



APPEAL BY:
Mrs Mina Dragojevic

AGAINST THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN COUNCIL'S REFUSAL
TO GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION FOR:

Erection of 1st floor rear extension with rooflight and attached roof terrace with
privacy screens

AT
12 Aldred Road, London, NW6 1AN

London Borough of Camden Council's Reference: 2023/1142/P

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS: RESPONSE TO LPA STATEMENT

October 2023

RJS PLANNING

T: 0208 3543582 M: 07884 138682 E: info@rjsplanning.co.uk
RJS Planning. 15 Vale Court, Ealing Road, Brentford, TW8 0LN

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This statement has been prepared by RJS Planning, on behalf of Mrs Mina Dragojevic, in response to the statement of the Local Planning Authority.

2.0 RESPONSE TO COUNCIL'S STATEMENT

2.1 The council state that their case is primarily set out in the delegated report and as this has already been fully addressed within the Appellant's Statement of Case (SoC) the following paragraphs will respond where appropriate to council's comments.

2.2 Response to point 1: The council's argument that there would no longer be any symmetry with the pair (No. 13) and the hipped roof would no longer look like a hipped roof fails to take into account the existing site situation.

2.3 Due to existing roof alterations at no. 12 the symmetry has already been reduced and thus, the changes now proposed would not significantly affect this existing situation.

2.4 Furthermore, the symmetry across the terrace group has also been affected due to the extension at no. 11, the different roofing materials which have been utilised as well as the different roof forms at nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5.

2.5 The appellant states that the changes to the hipped roof form are modest and retain an element of the roofslope that preserves its original character. As such, the roof terrace would appear subordinate and does not unacceptably affect the appearance of the roof form.

2.6 Response to point 2: Whilst the council refutes claims that the proposal would reduce visual clutter, it is evident that the development would have a positive impact on the character of the property providing an improved solution to the open style terrace which is currently in place.

2.7 Response to point 3: The council argue that there is no similar development within the immediate context, however, there is an existing roof terrace at the appeal site and there is a roof terrace at adjoining property no. 11. There are also other roof terraces within the group. Consequently, the council's assertions are inaccurate and other roof terraces within the locale serve to demonstrate that the proposal would be in keeping with the prevailing pattern of development.

2.8 Response to point 4: The appellant acknowledges that the existing property has some outdoor area available, however, this space is of limited use to the appellant who due to ongoing health concerns is at times confined to her bedroom. Direct

RJS PLANNING

access to outdoor space would have many positive impacts for the appellant in terms of both her mental and physical health which should weigh heavily in favour of the development.

3.0 SUGGESTED CONDITIONS

3.1 The appellant states that any conditions deemed reasonable and relevant to this particular case will be acceptable.

4.0 CONCLUSION

4.1 The appellant considers that the council have not put forward any compelling evidence to demonstrate that their original refusal was well founded. Therefore, the appellant states that the scheme would comply with the overall aims of the NPPF, policy D1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and policy 2 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015.