

## STATEMENT OF CASE

17 Edis Street. Application number: 2015/2469/P

Planning Appeal Statement of Case.

The application is for a single storied rear extension and a new double height window, formed by joining two existing windows one are Ground floor and one at Lower ground floor.

We initially submitted a scheme which included the single storied extension, a double height window as well as alterations to the balustrading on the second floor terrace, new windows on the rear and side of the outreach extension and lowering the lower ground floor by 500mm. Following feed back from the planners the scheme was then modified. The plans were resubmitted removing the new windows in the outreach extension (because they overlooked the neighbours) , leaving the balustrading at second level as existing and not lowering of the Lower ground floor level.

Camden has assessed and based their decision on the final drawings that submitted. Camden have advised that they have given consideration to a) Design (that is the impact that the proposal will have on the host property and on the wider primrose hill conservation area) and b) amenity.

Camden have determined that the proposal does not affect the amenity of the neighbours in any way. They have noted that as the garden at 17 Edis street is already enclosed by a high wall and trellis and the roof of the proposed extension would only be 300mm above this, there is no overshadowing. They have also confirmed that there is not any increased overlooking from the proposed double height window as it is in the same position as the existing windows.

Camden have refused planning permission on the grounds that proposed single storey extension and double height window on the ground is contrary to policies CS14 ( Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage), DP24 ( securing high quality design ) and DP25 ( conserving Camden's Heritage).

Because Camden have confirmed that there are no amenity issues and has refused planning permission solely because they consider that the proposed extension will be detrimental to the host building and out of keeping with the conservation area then the only issue to consider are ones of aesthetics.

We contend that the proposed single storey extension and double height window is of a high quality of design and that the proposal would not be detrimental to this particular part of the conservation area and that the planners are turning down the planning application because what is being proposed is 'not the norm'.

There is already planning permission in place at 17 Edis Street for a full width extension glazed infill extension with a glazed roof.

The client bought the house with this planning permission in place but has not been interested in carrying out the works because they consider, in our opinion quite rightly, that the existing design which has been given planning permission would not improve the living areas of the house and would reduce rather than increase the amount of light getting into the Northeast facing basement.

Since being established 2002 Paul+O Architects won various awards for their architectural projects. The practice prides itself on producing building which are both contemporary, that is of our time, and contextual, that is buildings that refer to the host building in terms of form and materials.

Stefan Isaacs, out client at 17 Edis Street, approached us because of our history of designing architecturally significant and appropriate house and extensions and for our attention to detail. He

asked us to come up with a scheme which made better use of the garden and ensured that the house was filled with as much light as possible.

As architects we have given this project careful consideration sketching up numerous proposals and making models to test the design.

The clients brief was to create an open plan living / Kitchen at the lower ground floor, bringing as much light into the house as possible, while retaining the Character of the house.

Rather than having a full width extension with a fully glazed roof we consider that a better solution, in this instance, is to have a full length extension with a solid roof ( with a long thin skylight) . The full length makes better use of the Garden and the extension and double height window bring considerably more light into the house.

It is our opinion that this minor extension to this London terrace house cannot be considered to be harmful to the host building. The extension will be constructed out of brick, to match the existing house. The sliding windows will have minimal frames and The roof of the extension will be clad in black thin 'decking' and will be covered in creepers. So when seen from above all the neighbours will see is foliage and flowers of the climbing plants.

The current view from the neighbours is down onto a dark garden paved in concrete pavers and devoid of any planting - The roof, covered with climbing plants ( Jasmine, Clemantis , Roses etc) will improve the view from the neighbouring houses.

The extension accentuates the rhythm of the outreach extension and uses materials already used on the house building and neighbouring houses, that is brick and aluminium windows. Importantly the aluminium windows have a very thin mullion which mimics the thin mullions on the Victorian sash windows.

Importantly if this house did not have an article five directive placed on it the extension would fall under the house holders permitted development rights and because if this it is the standard form of extension that you see built all over London under PD.

We contend that it not enough for the council to turn down this application by simply claiming that the application is out of keeping with the character of the conservation area without assessing what the character it of this particular part of the conservation area.

In some part of Camden the rear of the terraces remain exactly as they were when they were built and are visible from the public domain – for instance that back of the Cumberland Terrace n Regents Park.. It would be understandable if the Council turned down any extension to the rear of these buildings.

