CHASE & PARTNERS

Retail & Leisure Property Specialists



Department of Planning & Transportation Camden Town Hall Extension Argyle Street London WC1H 8ND

OUR REF: TG

PLANNING PORTAL REF: PP-03509694

9 July 2014

Dear Sir or Madam

PLANNING APPLICATION: FLAT G, 8 – 9 ELDON GROVE, LONDON, NW3

On behalf of my client's, Tom Mercey and Lucy Wray, please find enclosed a planning application in respect of the above address. Retrospective planning permission is sought for the amalgamation of two maisonettes (H and G) into a single residential unit.

Accordingly, enclosed herewith are the following:

- Cover Letter:
- Application Drawings:
 - o Existing 2nd floor (Ref: ELD-01);
 - o Existing 3rd floor (Ref: ELD-02);
 - o proposed 2nd floor (Ref: ELD-01 Rev D);
 - o Proposed 3rd floor (Ref: ELD-02 Rev D);
- Site Location Plan;
- Application fee for £385.

Principle of Development

The building is not listed, but is located within the Fitzjohns and Netherall Conservation Area. Planning permission was granted in November 1987 to sub-divide 8 – 9 Eldon Grove into six flats and

Highlight House, 57 Margaret Street, London W1W 8SJ T: 020 7462 1340 F: 020 7580 0086 www.chaseandpartners.co.uk

Partners: Graham Chase FRICS FCIArb FRSA FInstCPD Gregory Moore BSc(Hons) FRICS Keith Nelson BSc(Hons) MRICS Mark Paynter BSc MRICS John Shuttleworth BSc FRICS ACIArb Ian Campbell BSc MRICS

 $\textbf{Associates: Tom Graham BSc}(\textbf{Hons}) \ \textbf{DipTP MRTPI} \ \ \textbf{Charles Buckingham Smart BSc}(\textbf{Hons}) \ \textbf{MRICS}$





two maisonettes (Ref: 8700601) and it is understood that the works were carried out at the beginning of the 1990's. My clients have lived at the property for approximately 8 years and merged the two maisonettes in September 2013 after unit H came onto the market. All of the works were internal and no external alterations were made. The applicants did not realise that planning permission was required (there had not been a material increase in activity or level of floorspace) and were not aware of the judgement in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames v. The Secretary of State [1999] (2 PLR 115) which accepted that the loss of a particular type of accommodation could have an effect on planning policy and was material in the determination of the planning application. Consequently they have submitted this retrospective planning application.

Policy DP2 of the Camden Development Policies (adopted 2010) deals with maximising Camden's housing capacity and seeks to supply a range of dwelling types. Criterion (f) states that the Council will seek to resist development that would involve the <u>net loss of two or more homes</u>. The justification to this policy at paragraph 2.23 states:

"The majority of permissions granted for the loss of homes involved schemes to combine 2 or more homes into a single large dwelling. Within the affordable housing stock, these changes are justified by the severe problems of overcrowding and the high proportion of existing one-bed dwellings. However, there is no comparable mismatch across the borough's market sector, and typical layouts suggest that merger of existing market homes is largely geared to a demand for high value housing rather than the creation of additional bedrooms for large families. Therefore schemes that would create a loss of more than one residential property will generally be resisted. The Council does not seek to resist schemes combining dwellings that involve the loss of a single home." [OUR UNDERLINING]

The works have resulted in the amalgamation of 2 residential units to create one, thus resulting in the net loss of only one residential unit. Therefore the principle of development is in accordance with Policy DP2 (f).

Scheme Design

The buildings, 8 – 9 Eldon Grove, are not listed although they are identified within the Netherall and Fitzjohn's Conservation Area Statement as a group that make a positive contribution to the area in terms of their 19th Century architectural character. Although planning permission was granted for the sub-division of the buildings into flats and maisonettes in 1987 the external character and appearance of the buildings was largely maintained.

The plan form of the buildings was altered under the 1987 consent. The retrospective works associated with this application were solely internal and no works were carried out to the exterior of the building. Therefore they maintained the character and appearance of the building when viewed from within the Conservation Area. Even though the original plan form of the structure has been altered the works carried out as part of the amalgamation, and for what planning permission is now sought, have largely maintained the plan form of the upper levels following its sub-division in 1990.

Retrospective planning permission is therefore sought for the change of use of flats G & H into a single residential unit. These works are in accordance with relevant planning policy and should therefore be granted consent.

I trust this is satisfactory, but should you have any queries please contact me direct.

Yours faithfully

Tom Graham

HEAD OF PLANNING