

From: "Heavey, Eimear" <Eimear.Heavey@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: **RE: 517 - 7a Buckland Crescent**
Date: 17 September 2008 16:03:44 BST
To: "Peter Camp" <eca@freenet.co.uk>

Dear Mr Camp,

Yes, if you wish you may send your query to the conservation team at the address below. As you are aware I have dealt with your query by email and subsequently spent time on the phone explaining things to you and I cannot offer any more advice unfortunately.

The address for the conservation team is as follows:
Conservation & Design Team
6th Floor
Development Control Planning Services
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall, Argyle St, WC1H 8ND

Kind regards,

Eimear

From: Peter Camp [mailto:eca@freenet.co.uk]
Sent: 17 September 2008 13:57
To: Heavey, Eimear
Cc: angelinakohli@btconnect.com
Subject: 517 - 7a Buckland Crescent

Dear Eimear Heavey,

Thank you for your response to my email of the 8 August 2008, and are subsequent telephone call last Thursday.

I note your comments below and have tried to reconcile our conversation on the phone last week with your written response. There seem to be a number of queries which I would like to clarify as follows and I have made comments in red under each one of your points below.

Kind regards

Peter Camp

Elliot Camp Associates - Architects
78 Albert Street
London NW1 7NR
M: +44 (0) 7788 17 4660

From: "Heavey, Eimear" <Eimear.Heavey@camden.gov.uk>
Date: 28 August 2008 08:56:42 BST
To: <eca@freenet.co.uk>, <angelinakohli@btconnect.com>
Subject: **7a Buckland Crescent**

Dear Mr Camp,

Further to your email of 8th August regarding the above property, I can offer the following advice;
The previous Permission for the above property to which you refer to in your correspondence was granted in 2001 for a full width extension of 8.8m x 5m and you have stated that you wish to extend this by a further 2 metres. However, from the plans it appears that this permission was never implemented and would therefore have since lapsed. -

I presume you are referring to "Application N° PWX0002795/R1 - Granted 26 Feb 2001 - Lower Ground Floor Flat - Erection of single storey rear extension at Lower ground floor level to accommodate a kitchen/dining room area for an existing self contained flat." This application was in fact an addition to an existing rear extension and is shown shaded green on the attached drawing (517.01) I sent you on the 8th August. This consent extends the existing lower ground floor extension into the garden by a further 1.85m.

Notwithstanding this, Camden's Replacement UDP, Policy B3 requires extensions to be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and size, whilst our Planning Guidance has a presumption against full width extensions given that they can

dominate the original building in terms of bulk and form.

In light of this, and given that the property is located within a Conservation Area, it is unlikely that a further permission for a larger full width extension would be considered favourably.

However, in the plans you have submitted it appears that the extension is not full width and is in fact an extension of the previous addition to the lower ground floor. It is likely that an extension of this type would be considered acceptable in principle given that it would be subservient to the original property.

This paragraph indicates that in your opinion our proposal shown on the attached drawing 517.30 would be considered favourable from the planning point of view. As you will see our proposal (shaded red & green) provides a new extension which extends into the garden by approx 7.5m as you mention in your paragraph below, but only from the "existing rear elevation" and not from the "existing extension". The existing extension extends into the rear garden by 3.25m.

Notwithstanding this, I feel that at a depth of 7.5 metres from the existing extension it would appear almost like a separate entity from the host building and would therefore detract from the surrounding Conservation Area. The depth of the proposed extension should therefore be reduced significantly.

Since planning consent was granted for the area shaded green (Nº PWX0002795/R1) and our proposal is for a single storey extension/conservatory extending into the garden by a further 2.5m, the query we still have is how much of this 2.5m is acceptable to you and would be considered favourable. The proposal is not for a extension/conservatory across the full width of the garden as you rightly point out.

We would draw your attention to our attached drawing 517.32 which shows the relationship of the proposal and the existing two storey extension which presently exists on the site. The relationship of the proposed extension with the existing two storey extension is in our view an agreeable one, and in no way gives the impression of being a "separate entity" from the host building, there being an easy angle of 21° from the eaves of each extension.

We would appreciate your views on this matter in a little more detail if that is possible, and we would of course be willing to incorporate any minor alterations to the design and style which eases your concerns on this particular point.

Would it be useful to consult with one of your Conservation Area Officers to gain further useful comments before making a formal application.

The materials you have proposed for the extension appear to be sensitive to their surroundings.

With regards to the proposed lift, it is not evident from the plans where exactly the proposed works to the ground floor entrance will take place and if there will be a change in the entrance to the ground floor. If you wish to forward me some plans with this information included I can get back to you on this matter.

