



Dear Mr Fitzpatrick and Development Management

Further to our invitation by email to allow Camden to perform a site visit from neighbouring properties to the above site in order to see the site in critical context, a leaflet from the applicant's architect was put through local doors on the afternoon of 28th March, just before the bank holiday weekend.

The applicant **did not engage** with us (or other neighbours) until we received this notification slipped under our door on the evening of Thursday, 28 March - the night before the Easter bank holiday weekend.

It suggested that their architect is willing to meet with recipients for a one hour slot on Wednesday, 3 April - a two working day notice, set during a time when almost every single school in England is out on holiday - in what can therefore only be described as a disingenuous attempt to try and suggest in future that they addressed the issues raised to date at such a meeting.

Perhaps the applicant will share their leaflet with you (no doubt they will do so in some form as they seek to obtain planning permission) and therefore we would point out the following rebuttals to their extremely misleading engagement.

On page 3 of the "Response to Objections" letter dropped through our letterbox on the evening of the Easter holiday there is a totally misleading suggestion of what is the "Existing view from 34 Downshire Hill". It looks as though it has been intentionally drawn from the ground directly underneath the single storey garden room at no. 35 Downshire Hill and does not at all represent the view from the house at 34 Downshire Hill. Therefore the "Proposed view from 34 Downshire" is also highly inaccurate and looks as though most of the property will be blocked by the garden room at 35 Downshire Hill when this is not the case at all.

In addition, the design makes it appear that the party wall between 34 and 35 is the same height as the wall between 34 Downshire Hill and 14a Keats Grove. The wall between 34 Downshire Hill and 14a Keats Grove is significantly lower than the wall between 34 Downshire Hill and 35 Downshire Hill.

Using a computer program to recreate a two dimensional view from a single (and unrealistic viewpoint) is not the same as looking from a property and how it is used on a daily basis.

The applicants and their agent have been highly selective, to say the least, in the presentation of the two story extension. A qualified architect must surely be aware the Protected Open Space is on a sloping site, so for example no 37 Downshire Hill is several metres higher up than those houses on South End Road or Keats Grove. Views

from No.35/36/37 Downshire or other viewpoints would for example be different from even the misleading views noted from 34 above.

The proposed extension clearly extends over the height of the decades ago consented single storey garden room at no.35 (not 1.5 story as bizarrely stated in the applicant's leaflet) and would be, by definition, twice the height of the studio room, moreover, the existing party wall between 35,36,34 and 14a . The idea that this proposed extension sits entirely in the shadow of the existing studio room at no.35 is for the birds. This can be seen, as an example, in this photo take from no36 Downshire Hill (the bottom line representing the roof of the single storey studio, the top line the proposed height for the two storey extension). The view from within the garden at no 36 (viewed from West to East) would be even more excessive.



Furthermore, the plan set out on **page 5 of the "Response to Objections"** is also inaccurate and out of date and especially misrepresentative given 14a's location in the centre of the open space. All of the extensions in the immediate area have been single storey. They have all been undertaken with care to follow Local and Neighbourhood plan policies - modest single storey extensions on rear elevations followed by long gardens, preserving the POS. The applicant refers to grouping in the middle of the POS - laughably suggesting that the single (and we repeat again, not 1.5 storey as the applicant bizarrely persists with) storey garden studio room and the proposed extension represent some kind of cohesive proposal. If anything this map highlights just how egregious the applicant's proposals is - standing out as extreme and in violation of the planning policies in comparison to all the others that have been highlighted.

In addition to the planning issues raised above and previously, we would point out that this application should potentially never have been validated. The application is clearly not accurate enough (through lack of competence or worse we do not know) to even be assessed properly and we reserve our rights in this regard.

With kind regards

Julian and Nicola Sinclair
36 Downshire Hill, London NW3 1NU