

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1071/P	Anthony Kay	14 St Pauls Crescent Camden NW1 9XL	29/03/2016 13:31:22	COMMNT	<p>I am the owner/occupier of the adjacent house.</p> <p>Whereas the original application was for a "single-storey" extension, building up to a bulk and height to the limit of what could be approved, the proposed enlargement pushes the scheme beyond this - up to an effective near-1 1/2 storey extension.</p> <p>The new application alleges that "the neighbour"s room next to the extension is a utility room and not a habitable room." This is nugatory and misconceived. No inspection of the views from my house has taken place. The applicant/agent is proceeding from a previous citation of this utility room merely as a static reference point for gauging the height of the extension.</p> <p>In fact the extension, if built to the amended height, would loom starkly large over my patio and garden, dominating the view to that side and blocking out much of the light. If built to this size the overall effect will be only to emphasize how out of keeping the whole structure is with neighbouring dwellings, especially in the context of the disharmonious concretizing of the garden, now enclosed by an illuminated white palisade (height &gt;2m to be verified?).</p> <p>The applicant/agent claims that the offending structure has been built to a prohibited height "by accident". Even if that is so, it indicates a gross failure of due diligence on the part of one or more contractors. The remedy is not to inveigle the council to contravene its own and national guidelines but to claim on contractor insurance policies in respect of direct and consequential losses, If it was an "accident" the policy will cover expense, time and inconvenience.</p> <p>It is not for the next door neighbour to suffer. It is not for the developer to exploit the "accident" in order to confront the council and community with a fait accompli.</p> <p>If developers can defy planning consent by building up to greater bulks and heights than permitted, merely alleging that it was all a mistake or an accident, and confident that Camden will readily let the scheme through, they will logically assume that they can infringe public law rights at will.</p> <p>Approval of this new application will create and entrench an inequitable and exploitable precedent, and serve only to encourage future developer duplicity.</p>

---