

Hazelton, Laura

From: Dominyka Togonidze <dtogonidze@higgseyoung.com>
Sent: 19 August 2015 10:29
To: Hazelton, Laura
Subject: Re: 123 constantine road

Hi Laura,

Thank you for your email.

Can we please withdraw the second application for larger roof extension? Could we keep the planning fee in if we want to submit other application in the future, how long the fee is valid for?

In regard to dormer design for first application, we will amend the drawings but we have to achieve minimum headroom height. We are not able to reduce dormer height by 500mm from the roof ridge as it will result with only 1.6m internal height. We could reduce dormer height by approximately 150-200mm from the roof ridge, by doing this we can create at least 1.9-1.95m internal height. We assume you have measured height from the line indicating raised party wall and not from the actual roof ridge. We will indicate heights on the drawings so we avoid confusion.

On our current drawings the dormer is set back from the roof eaves by 500mm, we assume that this is acceptable, the dormer cheeks are set away from the party walls by 300mm, which we will amend to 500mm on the right hand side, but cannot change it on the left hand side by the staircase.

Kind regards,
Dominyka

On 13 August 2015 at 16:26, Hazelton, Laura <Laura.Hazelton@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Dominyka,

Following our telephone conversation, I have discussed the applications with my team leader.

With regards to the rear third floor extension, any proposal to extend out onto the existing roof would be considered unacceptable in principle. Consequently, we wouldn't be able to suggest any amendments to make the scheme acceptable. I would still therefore advise you to withdraw the application. Alternatively, if your client wishes, I can register the application and write it up for refusal which would give them the option of appealing the decision with the Planning Inspectorate.

Turning to the rear dormer application, my previous advice still stands – the proposal should be brought in line with our planning guidance which requires a set back from the eaves, party walls and roof ridge. You mention that there may be difficulties achieving an acceptable head height;

however, the plans submitted seem to show quite a substantial difference in the dormer height – the section plan shows the dormer window has been set down by 94cm whereas the roof plan and elevation show it as almost flush with the roof ridge. When measuring the section, it looks as though if the dormer roof was set down by 0.5m from the ridge, a ceiling height of approximately 2.27m would be achievable.

With regards to the new door, there may be some concerns with regards to how it cuts into the roof line. Before I comment further, it would be helpful if you could provide a more detailed plan of this element.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind Regards,

Laura Hazelton

Planning Officer

Development Management

Culture & Environment

London Borough of Camden

Phone: 020 7974 1017

Web: camden.gov.uk

5 Pancras Square

London N1C 4AG

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

--

Regards,

Dominyka Togonidze

Higgs Young Architects Ltd

54 Boston Place

London,

NW1 6ER

+44(0)207 724 9395

info@higgseyoung.com

www.higgseyoung.com