

Flat 1

12 Hemstal road  
London NW6 2AN

Jenna Litherland  
Development Planning Control  
LB Camden Town Hall  
Argyle Street  
WC1H 8ND..

Dear Ms Litherland

I would like to make a formal objection to the following planning applications

Re 2013/7792/P

Re 2013/7801/P

In my view, the plans still fail to comply as permitted development in accordance with the 1995 Permitted Development Order (as amended) because:

1. Each extension goes right up to the rear boundary line of each house on each side, instead of being (as required) 2 metres from each separate boundary (Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Para. A.1 (d))
2. The extended part of each house will still be greater than 70 cubic metres or 15% of the cubic area of the house (Same Schedule, para A.1(a)(ii))
3. The extensions do not comply with the Department Guidance because they extend full width of the house, and are not limited to 1/2 width maximum.
4. They do not comply with the Departmental Guidance because they will involve the removal or alteration of flues/chimneys/stacks (which have still been omitted from the revised drawing submitted by Mr Golesorkhi).
5. The drawing is astonishingly "minimal", since it fails to show, for instance, (i) what is the treatment of the proposed extended building where the existing shallow extension at the rear of each house meets the new sloping roof or (ii) what is the surface of new slightly-pitched roof of the extension to look like (it ought presumably to be tiled with grey slates to match the existing pitched roofs).

You should note that, under the revisions, the extensions would be a bit smaller, because Mr G. has reduced the depth of the "wings" one each side of the central part of each extension (although this

part remains the same size ( 17.2 sq metres), but the "wings" on each side still go right up to the boundary lines on each side (see item 1 above). The reduced "wings" are also a "mish-mash" since each of them would have a different depth.

We ought, I think, to be concerned that iCamden have been given such minimal details of the (revised) proposals in the form of just one single drawing covering both houses.

It is a pity too that the proposals to want to warrant extensions constructed of solid walls and two French windows per extension, rather than well designed and attractive, predominantly-glass conservatories (as per Camden Development Policies 24 and 25).

Yours faithfully

  
David Futerman