



ANTHONY H. KAY LLB.  
SOLICITOR  
Non-practicing

26 Crossfield Road  
Hampstead  
London NW3 4NT



28 January 2016

BY POST & EMAIL

Raymond Yeung Esq.  
Case Officer  
Planning Applications  
London Borough of Camden  
5 Pancras Square  
London NIC 4AG

Dear Sir,

**25 Crossfield Road, London NW3 4NT  
Application No.2016/0375/P**

I refer to my phone conversation with you yesterday afternoon, when I informed you that, as the neighbouring owner together with my wife we are greatly adversely affected by the proposals, I would be writing to you setting out our objections. An email alert was sent out on the 26th January, which I could only read briefly on my old mobile phone as the internet connection on my computer was not working. The application was described as being for a Certificate of Lawfulness, from which I mistakenly got the impression that it was a belated application for permission for the existing conservatory or at the most for a replacement. Fortunately I received the new hub from BT yesterday and was able to check the application which is not a replacement or extension of the existing conservatory, but for the construction of a substantial brick sided building with what appears to be a conventional dark opaque roof (not the glass roof of a conservatory although that is not completely clear from the material submitted) extending the whole width of the property over the existing boundary wall with my property, and may well encroach over my land.

Although the applicant is described as being Kasia Piotrowska of Formwork Architects in St. John's Wood, that being her original maiden name which she still uses in her profession as an architect, she is in fact my neighbour and the owner and main occupant of the above property 25 Crossfield Road, the subject of the application. Even though since she has remarried and is less and less at the property, although she was there last weekend and her two grown up children are there a bit more often; she has had ample opportunity to discuss this with me first, and it is extremely disturbing that she has chosen not to do so; especially as it seems from our conversation yesterday afternoon that in respect of applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, Camden Council does not inform neighbours by letter or affix a nearby notice, in this case there is a post directly in front of no.25. Having read that Camden Council was thinking about discontinuing

sending out letters in the future to neighbours, I already subscribed more or less as soon as it became operative very recently for email alerts, but did not think that if I had not done so I would not have received any notice. Apart from anything else this means that permission might be granted without a neighbour's knowledge at all so he would be unable to even check if the proposals were really covered by the General Development Order. Fortunately that is academic in this case, and you should be receiving my objections in very good time so as to be able to take them fully into account before reaching any decision.

Before going into the detail of my objections, I think it might be helpful to give some information on the background of the original development of the seven terraced town houses, 24 to 30 Crossfield Road by Eton College in the early 1960s. Eton College had owned all the land around since the 1500s, and intended to continue to do so forever, until leasehold enfranchisement forced them to sell the freehold. Accordingly as Eton College thought they were going to own these houses forever, and be the landlord, there are quite a number of shared facilities and services, which are more straightforward for one landlord to maintain; but can cause complications when the houses are split into separate freehold ownership, especially when changes are made to the original design such as by rear extensions upon which I will comment in more detail. The original design at the rear is for the kitchen of two neighbouring houses to be next to each other, and similarly for the ground floor reception room/dining room (there is another reception room on the first floor to the front with balcony) of one house to be next to each other. So the reception rooms of nos.24 and 25 are next to each other, the kitchen of no.25 is next to my kitchen at no. 26, and similarly my reception room at 26 is next to that of no.27 and so on. The ground floor reception rooms, as part of the original design, have a small 90 metre extension at ground floor level only on to the terrace at the back of all the houses. This is indicated on the photo A of the rear of my house no.26 and no.27 which I have enclosed with the hard copy of this letter sent by First Class Post. Both nos. 24 and 25 have added to this extension by the addition of glass conservatories, that of no.25 being just over two metres away from our boundary and our kitchen window. This raised terrace leading down to the rest of the patio was not intended to be built over and be load bearing, as in many ways it is really only covering for the communal drain which runs along it very near the surface at the back of all seven houses providing drainage from the kitchens and for the rainwater of the flat roof extensions. This drainage system unfortunately quite often gets blocked, and to clear it a hose has to be run through one of the houses to the back and then into one of the manhole covers, so access is really needed to the terrace, and substantial building should therefore not be permitted on the terrace for this reason alone. Fortunately as you will see from photo A, there is no additional structure at the back of nos. 26 or no.27, and in fact this is also the position with no.28. Prior to becoming a conservation area various changes were made to the rear of no.29 and also more recently to no.30 (which does not affect the manhole there), but both these properties are more secluded and hidden from view by the high back side wall of Eton Court. Apart from two relatively light conservatories with glass sloping roofs at the rear of nos.24 & 25, the next three properties are still as originally planned, and any application for a bulky square shaped structure consisting of a lot of brick and a flat opaque dark roof, should be refused as being out of place, especially in the context of the locality being a conservation area.

