

From: stephen kapos

Date: 17 December 2024 at 03:43:49 GMT

To: Adam Afford

**Subject: Planning Application for alteration to Rear Addition terrace of Flat 2),
22 Lupton Street NW5 2HT.**

16th December 2024.



16.12.2024; Monday.

To: Mr Adam Afford,
Planning Officer,
London Borough of Camden.

Dear Mr Afford,

Alterations to Rear Addition terrace of Flat 2), 22 Lupton Street London NW5
2HT.

Further to our telephone conversation of today I am writing to confirm my

comments made to you as set out below.

My name is Stephen Kapos and I am the Leaseholder of flat 3), the 2nd+3rd floor maisonette at 22 Lupton Street, directly above Flat 2).

I also have a Rear Addition terrace, overlooking that of Flat 2), and I have been a Leaseholder and resident at this address continuously since the completion of the original conversion (Lease signed 24.04.1989).

I am a retired architect and as a Partner in my partnership of Hexon Architects had repeatedly worked with our Clients the then Housing Department of LBC on many conversion projects in the 1970s to 1990s.(ref Mr Robin Dickinson then Head of housing projects).

I am also a Co-Director of 22 Lupton Street RTM Co Ltd., a 'Right To Manage' ('RTM') self-management company set up to manage no 22 Lupton Street on behalf of the Freeholders.

With regard to the Flat 2) terrace my comments are:

(1) I am emphatically in support of the present planning application.

It concerns very minor, non-structural additions to an existing terrace; with original planning approval granted to the developers of the conversion in a letter by LBC dated 23.05.1988.

The two terraces of the building have been in continuous use from inception to the present date.

(2) The original surface of both rear addition terraces (of flats 2 & 3) was 75 mm walkable rock asphalt.

This material has a lifetime of 30 yrs max expected, but perished in parts after 20-25 years in our case.

The replacement proprietary more modern sheet material re-surfacing required protection to make it 'walkable'; hence the introduction later of light timber slatted decking (on both terraces of the building).

(3) Both terraces of the building have 125mm solid brick parapet walls on three sides of approx 900mm height.

The submitted design of the Flat 2) terrace contains a timber planter on top of the parapet wall towards the LBC council estate side (opposite side to adjacent no 20 Lupton street's flat roof).

The planter has a light timber 'pergola' type frame added to it to accommodate some loose decorative climbing plant greenery to an approx 2200mm total height from deck level — as can be estimated when viewed from the 2nd floor level (my own) terrace.

None of this is unsightly or in any way out-of-keeping with the varied treatments of surrounding rear garden terraces and the framework is flimsy enough to be clearly regarded as temporary. It doesn't obstruct any neighbours' views or reduce anyone's right of daylight.

(4) The original planning permission above contains a condition: (namely '02') to provide a screen to a height of 1.8m on the terrace side adjacent to the flat roof of no 20Lupton Street.

It's reasonable to assume that the intention of this condition was to safeguard the privacy of a potential adjacent terrace use of the no 20 flat roof. This screen was not erected in the event as no such adjacent terrace materialised over the past 36 years.

(5) However, a later side extension of flat 1) on the opposite side did recently incorporate a very large rooflight. This new rooflight allows unrestricted views into Flat1) and is in need of/much helped by privacy screening — in the spirit that planning condition '02' had previously established.

The temporary timber screen + planter together provide this

privacy screening to the Flat 1) side extension.

(see photo illustration attached, above, taken from the Flat 3) terrace).

I trust that you will find all the above helpful towards your determination and please do not hesitate to request any further clarification as needed.

With season's greetings,

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Kapos

Ps.: as I said when we talked —

I was very surprised indeed that the above minor and positive additions merit a formal planning application.

In my time such minor alterations would not merit more than a short note of confirmation to the LBC planners.

It's a distraction all round from much more important work.?! sk.