The lift is located to the front of the building and is shown on the flank elevation 517.32. It is located directly in front of the existing front door. It is proposed that this is a scissor lift with minimum impact on the general surroundings.

As I mentioned to you during our telephone conversation, my client and I are very keen to liaise with the planning department and conservation area department, in order to get a better idea of what is or is not acceptable. We appreciate you have a great deal of work to do, but the simple fact is that to make a planning application at this stage, which is clearly "unfavourable" in your view would be an error of judgment on our part. With better liaison with the planning department the more likelihood of success and the less work in the long run. I hope you agree with this view.

In the meantime I look forward to hearing from you in due course and thank you for your time and effort.

Kind regards,

Eimear Heavey

Planning Officer (West Team)
Development Control Planning Services
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall, Argyle St, WC1H 8ND
Direct Dial: 020 7974 3070
Email: eimear.heavey@camden.gov.uk

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer

From: "Wito, Alan" <Alan.Wito@Camden.gov.uk>
Subject: **FW: 7A Buckland Crescent**
Date: 12 November 2008 18:39:54 GMT
To: <eca@freenet.co.uk>

Dear Mr Camp

I'll try sending this again as it was returned because your inbox was full.

Regards

Alan Wito

From: Wito, Alan
Sent: 11 November 2008 19:16
To: 'eca@freenet.co.uk'
Subject: 7A Buckland Crescent

Dear Mr Camp

I write further to my site visit to the above property. You have already received pre application advice from my colleague in development control, Eimear Heavey (enq/29502). Having reviewed the plans submitted, the approval at number 9 Buckland Crescent I have to say that I share many of the views expressed by my colleague.

Permission was granted in 2001 for an extension (shaded green on the plans) but this was never implemented. Whilst a extension of the same dimensions may gain planning permission I feel that the proposed addition shaded in red is excessive and creates a further fragmented and disjointed rear elevation with an extension which projects further into the garden and would not be subservient to the parent building. There would be a situation at ground floor where the extension would have various widths and depths with different design treatments and then the existing conservatory perched on top. It would be much better if a degree of formality could be reintroduced by having the rear line on a single plain with a cohesive design treatment. In terms of the design I would advise that the approach taken at number 9 with a rendered walls and French doors would be more appropriate.

The extension approved at number 9 is smaller in width than your proposal and as such I do not consider it a precedent for your scheme in terms of any rear building line. On site there were also reservations regarding the accuracy of the plans regarding the depth of the extension to number 9.

Regards

Alan Wito
Conservation and design officer
Conservation and design
Culture and environment
London Borough of Camden
Phone: 020 7974 6392
Fax: 020 7974 1930

Town Hall, Judd Street, London, WC1H 9JE
Visit camden.gov.uk for the latest council information and news

The advice set out in this e-mail is the advice of an officer and is without prejudice to further consideration of this matter by the Development Control Section or to the Council's formal decision.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer

From: Peter Camp <eca@freenet.co.uk>
Subject: **517 Buckland Cres**
Date: 8 December 2008 12:30:15 GMT
To: angelinakohli@btconnect.com
1 Attachment, 164 KB

Dear Angelina,

Good news - I have spoken to Mr Wito and he has clarified a number of points in his letter of 11 November which even he felt were somewhat unclear.

The upshot is as follows:

1. He feels that the proposed extension projects into the garden too much and therefore suggests that it is set back by approx 2.2m as shown on the attached plan 517.40 Scheme 4.

This has an impact on the internal layout which I will come to later.

2. In addition to this he feels that the extension should go all the way across so that it reads as one element on the facade of the new extension itself.

I attach drawing 517.40 Scheme 4 showing the alterations to the internal layout due to his requirements.

3. As you can see I have therefore changed the position of the kitchen to more or less where it is at the moment.

4. I have taken the brickwork between the two existing openings from you existing sitting room so that the new extension reads as one long room - rather like your next door neighbours.

5. have altered the window/sliding door configuration on the new rear elevation to the extension to provide two new doors as shown.

6. The study is where the kitchen was in Scheme 3.

7. The kitchen shown in Scheme 4 can be open - which is what I would recommend - but could also be enclosed if needs be.

8. Have reduced the top lite glazing and provided three roof lights - one over the study, one over the dining area and one over the sitting area.

9. There is quite a lot of structural beams which need to go in but will explain these when next we meet. These structural matters will not affect the planning issues but will need to be discussed in more detail as to how we can achieve the open plan arrangement without internal load bearing walls.

Let me know what you would like to do next - but I think we may be on the verge of an application sooner than later.

It is important to get the external envelope sorted out with the planner and the internal arrangements can be altered and changed later within the agreed envelope.

Hope all is well and look forward to hearing from you.

