
From: Simon Jones [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 July 2023 11:02
To: Kate Henry
Subject: RE: 2023/1860/P - 19 Daleham Gardens
Attachments: 19 DALEHAM GDNS NW3 5BY - EXISTING GARAGE, DRIVE & FRONT WALL PLAN - AMENDED.pdf; 19 DALEHAM GDNS NW3 5BY - PROPOSED GARAGE, DRIVE & FRONT WALL - AMENDED.pdf

[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.

Good Morning Kate,

I have now had a chance to go through the proposals and do some research into alternative suitable garage doors. I have attached revised drawings for us to discuss, The existing plan has been amended to show the existing crossover position and parking bay in the road.

- Regarding the proposed alterations, the garage door generally poses a lot of constraints as it cannot open outwards due to the sloping drive, additionally a traditional up and over door going inwards will not work due to the low ceiling inside the garage which is why a roller shutter was proposed originally. I have found what I believe will be a good alternative in the form of a vertical bifold door, which can be made in timber to give a traditional appearance. The operation is a little complex, but when closed it would just look like a 'normal' timber garage door with a horizontal join at mid-height. I have added additional notation to make it clear regarding raising the garage opening, which as explained is not increasing in height, it is just moving vertically to suit the raised drive level. This is actually the same as for the roller shutter. As we are now not having a roller shutter I have removed the moulded timber fascia which was originally shown to conceal the roller shutter box. I have shown a brick soldier course over the opening instead to match the opening above at ground floor level. You will see from the original photographs with the application that the existing opening just has standard brick courses on the lintel, which I always feel look incorrect, but I am happy to revert to this if it is preferred.
- The front opening has been reduced in width so that the pier aligns with the existing crossover. This increases the opening by approx. 163mm over the existing giving a finished width of approx. 3050mm (reduced from 3400mm on the original proposal. For understanding the original 3400mm width was based on matching the pier/crossover relationship of the neighbouring property at no.21, where the pier sits beyond the crossover line).
- The proposed sliding gate across the vehicular entrance has been reduced in height to match the existing railings to the l/h side of the brick pier. In light of your comments the design has also been simplified to remove the decorative panels and wavy railings.

I hope you feel the above has addressed the issues raised and you now find the proposal acceptable.

Best

Simon Jones
Cox & Jones Ltd

Cox & Jones Ltd
14 Donnington Road
Worcester Park
Surrey
KT4 8EN

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Bespoke Conservatory & Joinery Specialists
Service & Maintenance
Architectural Services

From: Kate Henry <Kate.Henry@camden.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 July 2023 14:14
To: Simon Jones [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 2023/1860/P - 19 Daleham Gardens

Dear Simon,

Thanks, I will wait to hear from you.

Kate

Kate Henry
Principal Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 3794



From: Simon Jones [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 July 2023 15:51
To: Kate Henry <Kate.Henry@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: 2023/1860/P - 19 Daleham Gardens

[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.

Dear Kate,

Thank you for your email and comments. I have a clearer understanding now on what may be achieved and developed.

I can see the highlighted sentence isn't clear. What I was meaning is that the opening itself isn't increasing in height, it is just moving up relative to the drive level being raised. If it isn't raised inline with the drive the opening will be too low for entry. I have been careful to maintain a lower relationship with the openings on the neighbouring property.

I will address the other comments early next week.

Kind Regards

Simon Jones
Cox & Jones Ltd
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

On 6 Jul 2023, at 12:26, Kate Henry <Kate.Henry@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Simon,

Thanks for your emails. Please see my comments below in **red** for both emails.

Kate Henry
Principal Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 3794

<image001.png>

<image003.png>

<image005.png>

<image007.jpg>

From: Simon Jones [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 July 2023 11:20
To: Kate Henry <Kate.Henry@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: 2023/1860/P - 19 Daleham Gardens

[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.

Good Morning Kate Henry

Just following on from my email yesterday, I have attached some photographs of other same period properties in Daleham Gdns that have sliding gates across the vehicle entrances. I'm sure you will have already seen them but.....

No.16. diagonally opposite no.19. has white twisted railings and gates. **A quick search suggests this was approved in 2011, which is before the current Local Plan was published and also before the publication of the Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Plan (Dec 2022) which specifically notes that metal gates create hard urban frontages, causing harm to the verdant character of the area. It also states that boundary treatments should complement existing streetscape character and that parking areas should be screened behind a low wall or hedge and include landscaping as part of the design and layout. The white gates shown in the picture cause harm to the character and appearance of the wider area in my personal opinion,**

No.15. 2 doors down from no.19 has black iron railings and gates. (Shown open on photo). **This was approved in 2008.**

No.2. Has double width black iron gates and railings. (Shown open on photo). **I can't find the planning history for this gate.**

I hope this helps for reference and comparison.

Kind Regards

Simon Jones
Cox & Jones Ltd
[REDACTED]

<image009.jpg>

<image010.jpg>

<image011.jpg>

Sent from my iPhone

On 5 Jul 2023, at 16:16, Simon Jones [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Kate Henry

Thank you for your email with comments on application case 2023/1860/P.

I have just left a voicemail for you as I'd like to talk through the points raised before making any changes to the drawings and application. Clearly it would be better if we can discuss the points raised, but in the meantime I have replied to the points below.