On the other hand the rear elevations of the buildings on Edis and the surrounding streets have been constantly changed, altered and added to since the day they were built. While the fronts of these houses have a certain degree of uniformity up to the pediment , the back elevations are characterised by a layering of alterations and additions which reflect the modes and tastes of the day.

This charming contrast between the well-mannered street facades and the more eclectic and personalised rear elevations is typical of many terraces in England where Georgian or Victorian terraces often conceal an interior and rear elevation which is ,more often than not, completely different in architectural style from the street elevations. It is a tradition which has resulted in some beautiful and quirky garden elevations. Possibly the best historic examples can be seen in the Circus and Royal Crescent in Bath where a beguiling mixture of wildly differing roof heights, architectural

styles and fenestration on the rear façade is concealed behind uniform classic façade.



The desire to change, upgrade and personalize ones surroundings is innately human and is emphasized in a mercantile city like London, which has always been driven by economics and pragmatism. There has been, for the most part of the city's history, a desire to move forward and to construct buildings which are both economically and stylistically suited to the time in which they are built, each generation finding a language of architecture which expressed their age. Government Planning guidelines acknowledged this as does the 'London plan' which notes *'It would not be realistic to try to reverse these strong, deep-rooted factors driving change...'*

We therefore contend that an accurate description of the Character of this particular part of the conservation area would be " a uniform street frontage up to pediment level, with numerous roof and rear extension or various designs". If it is agreed that that this is an accurate description of this part of the conversation area then we argue that the proposed extension cannot be seen to be detrimental to it.

It is also difficult to understand how the council can argue that that the extension will harm the host building. There are numerous examples of double height glazed windows being granted planning permission in the area. ( 1 Edis Street ( 2013/4225/P ) , 28 Fitzroy road ( 2015/0053/P), 14 Fitzroy road ( 2014/3476/P) 31 Chalcot road ( 2013/4697/P ) , are a few that I know of – all of which use far more glass and affect the host building more than the proposed extension and double height window Which we have proposed for 17 Edis Street.

We also draw the Inspectorates attention to Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/D/13/2208307 37 Clifton Gardens, London W9 1AR. Appeal decision which found in favour of a contemporary double height extension in the Maida Conservation area.

**In direct response to Camden Councils 'assessment' we respond as follows:**

**3.0 Design and Impact on the Conservation area.**

3.1. Camden states that Policy CS14 "aims to ensure the highest design standards from developments" and to "respect the character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties and Policy DP25 seeks to preserve and enhance the appearance of the conservation areas".

We agree whole heartedly with the intent of the above policies and we as Architect always strive to design extensions which are of the highest quality. This does not preclude designing an extensions which does not mimic or copy either the existing building or the neighbour's extensions, which in this case Camden are suggesting we do. Camden are advising that a full width extension with a glazed roof as appropriate because that is what the neighbours have but that a full length extension is not acceptable , even though the neighbouring house at number 18 has a two storied full length extension. Camden had advised that the full width extensions with glazed roofs can be taken as 'precedent' but that the existing two storied full length extension cannot be taken as precedent. We contend that neither should be taken as precedent but that both should be recognized as forming the character of the conservation area.

We draw attention to - CABE / English Heritage Guidance on the management of the Conservation Area which notes that:

7.6 "New development in conservation areas should aspire to a quality of design and execution, related to its context, which may be valued in the future. **This neither applies nor precludes working in traditional or new ways, but will normally involve respecting values established through assessment of the significance of the area**".

7.7 "One of the most common problems on conservation areas is the lack of understanding by many developers and/or designers of the urban context, resulting in crude or debased imitations of adjoining buildings, or token gestures towards the local architectural style. Where the character of the area derives from its diversity, the imposition of imitative or 'in keeping with existing' styles runs counter to the way in which the area has traditionally evolved. The aim of site-specific design guidance therefore should be to encourage new development that compliments the established urban grain or settlement

The London Plan advises that Good Design is central to the Plan.

