

The Society examines all Planning Applications relating to Hampstead, and assesses them for their impact on conservation and on the local environment.

To London Borough of Camden, Development Control Team

Planning Ref:2016/3691/PAddress:40 Hollycroft AvenueDescription:Rear extension and garden houseCase Officer:Image: Case officer in the second second

Date 21 August 2016

We oppose these proposals, on these grounds:

1. Architecture of Locally Listed house

The design of the flat-roofed rear extension, comprising large areas of glazing, and brickwork of unspecified colour and type, is completely alien to that of the existing house, and harms its character and appearance.

The existing house, designed under the supervision of W.J. King, is very characteristic of those in Hollycroft Avenue, and is of considerable architectural merit. It was placed on the list of buildings contributing to Conservation Area character in the CA Statement; during the recent establishment of the Local List it was made clear that all those so listed in the CA Statement should be regarded as Locally Listed. We agree with this, both in principle and in detail with regard to No 40.

The applicants dismiss this by saying in their D/A Statement that the house "has no architectural merit" They are wrong.

2. Garden House

This replaces an existing summer house, by doubling its size, and designing it, effectively, as a stand-alone separate house, with kitchen and bathroom. This backland development is unacceptable.

It is also of bizarre architectural character, with jagged splintered-style walls and roof, even more out-of character with the existing house than the extension. It would set unacceptable precedents in the Conservation Area.

3. Trees

Two major trees, a lime and an ash, lie very close to the footprint of the garden house, whose foundations would put them at risk, contrary to the emollient statements in the arboricultural report. Our Tree Officer will have more to say on this., separately.

Please refuse.