

28 Belsize Grove

London

NW3 4TR

11 January 2016

Dear Mr O'Donnell

We are writing about the extension proposed to 26 Belsize Grove by new owner Alisa Pomeroy, following our email to your Department on 14 December. We understand from Ms Pomeroy that her planning application is now at its final stage and that she is prepared to slightly decrease the depth of her significant extension (to 3.5 metres) but will not accept any further consultation or adjustment. We are surprised by this, since we have not yet spoken to either the applicant (or yourself) and we understand that a further period consultation should take place if an amended plan is submitted. We do not know if this has been done.

In these circumstances, we have no choice but to set out our objections more formally, although we would have preferred a consultative approach. For the avoidance of doubt, we accept that a form of extension to number 30 is acceptable. Our objections relate to the size and design of the proposal, and the failure to consider and apply Camden Design Guidance CPG1 and CPG4.

You will aware that Camden's Guidance was updated in about July 2015, changing the position from that applicable to the extensions at numbers 30

and 34. Relevant caselaw, in particular the case of *East Northamptonshire District Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* [2014] EWCA 137, has also affirmed the important presumption against development in cases where harm or negative impact to a listed building has been identified. Such harm has been identified and is implicit in the heritage statement in this case. Again, this changes the position from the date of the grant of planning permission for numbers 30 and 34.

We understand that the real purpose of the application is to secure a large, lateral modern living space, rather than to work respectfully with the original design and proportions of our unusual listed Georgian terrace and apply current Camden's guidance. We believe that the applicant's interest in number 26 lies in the width of the house and not its unusual Georgian design and features. We do not think that a small reduction in the depth of the relevant proposed extension fundamentally addresses our objections or the requirements in the relevant sections of your Guidance. We are concerned that Ms Pomeroy has been poorly advised and should seek further or other help with her plans.

You may be aware that we have made a pre-planning application for a small glass extension - extending the depth of a reinstated traditional balcony with steps - to our house at number 28. We invite you to consider and contrast our own proposals. We have tried hard to respect the original features of the terrace, ensure the extension will be secondary to the house and apply other aspects of the Camden Guidance.

In making our objections, we have reminded ourselves of the key Design Guidance at 4.10 of CPG4:

‘General principles

4.10 Rear extensions should be designed to:

- *be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;*
- *respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;*
- *respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies or chimney stacks;*
- *respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space;*
- *not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure;*
- *allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden; and*
- *retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity, including that of neighbouring properties, proportionate to that of the surrounding area.*

. 4.11 Materials should be chosen that are sympathetic to the existing building wherever possible (see also CPG3 Sustainability on Sustainable use of materials).’

We think that the proposed extension to number 26 falls short of each part of 4.10 except for the requirement to retain a reasonable sized garden.

Our primary objection is that the proposal is not 'secondary' to the building being extended in terms of scale, form, proportion and detailing, contrary to the first point at 4.10 of your Guidance. Instead, it overwhelms and dominates the small Georgian house at number 26, as well as our own adjoining property. We think that the scale and primary features of the proposal would be more suited to a new build or extension to an Edwardian house. The heritage statement and the design and access statement refer to the existence of other extensions of this size and nature on the terrace; that is not correct.

Second, the design causes a loss of amenity to us and our family home with regard to (a) a sense of enclosure (b) light and (c) outlook contrary to your guidance and as described in our email of 14 December. We will look out at the extension from our sitting room and our much-used balcony at the extension. We believe we will feel 'hemmed in' between number 26 and number 30. The proposed extension will affect light - now and also when we have built our own small glass extension.

Third, the design does not preserve original design or features of number 26. In particular the delightful iron balcony and steps (which we intend to reinstate) will be made redundant at number 26. We do not accept that the ironwork and steps are not original or significant as suggested.

Fourth, we are invite you to impose a condition to any permission granted that the roof cannot be used as a terrace. We also invite you to impose conditions that building works may only be carried out between 8am and 4pm Monday-Friday. We have 3 children and often work from home.

We have been advised that permitted development does not apply to listed buildings. If it did, it would permit an extension of up to 3 metres (maximum). In our opinion, an extension to listed number 26 should not exceed this depth; nor should an extension exceed the volume of the extension at number 30, especially given the changes to your Guidance and the law since permission was granted. We invite you (and the applicants) to consider the following before grant of planning permission, if you grant permission at all:

1. a significant reduction in the depth of the extension;
2. preserving the original balcony and steps;
3. redesigning the model to ensure it is sympathetic and there are no unnecessary protrusions from skylights or anything else;
4. considering a green grass sustainable roof to the extension, together with a condition not to use as a terrace, so as to be as attractive and environmentally friendly and unobtrusive as possible.

Thank you for reading this letter. We are happy to discuss and elaborate on any aspect of it at your convenience.

Best regards,

Anna and Sa'ad Hossain