Policy 4B.2 " The Mayor will seek to promote world-class high quality design, by collaborating with partners to encourage contemporary and integrated designs for the built environment"

Policy 4.101 "Good design is rooted firmly in an understanding and appreciation of the local social, historical and physical context, including urban form and movement patterns and historic character. London is highly diverse and constantly changing, but developments should show an understanding of, and respect for, existing character. The Mayor has already produced some guidance on best practice for well-designed higher density housing. Boroughs and Applicants may also refer to a range of guidance from the Commission on Architecture and the Built environment ( CABE) on achieving the highest quality design in the built environment"

*In the introduction Building in Context. New Development in historic area. English Heritage and Cabe Sir Neil Cossons and Sir Stuart Lipton write:*

*Thoughtless haste on the one hand and ill-considered imitation on the other have both over the years damaged the fabric of our historic towns and cities. But there is another way, in the form of **buildings***

**that are recognisably of our age while understanding and respecting history and context.**” and go on to say that “the right approach is to be found in examining the context for any proposed development in great detail and relating the new building to its surroundings through an informed character appraisal. This does not imply that any one architectural approach is by its nature more likely to succeed than any other. On the contrary it means that as soon as the application of simple formula is attempted a project is likely to fail whether that formula consists of ‘fitting in’ or ‘contrasting the new with the old”.

“As always this is a question not of style but of quality. And quality whatever its stylistic guise, can bring a whole range of benefits – not only aesthetic but economic, social and environmental”

London Plan 4.125 also notes;

“...The Mayor wishes to see the sensitive management of London’s extraordinary historic assets planned in tandem with the promotion of the **very best modern architecture and urban design**. Designation of historic buildings is not enough. Sensitive management requires clear details of what needs to be protected, how and why. The mayor expects boroughs and others to use appropriate tools to manage the historic environment, including character appraisal and conservation plans”.

4.128 notes;

“Part of the city’s unique character is the juxtaposition of many different types of buildings and spaces and this should be reflected in the way the historic environment is managed” pattern, whilst representing the time in which it is built and the culture it accommodates”

#### Single Storey rear extension

3.2 Camden point out the CPG1 ‘offers further detailed design guidance, stating that that extensions should always take into account the character and design of the property and its surroundings. Extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation...”

The proposed extension is clearly subordinate to the main building, and it does take into account the character of the property and its surroundings. We contend that the council have not identified what the particular character of this conservation area is when making their decision.

3.3 Camden point out that paragraph 4.1 of CPG1 states that “ rear extensions should be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale. Proportions. Dimensions and detailing; respect and preserve that original design and proportions of the building, including its Architectural period and style; respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built and unbuilt space; not cause loss of amenity to adjacent properties ....”

As previously noted Camden have confirmed that the proposed extension will not effect the neighbours amenity in any way . We contend that the extension does respect the ‘historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area’, as what is typical of the historic pattern are the alteration and additions to the rear elevations which reflect the taste aspirations and wealth of the inhabitants over the years.

3.5 Camden points out that “Primrose Hill conservation Area statement states that where rear extensions are acceptable, they should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or the conservation area. In most cases the extensions should be no more than one storey in height, but its general effect on neighbouring properties and conservation

*area will be the basis of its suitability ( PH26) Furthermore Extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace or group of buildings”*

The proposed extension for 17 Edis street is clearly unobtrusive. It is only slightly higher than the existing garden wall and only its roof ( which will be clad in timber slats and covered in plants) will be the only part of it visible to the neighbours.

The proposed extension is in harmony with the original form of the host building – it uses the same brick and the extension accentuates the existing outreach extension. The extension also respects the ‘historic pattern of development’. Camden has advised that the neighbouring two storey full length extension could not be treated as precedence as it was not granted planning permission under the current planning guidelines but it does still add to and form part of the historic pattern of development as do all the other alteration and additions to the roof scape and rear of these buildings.

3.5. Camden note that the extension is unacceptable because *“ the proposal projects further than the adjoining extensions which is contrary to the character of the adjoining terrace of properties”*.

This is not correct. The neighbouring house at 18 Edis street also has a full length extension and the proposed extension does not project further than this. Also there are many extensions all over London of exactly this size and design as they can normally be built without planning permission as they fall under the clients permitted development rights.