We bought our house in 2002, when the existing conservatory was already there, but yesterday I tried to find online any information on the planning permission which may have been granted when the conservatory was originally built, but unfortunately was unable to find anything. I was particularly interested in seeing if the decision only permitted the conservatory to be an extension to the ground floor reception and not to spread over the whole of the back area close to or upto my property and the kitchen window, as any reasons given for this might again be relevant this time.

The plans submitted indicate a solid brick built structure constructed on top of the existing boundary wall. Whatever the exact legal status of that wall it does not belong solely if at all to no.25, and the owner of no.25 especially as an architect should know this. She should also be aware that this wall is a light partition wall only and is not intended to be load bearing, and in addition is unlikely to have sufficient foundations as that would interfere with the communal pipes running through the terrace. While the matters I have referred to in this paragraph raise issues in addition to purely planning aspects, I would submit that they are still relevant in considering this application.

I also wish to refer to the Supporting Document 160115 being two Rear Elevation Photos. The second of these also shows my kitchen window, and how the original design provided very well for both kitchens to receive good light and ventilation, but to be sufficiently separated from each other so as to minimise disturbance such as cooking smells. This overall good design would be negated by the proposed bulky structure immediately adjacent. As the adverse effects on the light and air to be enjoyed by our kitchen are not properly set out, I am enclosing photo B on which I have outlined how the new structure would loom over our property and in particular severely adversely affect our kitchen's access to light and ventilation.

The two Rear Elevation photos usefully show the existing set up at the rear of the kitchen of no.25. This indicates two important matters which will be completely blocked off by the proposed brick wall of the new structure. Firstly on the left there is a boiler house behind a white door with the appropriate air vent and balance flue. This will be blocked off by the brick wall directly in front, and there does not appear to be any provision for vents etc. in the plans submitted. Secondly on the right there is large white drain pipe which receives the rainwater from the original flat roof extensions to the reception rooms and conservatories of both nos.25 and 24. I have mentioned already that because of the original expectation that all the houses would remain leasehold and owned by Eton College there are quite a number of shared services which need to be taken into account. The water from that drain pipe then runs into the interceptor which is situated on my terrace. Also the waste pipe for the kitchen of no.24 runs into a gulley which is hidden from view now as it is next to the boiler behind its door, which again runs into the interceptor on my terrace as does the continuation of the communal drain going onto no.24. The important point on this is that this existing drain pipe carrying the rain water from the roofs of both nos.24 and 25 would seem to completely disappear if the new structure were built, and that there does not seem to be any provision for drainage and guttering of the new flat roof. It cannot be in order for permission to be given where a lot of the rainwater is likely to run over my land or even worse adversely affect the structure of my building.

To summarise I have set out a lot of reasons both to do with the bulk of the new proposals and its materials why it would be inappropriate for the locality, especially being part of a conservation area, and the particular proposals severely adversely affect and interfere with our own access to light and air; apart from a number of matters while being planning considerations also raise other issues. Accordingly I consider the application should be refused, and any future permissions should be limited to a replacement of the existing conservatory in the same position and of similar construction. If however despite this it is decided to allow any extension, I do not think it should be permitted to be right upto the boundary but should be set back by at least a metre. This would at least mean that proper provision can be made for the boiler flue, and also proper drainage from all the flat roofs belonging to nos.24 and 25 and a replacement to the existing white pipe can be arranged within the curtilage of no.25.

Yours faithfully,

A.H.Kay