



30 Daleham Gardens London NW3 5DD

Tim Cronin,
Development Control Service Manager,
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

RECEIVED 17 OCT 2007

16 October 2007

Dear Mr Cronin,

Revised scheme (Planning permission ref. 2006/0477/P): minor residential alterations – to provide a dormer window in place of 4 rooflights

Please find enclosed,

- 3 copies of our duly completed planning application form
- 3 copies of the architect's revised drawings ref. 02337/TP1/01C & 02A. Please note, these drawings are revisions of those application for which planning permission has been granted and employ the same layout and scales. Accordingly, the existing and proposed plans and elevations (scale 1:100) and the location drawing (scale)1:1250 are on drawing /01C
- 3 copies of conservation rooflight drawing 11060-23 (please note, this is the identical drawing for which there is existing planning permission)
- signed and witnessed s.106 Agreement

This is a revised version of the scheme for which planning permission was granted on appeal last July (Camden ref. 2006/0477/P): consequently, (1) we understand that no planning application fee is payable; (2) we have omitted further photographs and a separate design and access statement.

Before our architect prepared the revised drawings we e-mailed the planning officer and also the Assistant Director, as attached, to invite Camden's design in-put, as recommended by national planning policy guidance. Unfortunately, we did not receive a response.

Nevertheless, this revised scheme benefits from Camden's earlier advice and also from that of the planning inspector. In her letter to us dated 20 September 2006 the Assistant Director, Anne Doherty, expresses a preference for a scheme

incorporating a dormer rather than the line of rooflights proposed by application 2006/0466/P. Additionally, the planning history of the revised scheme also includes, as well as the existing planning permission, the Council's refusal of two previous applications to develop the attic as a self-contained flat incorporating a dormer. Although planning permission was refused the planning inspector's decision letter approves the principal of a dormer in the proposed position (permission was refused on other grounds): see paragraphs 12-15 of the decision letter dated 23 August 2006.

The proposed scheme is modelled on a design considered acceptable by the inspector, with the difference that the windows closest to the existing dormer of the adjoining flat, Flat E, would be replaced by skylights (top rooflights). These are shown on the elevation drawing but in fact would not be visible from the street/ground. The change enables most of the dormer, and all of that part of it visible from any public viewpoint, to be fully tile-clad. The dormer would have only one conventional window which would be positioned at the further end away from the adjoining flat's dormer and at an acute angle to it. This position is concealed by the existing chimney from the street and so the window would not be visible from any public viewpoint. This new arrangement provides a greater degree of separation than other local developments for which the Council has granted planning permission in recent years, for example, 23 Fitzjohn's Avenue.

The design shares the same essential design concept as the approved scheme. The round window and conservation rooflights would be the same as those for which there is planning permission. All other materials (tiles, brick) would match the corresponding existing features of the building. The proposed access is unchanged from the approved scheme.

The revised scheme would be subject to a s.106 Agreement in the same terms as that imposed on the existing, approved scheme. Enclosed with this application is an Agreement in the same terms, signed by us and ready for sealing by the Council.

As mentioned above, we would have appreciated Camden's input at the design stage but in view of the non-response to our e-mails have had to proceed without this. With the help of our architect, we have made great efforts to develop a final design which we trust will anyway be acceptable to the Council and which we hope will be positively welcomed by it.

Yours sincerely,



Christopher & Jan Balogh

30 Daleham Gardens London NW3 5DD

Vanessa Leddre,
Development Control Service Manager,
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

Yr ref. 2007/5321/

30 October 2007


Dear Ms Leddre,

Incomplete planning application

Revised scheme (Planning permission ref. 2006/0477/P): minor residential alterations

1. Further to the Council's letter dated 26 October and to our telephone conversation yesterday,
 - 1) please find enclosed , as agreed, 3 copies each of the drawings approved on appeal under Council ref. 2006/0477/P (paragraph 2 of the Inspector's decision letter dated 17 July 2007, which is on the website, specifically refers).
 - 2) You very kindly agreed that in the circumstances (a) the Council would accept the red outlining of the development site on the application drawings already submitted; and (b) our covering letter might also serve as our design and access statement.
 - 3) I confirmed that works have not commenced.
2. Please also find enclosed a revised, amended covering letter. Please use this in place of the previous version dated 16 October (which should be destroyed). It is re-dated with today's date, refers to the copy approved appeal drawings enclosed with this letter and makes further amendments which I hope make it clearer.

