

Hazelton, Laura

From: paul@paul-o-architects.com
Sent: 02 July 2015 15:54
To: Hazelton, Laura
Subject: 17 Edis Street. Planning permission . 2015/2469/P
Attachments: PL-311 A proposed section .pdf; PL-110 A Proposed Lower ground .pdf; PL-111 A proposed ground floor plan .pdf; PL-112 A Proposed First Floor plan .pdf; PL-210 A proposed rear elevation .pdf; PL-310 A proposed section .pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Laura

Following our email correspondence and various telecons we attach updated dwgs for 17 Edis Street and note as follows:

1. We are not now applying for planning permission to reduce the ground level by 500mm and have updated our dwgs to reflect this.
There is therefore no requirement to submit a BIA.
2. We have removed the side windows in the rear extension - there is now no issue of over looking
3. We have removed the brick parapet wall around the terrace on top of the outreach extension - existing railing to remain.
4. We have added sight lines on the ground floor to demonstrate that the double height glazing will actually reduce rather than increase the amount of overlooking from the first floor rear window.

And we note as follows:

- the proposed extension does not take up more than 50% of the garden . The current garden is 26 sqm. The proposed extension is 9 sqm.
- There is already in place an approved planning application in place for a full width extension which take up 8.3sqm of the garden.

Re the extension being subservient to the main building we note that :

- The extension extends 3.3 meters from the rear of the existing building , and is lower than 3m on the boundary . It therefore could be constructed Under permitted development if there was not an Article four on the house.
- There is nothing that I am aware of in the planning guidelines about an extension not being allowed to be built all the way to the rear garden wall.
That is choosing to build a full length rather than a full width extension.
- Planning permission already exists for a full width extension which would extend the same dimension from the rear of the existing house and be the same height .
- The approved planning permission would have more impact on neighbours light / sunlight/ daylight than the current proposal (which Will have no impact on the sunlight / daylight or views)
- We are aware that there is a presumption against building full width extensions, in order to preserve the rhythm of the outreach extension.
By building a single storied extension out from the rear extension we are preserving and enhancing that rhythm.
- There are not windows in the ground floor extension that overlook the rear garden, so the extension will not affect on the neighbours amenity

In response to your comments we note as Follows

We recognise that the gardens are small and we therefore want to make the most of the garden by wrapping the house around it – ensuring there are more windows onto it , creating a much stronger relationship between the house

and garden than currently exists. We are preserving the same area of garden as all the other schemes in the house which have a full width extension.

I find it difficult to understand how a low single storey extension to the rear of the building where only the roof will be seen by the neighbouring houses can be considered to cause 'harm to the host property and surrounding terrace'. It can be argued that ALL extensions and additions fundamentally alter the form and character of a property, whether it be a adding a glazed full width extension, a roof extension with glazed balcony. or even simply altering windows . I can give numerous examples of recently constructed additions in Primrose hill which fundamentally alter the character of the property but this does not mean that planning permission is not granted. A brief search Camdens web site brings up:

- 1 Edis Street (2013/4225/P) - where planning permission was given for a double height glazing with an external staircase. Importantly there is no precedent on the street for an external staircase but this was not a reason for refusing planning permission.
- 61 Princes road (2013/6644/P) new roof extension with full height sliding windows and metal balustrade to the rear elevation .
- 30 Princess road (2013/1565/P) full width ground floor extension - given permission even though in Camden there is a presumption against full width extensions as it does not preserve the rhythm of the outreach extension
- 28 Fitzroy road (2015/0053/P) – where planning permission has been granted for 6m high sliding glass windows the rear of the elevation.
- 14 Fitzroy road (2014/3476/P) - Again an application where planning permission was granted for significant alterations to the rear of the building including double height glazing.

All of these alterations significantly and fundamentally alter the appearance of the host building. All alterations do - but planning permission is still granted in order to allow the residents to add to and alter their houses, to modernise them so they better suit the way the residents live – with larger windows to let in more light, better insulating, installing modern kitchens, opening up rooms to create open plan living etc London is a ever changing city and we contend that the planning system is there to prevent inappropriate development and to preserve the character of the conservation area. As the London plan notes the planning system should not be stop innovation. Just because most people have full width extensions should not preclude a full length extension.

The proposed full length extension does not detract from the mature of the conservation area. I think that a good description of this conservation area would be ' Homogenous and ordered street elevation, below the line of the parapet, and a more eclectic rear elevation. The rear ./ garden elevation has been continually added to and altered by the inhabitants of the houses over time resulting in a more picturesque massing which is a pleasant and welcome contrast to the formality of the street elevations. The proposed full width extension adds to rather than detracts from this.