Acceptable subject to change

1. The proposed widening of the vehicular opening is acceptable, in principle; however, the Council's Transport officers would not support the widening of the crossover and have therefore suggested an increase in width to circa 3 metres rather than 3.4 metres. This is also in accordance with the guidance in [Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Plan \(Dec 2022\)](#) which notes that hard surfacing should be employed sparingly and the Council will resist any further loss of front boundary walls.
2. (The plans need to be amended to illustrate the dropped kerb / crossover and parking bay.)

Regarding the vehicular opening, I can see the drawings do not make it clear that there is no intention to widen the crossover or reduce any parking bays. The widening of the opening is to ease vehicular access as the existing is tight when turning in from the road. The crossover and parking bays are to remain as existing. Does this still mean the widening of the opening will be restricted to 3m? **Yes, so that it does not look awkward next to the crossover and where the kerb meets the wall. Happy to comment on this further once the crossover and parking bay are marked on the plans.**

Not acceptable

3. The proposed sliding gate is not acceptable as it is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the conservation area, contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the [Camden Local Plan](#).

I do not understand the point regarding not allowing the sliding gate. There are several other same period properties in Daleham Gardens that have sliding gates, most of which have not gone to the detail of replicating the original railings to make it blend in. Is it the height that is the issue or just that the gate will not be allowed? **See comments above about other precedents. The height and design are problematic as they are**

too ornate / defensive and detract from the character and appearance of the host building and streetscene insofar as the opening was designed to remain open, to allow views in towards the building from the street rather than the building feeling gated off.

4. The increase in height of the garage entrance and the roller shutter door are not acceptable as they would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area, contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan.

The reason for raising the drive is that currently no standard cars can access the drive and garage as it is too steep from pavement level. This means cars bottom out on the crest of the drive scraping and damaging vehicles and the drive. The only vehicles that currently clear the drive are high ground clearance 4x4's and vans etc. Even then some vans will not clear (my Mercedes Vito van for example scrapes on the bottom). If the drive is raised as proposed to allow vehicles to use it, then the garage opening needs to be raised accordingly otherwise you cannot access the garage. **We are not proposing increasing the height of the opening, just raising it inline with the raised level of the drive.** The opening has been kept to a minimum height to ensure it stays below the adjacent opening on the neighbouring property, exactly as the relationship with the openings at raised ground floor level above between the two properties. Therefore the raised garage opening reads consistently at both levels. We can look at a different approach to the garage door, if it the roller shutter door that is not acceptable or is it the whole proposal? I can forward some videos of the vehicles access problems if it helps. **The main issue is the roller shutter door. I'm happy to look at alternative options for the door, which are more in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building. I take your point about needing to increase the height of the opening - I think the sentence highlighted yellow is wrong. Please try and keep the increased height to a minimum.**

5. The increase in size of the garage to allow additional parking on site is not acceptable as it is contrary to the aims of Policy T2 of the Local Plan which seeks to limit the availability of parking in the borough.

We are not proposing increasing the size of the garage we are proposing removing an internal rear wall inside the garage to increase useable capacity. The rear wall to the garden is existing and will remain in place. I have attached a photograph of the area from the rear garden which will help understanding. **I didn't get the attachment I'm afraid. Removal of an internal wall would not require planning permission.**

If you could contact me to run through things. I can then amend as required.

Kind Regards

Simon Jones
Cox & Jones Ltd

Cox & Jones Ltd
14 Donnington Road
Worcester Park
Surrey
KT4 8EN



From: Kate Henry <Kate.Henry@camden.gov.uk>

Sent: 05 July 2023 14:10

To: Simon Jones [REDACTED]

Subject: 2023/1860/P - 19 Daleham Gardens

Good afternoon,

Re: 2023/1860/P - 19 Daleham Gardens - Proposed alterations to front boundary treatment including reconstruction of front wall and creation of enlarged vehicular entrance with electrically operated sliding gate, enlargement of garage entrance, installation of roller shutter and regrading of driveway and garage floor.

I am the case officer allocated to write up the above case. I make the following comments:

Acceptable

6. The reconstruction of the front wall is acceptable.
7. Re-grading the garage floor would not require planning permission (however, see later comment about acceptability of increase in size of garage).

Acceptable subject to change

8. The proposed widening of the vehicular opening is acceptable, in principle; however, the Council's Transport officers would not support the widening of the crossover and have therefore suggested an increase in width to circa 3 metres rather than 3.4 metres. This is also in accordance with the guidance in [Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Plan \(Dec 2022\)](#) which notes that hard surfacing should be employed sparingly and the Council will resist any further loss of front boundary walls.
9. (The plans need to be amended to illustrate the dropped kerb / crossover and parking bay.)

Not acceptable

10. The proposed sliding gate is not acceptable as it is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the conservation area, contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the [Camden Local Plan](#).
11. The increase in height of the garage entrance and the roller shutter door are not acceptable as they would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area, contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan.
12. The increase in size of the garage to allow additional parking on site is not acceptable as it is contrary to the aims of Policy T2 of the Local Plan which seeks to limit the availability of parking in the borough.

Please could you let me know how you'd like to proceed. I can refuse the application in its current form for the reasons outlined above or you can make the necessary amendments for me to recommend approval. Please could

you let me know within 5 working days. If I do not hear from you I will proceed to refuse the application.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Kate Henry
Principal Planning Officer
Regeneration and Planning
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 3794
Web: camden.gov.uk

5PS
London N1C 4AG

<image001.jpg>

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.