Camden also note that *“ Although the amenity space is of a similar size to the previously approved application, the long strip not enclosed by the rear extension is considered to be less usable space that is not harmonious to the existing pattern and character of the gardens here. The proposal is therefore considered to harm the character and appearance of the host property as well as the wider conservation area”*

We are Architects skilled in creating beautiful spaces and altering and extending houses to make the most of the existing buildings, it is our vocation. In this instance we have looked at all the options. The option which improves the house the most and ensures that the house gets the most natural daylight is to have a full length rather than a full width extension. Contrary to what Camden claim the long strip of external space along the side of the extension will be not be less useable space. In fact the long strip works far better as an external space as it is surrounded on two sides by windows. Further we cannot understand how Camden could claim that the shape and position of a small garden on the rear of an unlisted house could *“ harm the character and appearance of the host property as well as the wider conservation area”*. This is a slightly exaggerated and to my mind an Absurd claim,.

3.6. Camden notes that *“ Although the adjoining property no 18 Edis Street benefits from a two storey full depth rear extension, it is a historical development that was erected without the benefit of planning permission prior to current Camden planning policies and design guidance. This development is therefore not considered to set a valid precedent”*

Not only was the extension and 18 Edis built without planning permission but so were all the of the houses in the terrace and indeed most of the houses in the conservation area. So if the extension at 18 Edis street cannot be seen to add to or be part of the nature of the conservation area because it was constructed prior to current policies and design guidelines how do we treat the existing host building that was also built without planning permission? Surely everything that is currently built, that is all the built form, must form part of the character of the conservation area, even if it is not considered as ‘precedent’. We nor the council can pick and choose.

3.7 Camden notes that the proposal is “ *unsympathetic, bulky addition that fundamentally alters the form and character of the property and surrounding terrace*”.

It is evident that any addition to an existing building alters the form of the building, you cannot add onto a building without altering its form. If Camden refused all planning applications for additions and extensions because they altered the form of the building they would have to refuse every planning application. As a Mayor London’s plan points out London is and always has been ‘Diverse and ever changing’ . London is not like central Rome, Paris, Florence or Sienna, preserved in aspic, it is as mercantile city characterised by change , and by embracing this London remains a lively and vibrant city, at the cutting edge of Art and design.

In this vibrant mercantile ever changing city where we see buildings like the Shard, The new Kings Cross station and development, The extension to the Tate, the Walkie Talkie and numerous housing developments being build and receiving awards we are slightly flummoxed how we have end up in a position where by we are having to go to appeal over a single storied extension to an unlisted house in Primrose hill.

Camden’s refusal to grant planning permission is in our opinion unfounded and misguided. The proposal does not affect the amenity of the neighbours and any way but does significantly improve the amenity of the inhabitants. It is in keeping with the nature of this part of the conservation area. It is an tiny insignificant and obtrusive extension that cannot be seen to harm the host building nor the conservation area.

It would seem to us that the council are giving undue weight to the objections received from the neighbours. We note that when we first meet the planning officer on site she advised that she did not see anything contentious with the proposal, however receiving various objections from the neighbours the council seemed to change their opinion and advise that the scheme was unacceptable.

#### Windows:

3.8. Camden notes that the ‘Guidance’ in CPG1 ( design ) “ *Offers further guidance relating to the new or replacement windows. New windows should match the originals as closely as possible in terms of type, glazing patterns and proportions, opening method, materials and finishes, detailing the overall size of the window opening*” . Based on these design guidelines Camden advised that the “ *two storied glazed façade is contrary to Camden’s design guidance in term of it’s size, style and materials*’

In response to this we note as follows:

- i) CPG1 is design guidance only it is not policy.
- ii) The Guidance is relevant for windows on the street façade in existing openings. It is not relevant when looking at contemporary rear extensions,.
- iii) Camdens planning policy does not prevent the construction of contemporary extensions at the rear of houses using contemporary windows. Camden have already given planning permission for a rear extension at 17 Edis street with Aluminium sliding windows and a skylight .

iv) Planning permission has been granted for numerous extensions with double height in the area (1 Edis Street (2013/4225/P), 28 Fitzroy road (2015/0053/P), 14 Fitzroy road (2014/3476/P) 31 Chalcot road (2013/4697/P) for example..

vi) the proposal simply removes the brick transom between the ground floor sash window and the lower ground floor casement doors which are not original and replaces them with an elegant contemporary sash, similar to the one installed at 37 Clifton Gardens (Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/D/13/2208307 37 Clifton Gardens, London W9 1AR.)

vii)The window is carefully considered and adds another layer to the already layered rear elevations and we therefore contend that it will add to rather than detract from the nature of the conservation area.

