

Ms Katrine Dean  
Planning Officer  
Regeneration and Planning

London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London WC1H 8ND

20. October 2014

Dear Ms Katrine Dean,

**Application ref. 2014/4722/P**

Further to our telephone conversation today, I am now at home after a protracted period in hospital 30.july - 1. Oct. and in a position to respond more fully. The physical difficulty of major paralysis does not made things easier.

The application was registered with Camden on 21. July. I received your hard copies of related drawings on 27. September, these were helpful but limiting; with some omissions, together with minuscule and not very informative representations.

The wifi service at St. Pancras Hospital was ineffective and so my response to you was sent via MRA Design on 29. September. My comments therein still stand, in addition to which, I have now managed to access more information related to this application.

I first wish to address the '**Supporting Statement**' which contains some patently false statements emphasised in bold (hard copy):

under **Background (2)**

*2.0 '15 Rosecroft Avenue is a small semi-detached house located in the Redington/Frogna Conservation Area. No previous extensions have been undertaken.'*

**2.1 In fact an extension 2.6m deep front to back (see photo attachment) has already been built at 1st floor level in the order of 30 years back. This was presumably within the 10% of the original construction allowable. It was done in our absence and without our pre-knowledge.**

in the **Case for Development (6)** it is stated that -

*6.0 'The existing dwelling does already have a first floor balcony (although now overgrown) which we are informed by the adjoining neighbour was used regularly by the previous owner'.*

**6.1 this is not and has never been a balcony, the attached photo shows that there is no enabling access.**

**6.2 We, the adjoining neighbours at no.9, have never made such statement about regular use.**

*6.3 'With regard to the proposed loft conversion and roof alterations .....From the rear, the property is not symmetrical in composition.'*

The symmetry is implied in the (same) height and volumes of the two pitched roofs, albeit that of no.9 is slightly set back from that of no.15. The proposed extension would require construction to an additional height of 80-100cm (30" - 40"), in order to enable a min. bedroom head height of 230cm (7'6") plus constructional requirements eg increase to floor joists and finish, roof joists, insulation and finishes.

This additional height together with the increased volume would create a considerable visual imbalance to the present roof-scape.

ian tollady M des.RCA

9 Rosecroft Avenue  
Hampstead  
London NW3 7QA



under Conclusion (7) -

*7.0 'At the rear the extensions are not directly overlooked and are obscured by intervening tree and vegetation cover. Even if they were visible, they would be seen against the backdrop of the house and due to their limited nature would be seen as a minor change to the status quo.'*

7.1 We, the adjoining neighbours, would be directly confronting the proposed extension at **1st floor level**; the extension of the proposed **2nd floor** and the proposed **1st floor terrace**, it's proximity would be overbearing.

7.2 The extensions would be visible from nos. 3, 5 and 9 to the South on Rosecroft Avenue, because of the road curvature.

*7.3 'The applicant has been through the proposals/plans with both neighbouring properties and no concerns have been raised.'*

**7.4 The proposals/plans have never been discussed with us and despite requests we have never been provided with a comprehensible set of drawings. I had to request these from Katrine Dean.**

**Addressing the proposals:**

We object to the extension to the rear at **1st floor level** and the consequent projection of the **2nd floor** extension above that. We object because :

1 As referred under **Background (2)** an extension 2.6m deep front to back has already been built at 1st floor level. A further projection to the rear at this level, together with that proposed at 2nd floor level to the rear would:

2 create a significant increase in volume and corresponding architectural incongruity at a prominent position on this building and in relation to our own.

3 confront us uncomfortably close-up with an overbearing structure .

4 reduce our late afternoon and evening sunlight, which gives us great pleasure.

5 reduce the panorama that we enjoy over adjacent gardens and to the NW.

6 as commented in my 29. September email (via MRA Design) " I would draw attention to the fact that when we pursued the last developments to no. 9, we were required to limit that development to below eaves level, *in order to preserve the visual unity* of the two hipped roof lines. Clearly the proposal for development at 3rd. floor level would destroy that unity.

We might offer a solution to restore that unity by building an equivalent extension upon our existing loft area. This could employ similar roof detail so these two extensions could be brought together enabling at the same time, more space to the proposals for no.15."

**7 Original history of these two properties:** It is worth noting that no.9 and the adjoining no.15 were originally relatively small scale carriage/service properties, built for and serving the much larger houses on each side - no.9 as garages and chauffeur's quarters serving no.7 and no.15 (originally 11a) serving no.11 as stable and groom's accommodation.

We would welcome a site visit if this would be helpful. Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Tollady