

## Rudall Crescent Residents' Association

17 Rudall Crescent  
London NW3 1RR

25<sup>th</sup> March 2015

For the attention of Raymond Yeung  
Development Control Planning Services  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Argyle Street  
London WC1H 8ND

Dear Mr Yeung

### Planning Application 2015/1167/P – 35 Rudall Crescent NW3

You will know from this recent application that planning permission was granted in 2013 (2013/8062/P) for extensive changes to this property which lie in the Hampstead Village Conservation Area. Several members of this Association have some queries about this new application on which we value your guidance. They are:

1. The previous application requested that the front ground floor window to the right of the front door be converted into French doors. This was refused by Camden. I understand that the refusal was on the grounds that this would infringe the privacy of neighbouring properties and alter the front elevation to the detriment of the symmetry of the terrace of five properties of which Number 35 is the middle house. We wish to draw your attention to this, given that this new applications seeks again to challenge Camden's decision in respect of the front right rea windows, but also to convert the windows to the left of the front door at ground floor level in a similar fashion. The question is on what grounds Camden could overturn its earlier decision with regard to this new proposal?
2. This new application seeks to replace all wooden window frames with aluminium, not like for like as normally required by Camden in a Conservation Area. I am asked to point out that in May 2013 another property in Rudall Crescent was refused permission to replace wooden windows with aluminium ones, since would breach planning requirements in the Conservation Area. This was Number 41 which was built slightly later than the terrace of five houses of which number 35 is a part. The property in question – number 41 – is exactly to the right of number 39, the last house in the terrace of early 50s properties. The question is that if permission was refused for number 41 in


2013, how could it be granted for a similar conversion to Number 35 as requested in the current application?

I might add that yet another planning application is expected imminently for 37 and 39 Rudall Crescent, which is owned by a developer who is using the same architect responsible for the current application for Number 35. We are very concerned having battled to retain the symmetry of the terrace of five houses over the past three years – a position which has been largely supported by Camden's earlier decisions regarding numbers 37 and 39 - we are most anxious that any further changes to Number 35 do not erode further the symmetry of the terrace by creating a most unwelcome precedent.

The application for 37 and 38 was submitted in the same week as the current application for 35 but I understand that Camden have required it to be withdrawn and resubmitted since there were errors in the application. It might be appropriate for you to liaise with the planning officer allocated to deal with 37 and 39 when the application is re-submitted. I understand that Jennifer Chivers was allocated to handle that application when it was initially registered. It would be highly unsatisfactory if Camden's decision on No 35 created a highly unwelcome precedent enabling the developer of 37 and 39 to alter the front elevation of those houses thus totally destroying the symmetry of the entire terrace.

Best wishes

Yours sincerely



Jenny Stevens  
Planning Rep

Cc Chair, Rudall Crescent RA  
Jennifer Chivers, Camden Dev Control dept.