Yours sincerely,



Christopher & Jan Balogh

30 OCT 2007

30 Daleham Gardens London NW3 5DD

Tim Cronin,
Development Control Service Manager,
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

26/10

30 October 2007

Dear Mr Cronin,

Revised scheme (Planning permission ref. 2006/0477/P): minor residential alterations – to provide a dormer window

Please find enclosed,

- 3 copies of our duly completed planning application form
- 3 copies of the architect's revised drawings ref. 02337/TP1/01C & 02A. Please note, these drawings are revisions of those for which planning permission has been granted and employ the same layout and scales with existing and proposed plans and elevations (scale 1:100) and the location drawing (scale) 1:1250 on drawing /01C
- 3 copies of drawings 02337/TP1/01A & /02. This is the amended drawing submitted with our appeal against rejection of planning application ref. 2006/0477/P and approved by the Inspector under ref. APP/X5210/A/06/2027133 (see paragraph 2 of his decision letter dated 17 July 2007)
- 3 copies of conservation rooflight drawing 11060-23. This is the identical drawing for which planning permission has been granted
- signed and witnessed s.106 Agreement

This is a revised version of the scheme for which planning permission was granted on appeal last July (Camden ref. 2006/0477/P): consequently, (1) we understand that no planning application fee is payable; (2) we have not provided further photographs nor a design and access statement (other than this letter).

Before our architect prepared the revised drawings we e-mailed the planning officer and also the Assistant Director, as attached, to invite Camden's design in-put, as recommended by national planning policy guidance. Although, unfortunately, we did not receive a response the revised scheme nevertheless benefits from Camden's earlier advice and also from that of the Planning Inspector. In her letter to us dated 20 September 2006 the Assistant

RECEIVED
30 OCT 2007

Director, Anne Doherty, expressed a preference for a scheme incorporating a dormer rather than the line of rooflights proposed by application 2006/0477/P for which permission had been granted on appeal. Additionally, the planning history of the revised scheme includes, as well as the existing planning permission, the Council's refusal of two previous applications to develop the attic as a self-contained flat incorporating a dormer which we appealed unsuccessfully. Although planning permission was refused paragraphs 12-15 of the Planning Inspector's decision letter dated 23 August 2006 specifically approves the principal of a dormer in the proposed position (permission was refused on other grounds).

The proposed scheme is modelled on one of the designs considered acceptable by the inspector, with the difference that the windows closest to the existing dormer of the adjoining flat, Flat E, would be replaced by skylights (top rooflights) and two rooflights at the front. The skylights are shown on the elevation drawing but would not in fact be visible from the street/ground. The change enables most of the dormer, and all of that part of it visible from any public viewpoint, to be fully tile-clad. The dormer would have only one conventional window, positioned at the further end from the adjoining flat's dormer and at an acute angle to it to maximise separation, providing a greater degree of separation between the adjoining units than other local developments for which the Council has granted planning permission in recent years, for example, 23 Fitzjohn's Avenue. The proposed window would be concealed from street view by the existing chimney and would not therefore be visible from any public viewpoint. The revised scheme results in an overall reduction in the number of rooflights from the 7 approved on appeal to 5 (excluding skylights).

The design concept of the revised scheme is essentially the same as the approved scheme's. The round window and conservation rooflights would be the same as those for which there is planning permission. All other materials (tiles, brick) would match the corresponding existing features of the building. The proposed access is unchanged from the approved scheme.

The revised scheme would be subject to a s.106 Agreement in the same terms as that imposed on the existing, approved scheme. Enclosed with this application is an Agreement in the same terms, signed by us and ready for sealing by the Council.

As mentioned above, we would have appreciated Camden's additional input. With the help of our architect and benefiting from the guidance in the Assistant Director's and planning appeal decision letters we have made great efforts to develop a final design which we trust will anyway be acceptable to the Council and which we hope will in fact be positively welcomed by it.

Yours sincerely,

Christopher & Jan Balogh