

Brian and Tessa Evans  
7 Evangelist Road, London NW5 1UA  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
e mail [REDACTED]

Emily Whittredge  
Camden Regeneration and Planning Development Management  
Town Hall, Judd Street, London WC1H 9JE  
1 June 2016

Dear Ms Whittredge

**Comments on Planning Application 2015/6602/P: 9A Evangelist Road**

We have previously commented on this application with a number of objections (22 March 2016). We were under the impression that the applicants were intending to submit revised plans which took account of our comments. However the plans which are now under consideration are identical to the previous ones, and with the same planning reference. Accordingly our comments remain the same.

We wish to object to a number of features of the proposals, and draw your attention to some points where there is a lack of clarity which makes it difficult to evaluate them. We would also like to suggest some modifications which would make for a more acceptable proposal. The plans are for a permanent structural extension to replace the present conservatory, and extending all the way across to our wall. While we have no objection in principle to the creation of a permanent lateral extension of the original rear extension, we remain opposed to the following aspects:

1. The plans indicate that the extension would continue beyond the end of our extension, alongside a stretch of the wall of our garden. This is clearly not aesthetically pleasing and would be an unsatisfactory encroachment. We propose that the extension should end in line with ours.
2. Although they are not very clear on this point, the plans appear to indicate that the flat roof would be at a higher level than ours, giving rise to interference with our present parapet wall and coping stones. This would be most unattractive. We believe that it would be more in keeping if the proposed flat roof were at the same level as ours.
3. There is no indication as to how rain water drainage from the proposed flat roof would be achieved.

We have discussed these issues with the owners of No. 9 at the time of their first application (February/March 2016). They indicated that they would consider modifications to their application to deal with them. In particular we understood that they would consider reducing the length of their original extension so that the lateral extension would coincide with the end of ours, with the full width rear extension thus squared off. They also indicated that they would ensure that their plans specified that the flat roof would be at the same height as ours.

As these modifications to the plans have not been made we re-iterate our objections.

[REDACTED]  
Brian and Tessa Evans