

From: Ben Phillips
Sent: 17 July 2023 15:05
To: Planning Planning
Subject: 2023/1971/P - Comments on planning application

[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 Duty Determination Team

Re: Planning application 2023/1971/P - Objection

. We provided comments objecting to the application on 30 June. We are now providing further comments in relation to the amended drawings that were made available online on 12 July.

We welcome the reduction in the size of the proposed first floor (FF) extension. However, we maintain our objection in respect of the size of the proposed ground floor (GF) extension, which has not changed in the amended drawings. We refer to our comments of 30 June, which set out in detail our reasons for objecting, but in sum:

Recent extensions to properties along the terrace, including at no 46 and no 42, have adopted a similar build line to one another. The proposed GF extension would extend far beyond the established building line and, as a result, would be detrimental to neighbours and the established character of this part of the street.

The proposed GF extension would not be subordinate to the host building, would protrude 2.15m beyond the extension wall of no 46 and (unlike the existing outrigger) would be full width. It would also (again, unlike the existing outrigger) loom approximately 1.2m above the boundary fence between no 46 and no 47. This would be overly intrusive and cause a sense of enclosure. No 46 would also receive significantly less sun and light under the proposals, as shown by the Daylight and Sunlight Report provided with the application.

The proposed GF extension occupies an excessive part of the garden and is contrary to Policy D1 Design and Policy D2 Heritage as

outlined in the Camden Local Plan 2017, to the Inkerman Conservation Area Statement and to Camden Planning Guidance 2021.

We therefore maintain that the proposed GF extension (as well as the proposed FF extension) should be no greater than the extension at no 46 (and we note that the extension at no 46 was itself initially turned down by the council as too bulky on the basis of height and width).

We would invite the Case Officer to visit no 46 in order to view the proposed extension from the perspective of our garden. Further, we are of course very happy to answer any queries in relation to these comments or our 30 June comments.

Kind regards

Ben Phillips