

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4659/P	Simon Woods	39 Ravenshaw Street London NW6 1NP	19/08/2014 13:53:09	OBJ	<p>This is a retrospective application in respect of works which were proposed in a previous planning application but which, rightly and for good reason, were refused approval.</p> <p>Together with other works, the applicant sought permission (and now seeks retrospective permission having breached the extent of the original permission) to increase the height of the FIRST floor side return by 5 breeze blocks. In the application I understand this is summarised as “alteration to existing rear extension roofslope to create flat roof”. For the avoidance of doubt it is this aspect of the works which are objected to.</p> <p>As one of the owner/occupiers of number 39 (neighbouring property) I'm unable to put into words how upset and disappointed we will be if Camden Council does not use the powers available to it to enforce its original decision not to permit the extension of the height of the rear side return by such a huge amount. To put matters into perspective, a standard breeze block is .215 high therefore the additional height of 5 breeze blocks amounts to 1.075 in height. A breeze block is equal to three bricks high so, if the wall was in brick, it would be 15 brick courses above the original permission.</p> <p>The works which have been carried out in breach of permission have a massively detrimental effect on the utility we get from our home in terms of ascetics but most importantly the level of natural light which enters the rear of our property and garden and this is very important to us. In particular, there is a loss of amenity to us in regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook and overshadowing. This is contrary to pp 29 of your planning policy guidance notes and this principal is enshrined in DP26 –managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours. Furthermore, the original permission was for a sloping glazed roof to be erected to the new rear addition which would have helped to bounce light into our kitchen area – this has now been replaced with a flat roof in addition to the higher wall.</p> <p>Regarding the appearance of the work, given the height of the side return and the poor quality of the workmanship (about which Building Control should be informed) looking at number 41 from the rear of our property is akin to standing a few yards away from a prison wall and looking up at it. The breeze blocks have been rendered which is visually unattractive and does not comply with Camden’s planning policy in that it is not sympathetic to the existing building. Given this, the design is in contravention of DP24 (a) in that it does not consider the character, setting, context and form of neighbouring buildings</p> <p>We ask that Camden Council does everything within its powers to stand by its original decision and ensure that this particular aspect of the recent changes to the property are reversed and taken down through the use of enforcement if this cannot be achieved through co-operation. No reasonable local authority acting reasonably and in accordance with its powers and in the proper discharge of its responsibilities could refuse to take corrective action. What is the point of a planning department if it cannot uphold its original decision as the changes made are not minor and are detrimental to the amenity of our property.</p>