

Dike, Darlene

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 October 2013 14:18
To: Planning
Subject: Rob Tulloch Applicaton Reference 2013/4818/P
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Dear Mr. Tulloch,

The Managing Trustee of the Newman Hall Homes for Pensioners (8 and 7 Hampstead Square) is out of the country at the moment and has asked me to let you know that the Trustees of the Newman Hall Homes associate themselves with the objections made [REDACTED] to the variations of permission applied for [REDACTED] (4 Hampstead Square). viz:-

"This application is an example of planning creep concerning a listed building which has been subjected to multiple assaults in recent times. When the porch was first granted permission, the applicant made a virtue of the fact that the roof, being glass, was unobtrusive, and it was allowed on that basis.

Then, without planning permission, the applicant extended the porch area up to the boundary wall, thereby forming an opaque cupboard space. The enforcement officer decided against taking any action as it was claimed that to remove the unauthorised structure could cause damage to the wall. What is now proposed is a permanent more solid structure, which neither has the supposed benefit of a discrete glass roof, nor does it protect the wall from the alleged damage removal of the cupboard extension would involve.

Such attempted planning creep should not be authorised."

Furthermore, it is not appropriate that a listed Georgian house (albeit with a modern extension) should be fronted by a solid porch structure of this type which is out of keeping both with the integrity of the building itself and with other (18th houses in the vicinity. It would be detrimental to the house itself, to the amenity of neighbouring properties looking on to it and to the conservation area in which it is situated."

I overlook all this work from my flat and can see that for the authority to grant permission would be wrong.