viii) The window can only be seen by a few people, namely those living directly opposite. The proposed window will not in any way affect these neighbours amenity, there will be no increased overlooking, no increase light pollution but it will significantly improve the amenity of our clients as it will increase the amount of daylight into what is currently a dark house

ix) Camden seem to be suggesting that because the extension is 'contemporary' or 'modern' it is incongruous to the conservation area. It is great pity that well designed contemporary extensions which are authentic to the age in which it is built are not granted planning permission while less considered extensions which try and mimic, often unsuccessfully, the existing buildings are given planning permission.

x) Government policy states that “ ***the historic environment of England is all-pervasive, and it cannot in practice be preserved unchanged. We must ensure that the means are available to identify what is special in the historic environment; to define, through the development plan system its capacity for change; and, when proposals for new development come forward, to assess their impact on the historic environment and give it full weight, alongside other considerations***”

Although it forms part of the conservation area. 17 Edis Street is not a listed building. If the rear of the houses of on Edis street were of special notational importance one would expect them to be listed . Because the Buildings have not been listed it would seem to us that what is considered important about these buildings is the street façade that faces the public domain. Changes to the front of the building, especially below pediment level, should be given more consideration than changes to the rear. In this instance the council is giving equal weight to the street and garden elevations.

xi) When we meet with the planning officer on site she advised that she saw nothing contentious with the double height window, her only concern being that there may be an increase in overlooking. It seems that after receiving letter of objection the council have changed their opinion.

CORRESPONDECE THIS CANDEM AFTER THE PLANNING APPLICATION WAS SUBMITTED.

We responded to Camdens initial objections to the scheme in an email dated 2<sup>nd</sup> July noting that :

*-The proposed extension does not take up more that 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 no 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 Camden's 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 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 no other 6m high sliding doors in Fitzroy road but planning permission was granted for this at no 28 Fitzroy road. There are no 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 times 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 to be 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 above the neighbours will see a mass of flowering climbers, jasmine, honeysuckle, rambling roses and clematis. 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.*

In email to Camden 28<sup>th</sup> July we noted as follows:

*The extension will only be visible from above ( it sits below the height of the existing garden walls) The Roof of the extension would be finished with timber slats and covered in climbing plants and it would be much more interesting to look down onto this than onto current garden which is covered in grey concrete pavers and devoid of any planting. I have attached a couple of photos taken today in Primrose hill. The first is of a garden wall and shed on King Henry's road which is covered in the flowering and scented climber Trachelospermum jasminoides. The second looking is taken looking along the back garden of the houses on the South side of Gloucester road. The proposed extension when covered climbing plants would look very similar to these two images.. covered in plants it will look like a thickened garden wall, covered flowering and scented climbers. To my mind it will enhance the existing gardens.*

We also drew the councils attention a few of the other contemporary extensions built in the area noting:

*I have also attached photos of a few rear extensions which have been built in the area. The ones on Fitzroy road and Chalcot road have only just been completed, the one at 27 King Henry's road got planning permission in 2008. What is important to my mind it is the fact that these extensions, which are far more visible to the neighbours than the proposal for 17 Edis) have been given planning permission. These are simply three examples of houses that I have had access, there are many more examples that I have not photographed. It is therefore puzzling why the far more discrete extension which we are proposing is considered to be detrimental to the conservation area.*

*We contend that just because building an extension like this not the norm in this part of conservation area is not in itself a good enough reason not to grant planning permission, Camden own planning policy and the London plan states that innovation, that is finding a different solution to a problem , should not be discouraged. It seems that is exactly what Camden are doing in this instance.*

*We have made the changes requested by Camden including removing the proposed side windows, not digging down ( so there is now no requirement for a BIA) and reinstating the railing to the terrace. There is clearly now no amenity issues as there is no overlooking , there is not loss of daylight or sunlight to any of the neighbours ( the extension sits below the height of the existing garden fence) and the extension does not form a 'cliff like' effect when viewed from the neighbouring properties. Further the extension could , if there was not an article 4 on the, be built under the house holders permitted development rights.*

*There is to our knowledge no Camden planning policy which restricts the building of a full length extension ( There is on the other hand, planning policy that restricts the building of 'full width extensions' because it 'disrupts the rhythm of the outreach extensions'). It is therefore simply the opinion of the Camden planning department that the extension would be detrimental to the conservation area.*