

Mayamiko Kachingwe & Barbara Storch
21 Boscastle Road
London
NW5 1EE

Wednesday, 08 May 2024

Objection to Application 2024/0306/P

Site Address: 23 Boscastle Road London Camden NW5 1EE

Description: Ground floor rear extension and associated rooflights, loft conversion, 3x rooflights on each of the existing front and rear roof slopes, rebuilding of the existing front boundary wall

This addendum to the objection dated 21 March 2024 is submitted in response to additional material posted to the portal subsequent to that date.

1. Side section drawings

We note that the applicants have provided new side section drawings. However, the applicants have not provided revised, accurate rear elevations of the proposed structure alongside the neighbouring properties (ie replacing the inaccurate rear elevations previously provided). The drawings submitted to support the application thus remain inaccurate.

Further, the new side section drawings provided do not set out dimensions translated to topological levels in relation to the measured survey (which would allow for an accurate and objective comparison of the dimensions of the proposed structure to the known dimensions of the adjoining properties, and in particular to 21 Boscastle Road).

The failure to provide accurate rear elevations of the proposed structure alongside neighbouring properties, and the failure to provide measurements of the proposed structure that enable transparent comparability of the scale of the proposed structure to neighbouring properties appears consistent with a deliberate effort to avoid direct scrutiny of the true scale of the proposed structure relative to adjoining properties. It is of course the detail of this relative scale that forms the basis of the objections set out in our previous submission.

The additional information provided by the applicants to date does not correct inaccuracies in the applicants' previous submissions, and fails to rebut the points made in our objection letter. The points set out in our objection letter of 21 March 2024 remain valid, and thus our objection stands unamended.

2. Pre-application guidance

We have reviewed the pre-application guidance dated 12 January 2024 and note in particular the caveat in that letter that "this document represents an initial informal officer view of [the] proposals based on the information available to us at this stage".

There are three key pieces of information that have been provided as part of the formal planning process that were not available when the pre-planning guidance was provided:

- (i) First, as set out in our objection dated 21 March 2024, and re-iterated in this letter, the information provided by the applicants as at the date of the pre-application guidance with regard to the scale of the planned works is inaccurate.
- (ii) Second, our objection letter of 21 March 2024 provided new information by way of more accurate measures of the scale of the planned works in relation to neighbouring properties.

It also set out in detail the grounds for rejection of the application based on those measurements.

- (iii) Third, the planning process has revealed the inability of the applicants to rebut the points set out in our objection as to the relative scale of their proposed structure (for example by providing either (i) accurate rear elevations (including comparisons to neighbouring properties), or (ii) drawings that set out dimensions translated to topological levels in relation to the measured survey).

The formal planning process has therefore revealed new information, unavailable at the time the pre-application guidance was given, that would give robust grounds for the pre-application guidance to be reversed. It would also leave the failure to do so – without transparent justification – open to subsequent challenge.

Conclusion

The additional information provided by the applicants to date does not correct inaccuracies in the applicants' previous submissions, and fails to rebut the points made in our objection letter. The points set out in our objection letter of 21 March 2024 remain valid, and thus our objection stands unamended.

The formal planning process has revealed new information, unavailable at the time the pre-application guidance was given, that would give robust grounds for the pre-application guidance to be reversed. It would also leave the failure to do so – without transparent justification – open to subsequent challenge.

Yours sincerely

Mayamiko Kachingwe, Barbara Storch