I also take umbrage to your comment that the proposed extension does not 'follow the principles of good Architecture'. As an Architectural practice we pride ourselves on designing buildings which are well considered. Building which are contemporary and at the same time refer and respect the context within which they are built and we have won numerous Architectural awards for our work The proposal which we have submitted for planning is also carefully considered and takes into account all the site constraints , a narrow house, a small garden which gets little sun , a building which faces east / west and the clients brief. The new spaces , if built, would create a charming lower ground floor living space wrapped around a well planted courtyard garden. The extension would be built of brick to match the existing house and the roof would be finished in line timber boards which would be covered in creepers – roses, jasmine, clematis - which would grow up towards the light - so from above it would look like the top of a pergola – increasing rather than reducing the amount of foliage in the rear garden (at the moment the neighbours look down onto a rather dismal shady garden with not planting what so ever)

You mention that you need to consider the ratio of built of un-built and refer to the previous first floor extension. To my knowledge there are been no first floor extension and as pointed out above Camden have already given planning permission for the same area of garden to be built over.

We contend that the extension is unobtrusive and is not out of character with the terrace as a whole and does not contravene any of Camdens planning guidelines.

In response to the objections received from the Neighbours we respond as follows:

Laura Rivkin writes that the rear extension is 'totally acceptable' "because a) there is only one other full length extension in the terrace b) the surrounding properties will be boxed in with brick walls c) there will be a major loss of Daylight d) will affect the bird life and wild life e) reduce the amount of greenery f) create light pollution.

Just because there are no other full width extension in the terrace is not reason enough to deny planning permission. There are not other 6m high sliding doors in Fitzroy road but planning permission was granted for this at no 28 Fitzroy road. There are not other external staircases in this terrace but planning permission was granted for an external terrace a 1 Edis street. The existing garden walls around each garden are built of brick and garden wall around the garden walls at 17 Edis Street are already over 2500m high. So to all intends and purposes the properties are already boxed in with brick walls. I think that Ms Rivkin maybe thinking that the application is for a two storied extension as exists at 18 Edis street – This not the case. Therefore there will be no loss of daylight or directly sunlight to the neighbouring properties. Further the single storey full length extension will be covered in climbing plants so the amount of greenery will be increased providing a good habitat for nesting birds etc. The amount of increase light pollution will be minimal – no more than the full width extension for which planning permission already exists.

Annette Clancy also objects on the ground that the increased height of the extension will make it oppressive (again we note that the extension is only just higher than the existing garden wall) that there is no precedent (answered above) and that the garden walls of 17 Edis street of 17 Edis street do not align with the gardens of 57 Princess street.

Michael Turoff objects because he did not get planning permission himself for double height glazing in 2000. There are many examples of planning permission being granted for Double height glazing in the conservation area (1 Edis street, 28 Fitzroy , 14 Fitzroy) and this has been tested at appeal . . Mr turoff also cites the two storeyed extension at 18 Edis street as a reason why planning permission should not be granted for the single storied extension at 17 Edis street. We agree that the double storied extension at 18 street does cut out light etc but the single storeyed extension at 17 Edis Street is completely different and comparisons should not be made to 18 Edis street.

Edward Williams objects on the ground that a) changing window design is not keeping with the general fenestration patterns on the street. B) increasing height of extension by deleting the railing is not acceptable c) Double height glazing not in keeping d) the single storied extension is not acceptable because the full width extension at 18 Edis street was a mistake.

We have now amended the dwg to retain the railing around the roof terrace and we note that planning permission has been granted numerous time in recent years for changing the fenestration and installing large full height to let in more light.

Richard Simpson cites Camden Design Guidance paragraph 4.22 which states that " *The construction of garden buildings, including sheds, stand – alone green houses and other structures in the rear gardens and other over developed areas, can often have a significant impact on the amenity, bio diversity and character of the area. They may detract from the generally soft and green nature of the gardens and other open space, contributing to the loss of amenity for existing and future resident of the property*'

We agree with the planning guidelines and with Mr Simpsons concerns but note that each case needs the looked at individually. In this instance there will be no loss of greenery as the extension is being built over a smaller shady garden with no plants in it .The intention of the design is to have climbing plants growing over the extension so from able the neighbours will see a mass of flowering climbers, jasmine, honeysuckle, rambling roses and clemantis. The proposed extension will therefore increase the amount of greenery in the rear garden. We are happy for the planting of these climbers to be included as a condition should planning permission be granted.

I would be happy to discuss this with you further and also consider that it might be worthwhile you making another site visit . Let me know if you would like to and can organise this .

Regards

Paul Acland |for Paul+O Architects Ltd.

Unit 8, 73 Maygrove Road, London NW6 2EG | 020 7604 3818 | 07753 982 715 mob. | www.paul-o-architects.com

