

Camden Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London
WC1H 8ND

6 November 2013

Dear Ms Miller,

PLANNING APPLICATION NO 2013/5712/P
and APPLICATION NO 2013/6598/T

This letter refers to the concurrent applications referenced above and for erection of single story rear infill extension, to include creation of lightwell, in addition to alteration to existing rear openings, repositioning of front entrance door at lower ground floor level of residential flat (2013/5712/P) and of Intended works to tree in a Conservation Area (2013/6598/T).

As an advisor to and representative of the owner of the basement flat at number 5 Denning Road I would like to strongly object to both applications referenced above.


This letter references both applications as it appears that the applicant intends to fell the tree of heaven to facilitate construction of the proposed extension.

We have serious and significant concerns regarding the proposals, they are listed here below.

1. The application has been validated without all necessary documentation. The application lacks a Site Plan showing context. Without this the impact upon the neighbouring property cannot be determined and caused the occupants at number 5 to underestimate the impact on the property. The absence of this document should have prevented validation and should highlight a serious lack of consideration of context.
2. Related to above the Location Plan shows an inaccurate footprint of number 5, therefore reducing the perceived impact on number 5.
3. Further lack of consideration to context is shown in the proposed plans, sections and elevations, none of which show the neighbouring properties, notably the visualisation which shows blue skies beyond the site boundary, this drawing does not show the design within the context of the Conservation area, a more accurate visualisation may show that the metal clad extension would not sit well within the predominantly brick site.
4. Question 15 part 2 on 2013/5712/P was answered no, I would query this as the residents of number 5 Denning Road would consider the Tree of Heaven an important part of the landscape character, it is also visible as part of a green view from the public

realm of Willoughby Road. The tree is also crucial to privacy in the garden and living rooms of number 5 given the number of high level windows that look over the space. Application 2013/6598/T states that the tree is in danger of causing subsidence to both 5 and 7 Denning Road, both buildings are further away from the tree than the proposed extension, if the statement is true then the extension will have an impact on its root zone.

5. The proposals to alter the front of the house would be detrimental to the character of the street, the Camden Council Hampstead Conservation Area Statement notes the following in reference to Denning Road "Nos.1-7 have distinct porticoes and ground floor bays" This move will have an impact on the front elevation of the house and the extent of the proposal is unclear as a door is being shown from the dressing room to the lightwell in the proposed plan but not in the existing plan, this is directly below the ground floor bay highlighted and no elevation of the door is provided.
6. PPS 3: Housing, paragraph 16 states that a good design: *"Is well integrated with, and complements, the neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally in terms of scale, density, layout and access."* *"Creates, or enhances, a distinctive character that relates well to the surroundings and supports a sense of local pride and civic identity."* *"Provides for the retention or re-establishment of the biodiversity within residential environments."* The proposed scheme does none of the above. It does not compliment the neighbouring buildings nor the building it is adjoining but rather uses out of character cladding, detailing, materials and fenestration, nor does it support a sense of local pride or relate well to the surroundings, noting the increase in boundary height, the use of different materials, the different heights of glazing proposed within the same proposal show an attempt to make it distinct and unrelated to the existing brick building. As noted in previous points the proposal looks to fell an existing tree thereby reducing biodiversity.
7. PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment repeats the importance of *"Understanding the significance of affected heritage assets is vital to a successful scheme"* However, the section of the Design and Access Statement titled 1.0 Historical Context does little to understand the conservation area by copying nearly verbatim two paragraphs from British History Online, which reads *"All the roads (Denning, Willoughby, Kemplay, and Carlingford roads and Rudall Crescent) had been laid out on the estate by 1878, (fn.55) and houses there and on the Willow Road frontage were complete by 1886. Among the last to be built, in 1890, were nos. 54-66 Rosslyn Hill," and "North of Pond Street was a small estate owned by George Crispin, where Hampstead Hill Gardens had been built by 1873,"* It is noted that no description of the existing external features, details or materials is given and no reference made to the wider conservation area. The understanding of the historic asset (Hampstead Conservation Area) has not been met, and the majority of the repetitive statement is dedicated to an introverted design process.
8. Further to this the Guideline EN31 and UDP policy H5 require the development to *'preserve or enhance'* the *'special character of the Conservation Area,'* the proposal achieves neither. UDP H21 requires a new development to *'enhance'* and *'respect the built form and historic context of the area, local views... existing features... elevational design'* the design does not achieve this.



9. London Borough of Camden 'Planning Guidance 'Design CPG1' states that any development should positively enhance, respect, avoid overshadowing, which this proposal fails to do.

10. Paragraph 3.6 of the applicant's Design and Access Statement, subheading "*In considering the works and the impact it may have to No 5 and 7 Denning Road we were mindful of*" states the eaves height of the proposed extension as 2555mm, however, the elevation drawing dimensions it as 2590mm as measured from a ground height noted as having been raised by 100mm. In addition to this the drawing shows a new boundary wall forming a parapet that goes another 300mm, making the resultant boundary height 2990mm. A boundary height of nearly 3 meters is of considerable concern to the occupant of the garden flat at number 5 given that this would significantly reduce daylight and sunlight within the living room and more so within the bedroom in which the only window will be severely overshadowed by the proposal. The impact of this has been falsely diminished by inaccuracies in the report and selective dimensioning of the drawings. Not only this but the proposal extends out further than the neighbouring extensions, which cannot be determined from the drawings that show no context. These drawings and documents should make clear the proposal and the application should include a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment to determine the impact upon the neighbouring property.

11. The small courtyard is out of keeping with the character of the conservation area, this design move looks to compensate for over developing the property at number 7. However, the boundary wall continues at full height around the yard and the overshadowing effect is the same on number 5. In addition to the assessment of the effect on number 5, the Daylight and Sunlight statement should provide evidence whether the bedroom in number 7 will receive enough light.

To summarise; the application is invalid according to national requirements; it contains errors and inconsistencies that need to be corrected in order to properly assess its impact; the removal of the tree will be detrimental to the local landscape; the design and materials are not in keeping with Hampstead Conservation Area; the extent and height of the proposal diminishes the amount of light to living space in the neighbouring properties and the application shows a lack of compliance with planning and conservation policies, this list is not exhaustive. For information I attach photographs of the windows at number 5 to be affected by the proposal.

It is our view that the application should be rejected, however, if this application is to be reviewed in a public planning committee meeting, I would like to represent my clients and voice their objections, please let us know the date of the meeting.

