

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1993/P	Sharmila Chatterjee	21 Fairhazel Gardens NW6 3QL NW6 3QL	08/05/2015 12:57:50	NOBJ	I agree this planning application should be granted. This row of 4 terraced houses are restricted in space and I and the rest of my neighbours would also like to add a dormer extension to the loft space from the pitch of the roof. This will make a big difference to the use of what is otherwise a wasted space and ease our space constraints considerably.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1993/P	Ms Maria Fernandez	23 Fairhazel Gardens NW6 3QL	11/05/2015 15:12:51	INT	<p>I, Ms Fernandez, wish to comment on planning application 2015/1993/P - to alter the existing rear dormer (built without planning permission) on the site 17 Fairhazel Gardens, London.</p> <p>Firstly, I have NO OBJECTION to the fact that 17 Fairhazel Gardens currently has a rear dormer in place, nor do I have any objection if 17 Fairhazel Gardens alter their current rear dormer.</p> <p>I am an interested party to this development as I have previously requested planning permission, refer to 2010/5803/P.</p> <p>I believe 2010/5803/P planning application was unjustly refused on the reasons of detriment to Conservation Planning Guidelines and bulk of the dormer. With great significance I draw your attention to planning application 2010/1466/P which was granted in May 2010 and this extension to the roof (as a dormer to provide additional living accommodation) was not taken into account as precedence for my application yet is clearly visible from Fairhazel Gardens and this property is also bound within conservation area boundaries as it states within the Swiss Cottage Conservation Area Statement (1995), "conservation area includes rear boundaries of properties of Fairfax Place and Marston Close."</p> <p>Granted application 2010/1466/P is exactly what is currently built (without permission) on site 17 Fairhazel Gardens, although they do seek permission to have the existing dormer and alter it through their planning application 2015/1993/P.</p> <p>In addition and just as pertinent, permission for a rear dormer has been granted for the new build at site 17A Fairhazel Gardens (2006/5560/P and renewal 2010/0446/P) and this was also dismissed as any precedent for my application of a rear dormer as the case officer stated that this site had not yet started building works so it would not be considered in our application. However, building works have commenced therefore the rear dormer will be built imminently.</p> <p>With regard to 17 Fairhazel Gardens I approached the builder after the completion of the rear dormer and he advised me that they had received planning permission for the rear dormer by applying through a borough other than Camden so this really upset me as I had used the correct legal channels of applying for permission and was refused (I believe due to insufficient research and total lack of fact of previous Conservation Area planning permissions) and now we find ourselves in a situation where 17 Fairhazel Gardens have a dormer which was built illegally and now request permission to rectify their errors.</p> <p>With regard to objections from Flat C and D from 47 Greencroft Gardens I expect that the case officer review their objections to any granted permission of rear dormers (they objected on planning for 2010/5803/P) as a matter of fact rather than an objection based on their opinions. For instance, both flats C and D rejected my initial planning application 2010/5803/P on opinions of restriction of light and creation of a wind tunnel affect should a dormer be built, however these are just ridiculous statements of objection which hold no matter of fact substance.</p>

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Consultees Addr:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

My planning application was refused on bulk and detriment to the look of the Conservation Area, However, planning application 2015/1993/P clearly states reasons where a rear dormer would be acceptable on the following grounds:

" It is reasonably apparent that this terrace is relatively utilitarian in appearance and does not form part of the

area's 'special character.' Two pieces of evidence support this:

(1) The Council's Character South Hampstead Conservation Area Character Appraisal (Feb, 2011) for the area designates the property as one of a number of 'neutral' buildings (Map 9 South Hampstead CA Townscape), which predominantly display a poor design. The Character Appraisal notes neutral buildings neither 'preserve nor detract from the character and appearance of the area (para. 6.8).

(2) The property is one of a small few excluded from the list of properties in the area to which an Article 4(1) direction applies (Second Schedule of Article Four Direction Notice) in the Conservation Area."

Since 1996, demolition, extension and appearance within the Swiss Cottage Conservation Area has been altered so vastly resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area it has been compromised, for example please refer to granted planning application 2009/1101/P

Application 2009/1101/P is contrary to policy EN31, However this new build was unbelievably granted permission and the case of the current application 2015/1993/P is being considered, even though the dormer is built at the rear of the property with no visibility of the dormer from the front of Fairhazel Gardens.

I put forward my arguments of NO OBJECTION to the rear dormer at 17 Fairhazel Gardens and request that this planning proposal is given due diligence by the local Camden Planning Officers.

I would also like to add that all three owners of the properties attached to 17 Fairhazel Gardens (owners of 23, 21, and 19 Fairhazel Gardens) have verbally consented that they DO NOT OBJECT to the construction of a rear dormer and would consider the proposal for their properties as London is currently in a shortage supply of houses and improvements to current properties would be a positive outcome for local authorities and current home owners.

Furthermore, as I am an interested party in the future decision of planning application 2015/1993/P I would request that I be notified of the committee date for this planning application hearing.

Regards,  
Ms Fernandez  
23 Fairhazel Gardens