

Sent: 04 July 2014 16:02

To: Planning

Cc:

Subject: App Ref 2013/8275/P Land adjoining Fellows Road- Comment before determination of permission

Attention: Mr. David Peres Da Costa

Dear Mr. Costa

Thank you for explaining that you are preparing to determine this application.

I am alarmed to hear that you are minded to accept a deeper, extended volume of the currently permitted scheme.

This would be totally unacceptable because it would move the rear of the new house still closer to the Eton Avenue houses, and present a still longer flank wall to the neighbourhood houses in Winchester Road. This would be very considerably out of character with the established pattern and plan of development in the Conservation Area. You did not refer or explain the applicant's justification for such an enlarged scheme, and it is hard to imagine such exists when the current permitted scheme already represents a very significant developable area; of the above ground house, in combination with the area realised from Camden's acceptance of the conversion of the former rear garage block to form part of the habitable dwelling, together with the very extensive --whole site-- underground portion of the house. Why should further plan and volumetric extension of this very large scheme be accepted when such would injure the amenity of neighbours, and erode the character of the Conservation Area ?

VOLUME ALREADY TAKEN AT THE DEVELOPMENT SITE REAR FROM THE GARDEN SPACE
You will note from the attached photograph that the whole of the rear portion of the site that was a garden has been raised on a concrete podium structure, approximately one metre above former garden level, indicated by six cast concrete steps. Thus, a very considerable addition of volume for dwelling purposes has been added to the scheme, and "taken" from the very portion of the site you are contemplating an award of more. Is this justified ? Further, this raised one metre high podium may not form part of the permitted scheme. It effects a raising in the height of the development from the long standing height datum of the former garage block that stood there previously. It would be helpful to verify whether this podium is in breach of permission, and whether the height of the proposed new rear pavilion would, as a consequence, also be in breach of the permitted scheme.

The attached photograph indicates how much further back this development would sit, if accepted, extending from a position indicated by the right hand finger to the left. A deeper development would depart from the pattern of building footprints in the Conservation area, because it would extend beyond the established main rear wall line of the C19 Fellows Road terrace of houses to the line of the historic characteristic "closet wings". This added bulk would breach the proposed development's subsidiary relationship to the older houses, and thus diminish, not enhance the development's contribution to the character of the local Conservation Area.

Given the very considerable generosity of the development as permitted, I see no justification for further enlargement.

I would be grateful if you would call me to discuss this matter and trust that this development will be refused for the reasons noted above.

yours sincerely
Paul Fineberg

Paul Fineberg Dipl.(UCL) / M.Arch (Princeton)
Architect+Designer: Environments



