission to be extended (planning ref 2020/1736/P)**.

Importantly, the current building makes a positive contribution to the area's character. Once gone, heritage cannot be replaced. For that reason alone, the council should resist its destruction.

Conservation Area guidance seeks to prevent what is described as *further erosion to the character of the area by further development that unbalance the historic urban grain and architecture by inappropriate scale, design and/ or materials*. The current housing stock in the area is not uniform in nature, but all of it has an Arts and Crafts flavour. I believe that the proposed development would significantly unbalance the streetscape.

**Local Plan Policy D1 (Design)** requires that all development is of a *high quality design that: a. respects local context and character; b. preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with Policy D2 (Heritage); e. comprises details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character; f. integrates well with the surrounding streets and open spaces, improving movement through the site and wider area with direct, accessible and easily recognisable routes and contributes positively to the street frontage; m. preserves strategic and local views*.

The design of the proposed building does not comply with these requirements.

As for the claim that the "scheme design is a contemporary take on a Georgian home", this is entirely fanciful. Anyone can see that the proposed building is bulky and ultra-modern, with a flat roof, and without any of the finesse of a Georgian home.

It is inaccurate to claim that the site cannot be seen from the street. I can certainly see it, as can many others. Contrary to claims made in the documents accompanying the application, the new building would indeed be visible.

For all these reasons, planning approval should be refused.

Dr Linda Carol Cooper

