

22.01.2015

**Re. Application 2014/7598/P , 71G Fitzjohn's Avenue, NW3 6PD**

Dear Raymond

Thank you for your e-mail, I would like to make the following points.

1) Four of the five objections raised by the HHS are factually incorrect and the fifth is highly debatable (see Point 3 below). Following a discussion with my client, HHS have agreed to take this back to the their planning committee and reconsider their objections.

2) No objection to the scheme were made by any neighbours during the consultation period.

3) The proposed alteration **exactly** corresponds to the existing footprint of the roof structure and seeks to unify two rather clashing elements, dating from different times, differing significantly with regards to both form and material. As such, I do not understand the rationale behind your comments about 'not enhancing or preserving the current arrangement'.

I have attached two drawings 010-101 and 102 which were not submitted as part of the planning application but which explored with our client different roof treatment options. We still feel that our proposed scheme is the right solution but if you would look more positively on any of the others then we will gladly follow your recommendations with regard to roof profile and detailing.

4) As the roof line will be lower and the total increase in volume amounts to just 3.9 cubic metres, (See sketch 010-dwg-106) I do not believe the proposed structure will impact in any meaningful way on any views from private areas around the property.

5) My client is an 82 year old lady who finds it increasingly difficult to access her roof terrace via the existing spiral staircase. She lives on her own and if she were to fall down the spiral staircase the consequences of course could be very dangerous. In addition whilst she has good mobility at present, the possibility of her being wheelchair bound in the future must be seriously considered. Whilst we would be open to considering any suggested amendments to the aesthetics of the design, we cannot alter the proposed dimensions as these are the minimum required to allow lift access.

5 Glenloch Road, London NW3 4BX

M: 07979 690074 & T: 020 7483 3551 / [jo@studioglyn.co.uk](mailto:jo@studioglyn.co.uk) & [www.studioglyn.com](http://www.studioglyn.com)

Studio Glyn Ltd, Registered Company Number 09038772 (Limited Company)



6) Camden Council's own planning portal on Design and Access includes a link to CABE which states

*'As the demographic shift towards an ageing population intensifies, we'll continue to argue that inclusive design is not a choice but a basic essential'.*

Your own housing strategy 'Camden's housing strategy 2011-2016' chapter 4.9 talks extensively about your commitment to independent living and making properties adaptable. This is all my client is seeking to do- to adapt her home to provide access to amenities already at her disposal which are otherwise inaccessible to her due to reduced mobility.

Furthermore, while she is mobile enough to leave the premises now with use of the lift, she is planning ahead for a time when her mobility will be further restricted and when she may be permanently housebound, at which point by your own assessment, the flexibility and improvement to her quality of life will be significant if she is able to access her own terrace/ outdoor space.

8) As we cannot therefore submit a revised proposal with a reduced bulk, and for all the reasons above, we believe that we have a very strong case and will have no choice but to make an immediate appeal if the application is refused, at which point we may engage the services of an occupational therapist/ social services to support our appeal.

I do hope the Council will reconsider and I would be happy to facilitate a site visit if this would help.

Yours sincerely,

Josephine Glyn.