



## **Jeff Radwell Associates**

3 The Square Richmond upon Thames Surrey TW9 1DY

T: 020 8332 0111 E: info@jeffradwell.co.uk

13<sup>th</sup> October 2011

Planning & Environment Department  
Camden Council  
Camden Town Hall Extension  
Argyle Street  
London WC1H 8EQ

Dear Sirs,

**Erection of single storey extension and second floor / roof gable end  
to existing dwelling at  
9 Minster Road London NW2 3SD**

We are instructed to submit the enclosed Planning Application on behalf of the current owners of the site, Dr. G. Fowler for the demolition of an existing lean-to building, erection of a single storey rear extension and second floor / roof gable end. In order for you to consider this application, the following documentation has been enclosed:

- 1) Householder Planning Application form signed and dated.
- 2) Certificate of ownership "B" signed and dated.
- 3) 1:100 scaled plans numbered 9.10/1 TP01 to TP08 inc.
- 4) Copy of Certificate of Lawfulness (2004/0650/P)
- 5) Drg. no. 9.10/1 TP10 - Satellite picture with proposals overlaid.
- 6) Drg. no. 9.10/1 TP09 - OS map at 1:1250 scale with site outlined in red.

The above documents have been submitted electronically via the planning portal. The fee will be paid direct to Camden Council ASAP in order for the application to be fully validated.

In support of this application, we would be grateful if the following points are taken into consideration:

1. The site is located in a residential street just off the A5 on land rising from Kilburn to Cricklewood. The existing three storey dwelling with approx. 270m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area is a semi-detached building on a site of approx. 0.032 ha which slopes up slightly to the south. The existing house has remained unaltered except for minor internal modifications and we believe there to be no previous planning history.
2. Permission is sought for a single storey extension of 39m<sup>2</sup> (gross area) to the rear of the existing building, subsequent to the demolition of the existing lean-to rear building of 10m<sup>2</sup> (gross area). Therefore the extension will only add a nett gain of 29m<sup>2</sup> to the existing footprint of 105m<sup>2</sup>. The extension has been carefully considered in terms of form, scale and materials used, to complement the local vernacular. The extension outlook has been positioned towards the garden with a reduction in side windows, thus reducing potential overlooking. The ground floor

internal space has been opened up achieving a contemporary family/kitchen space with strong links to the rear garden beyond via new double glazed sliding/folding door sets. In order for daylight to reach the existing lounge we have incorporated a roof mounted lantern light in keeping with the building style. Also the extension maintains the existing ceiling heights giving a sense of continuity internally. It is to be noted that the rear face of the proposed extension has been increased by only 2.5m in order to create a step in massing terms from the rear of No.7 & No.11. This is clearly demonstrated on drg. No. 9.10/1 TP10.

3. Permission is also sought for remodelling the rear most mono-pitch sloping roof to form a gable end. This achieves an efficient use of internal space without compromising the history or architecture of the building. The gable end roof extension integrates appropriately with the existing roofscape taking its design lead from the front gables. By using materials to match the existing and scale and style of windows, this extension again blends in well with its surroundings. It is proposed to have a double glazed doorset with a painted metal "Juliet Balcony" in front to complete this level. The brickwork at first floor level directly below the proposed gable end is in a poor state of repair. It is therefore proposed to rebuild the rear section of the building with matching brickwork to current building standards. This will enable all the brickwork to match both in material and detailing, harmonising both the proposed rear gable and ground floor extension work. The large sash window at first floor will be replaced with a new double glazed doorset as above with improved thermal performance and the addition of a painted metal "Juliet Balcony" in front.
4. Policy S4 makes housing a high priority. The proposals retain the buildings residential status and increase its life expectancy, by rebuilding the rear wall. The proposals also accord with Policy H3 by protecting and increasing the residential floorspace.
5. Policy SD6 seeks to avoid loss of amenity by any proposals. Again the upper and lower extensions have only windows to the rear, more than 18m from potentially overlooking 118 Fordwych Road situated at the end of the rear garden. There are no additional side windows proposed, but in fact the removal of one. With regards to the rear windows to No.11 we feel that their own rear extension has already created a negative effect on their least rear window (serving a corridor), creating a sense of enclosure and reduction in daylight/sunlight. We therefore consider that the proposed extension will have a minimal significance with regards to these factors.
6. Policy B1 seeks buildings designed to the highest standards. The proposals demonstrate this with a distinct improvement to the rear of the building and boundary treatment, thus adding attractiveness to the rear but keeping in context with its neighbours. The roofscape to the rear has no established pattern with many of its neighbours in this block having already been converted to other forms, giving rise to the opportunity to both improve and refine the crown of this building.
7. Policy B3 provides guidance on alterations and extensions. Although this policy is against "full width" rear extensions; a Certificate of Lawfulness for a full rear width extension proposal was granted on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2004 (Ref: 2004/0650/P). It is also to be considered that the proposed extension is restricted to only one storey high, is not in a conservation area and is shielded from the side street by its neighbour's extension at No.11. Reinforcing this point many of the buildings in this group have had full width extensions constructed thus breaking any previous harmonic composition. It must also be mentioned that there have been no losses in features

of value but both upper and lower extensions do improve the overall look. Importantly the "closet wing" has been retained and dominant contextually. With only a depth increase of 2.5m to the house, the garden is still maintained to a reasonable size and well within permitted allowances. Also the proposals retain high window heads with brick on edge detailing, corbelling to underside of gutters, using materials sympathetic to the original design and with the unsympathetic rear extension removed the architectural integrity of the building is not only retained but improved.

In conclusion we believe that the proposals fully accords with the Development Plan and Government Guidance, as well as meeting all the Development control standards. The extension proposed has been carefully sited and designed with minimal impact upon its neighbours in this dense urban area. We therefore envisage that the proposals are acceptable to the council. However, should you have any questions or issues that you wish to discuss relating this application please do not hesitate to contact us.

We hope the above is of assistance and await your positive response. An early response to this application would be greatly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

Jeff Radwell  
**Jeff Radwell Associates**

Enc.