

**RICHARD FERRARO - BA(Hons) DipArch ARB RIBA FRSA**

**CONSULTANT ARCHITECT**

**28 PALGRAVE HOUSE FLEET ROAD LONDON NW3 2QJ**

**E MAIL: [richardferraro@hotmail.com](mailto:richardferraro@hotmail.com) MOBILE: 07794 858479**

**For the attention of:** John Diver (Case Officer),  
Planning and Built Environment, London Borough of Camden

**Date:** 21 July 2016

5 Pages

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Ref: Planning Application no. 2016/3305/P at 30 Ornan Road,  
London NW3 4QB – for “Erection of roof extension to create a second floor level  
with external terraces and canopy to existing dwelling (C3)”**

I am a Chartered Architect of 40 years’ experience in the UK, during which time I operated my own Architectural practice for 30 years. My experience includes the design and construction of housing in London and other parts of the UK, and many other building types. I have extensive experience of preparing and managing Planning Applications.

On this occasion, I have been engaged on a professional basis as advisor regarding this Planning Application, by Mr Adriaan de Mol van Otterloo and Ms Fleur Meijs, who are joint freehold owners and occupiers of the four storey Victorian house next door to 30 Ornan Road; ie the detached house on the adjoining plot, just to the west of 30 Ornan Road.

**NB:** For historic reasons, there is no longer a property titled 32 Ornan Road. My clients’ house is titled 34 Ornan Road, and it is immediately next door to 30 Ornan Road.

I have inspected the application documents for this Planning Application, as posted on LB Camden’s application website under the heading “Related Documents”. I have reviewed the Application Form, the drawings, and the “Planning and Design Statement”.

**My early conclusion is that the application documents contain very significant material errors and inconsistencies. So much so that I am of the opinion that the Planning Application cannot be properly evaluated and considered by the Council in its present form, and certainly not approved. In my opinion the Planning Application must either be withdrawn in its entirety by the Applicant, (then corrected and re-submitted from scratch, resulting in a new public consultation period); or the Council must refuse the Planning Application at the earliest possible date, under delegated powers.**

In particular there are serious material errors and inconsistencies in the drawings of the proposals, to the extent that it is not at all clear what the design proposals actually consist

of. The drawings of the proposals do not co-ordinate one with the other. In fact they specifically conflict, one with the other, and different drawings show different design proposals.

**This is wholly unacceptable, and results in a situation where there is no clear definition of the design proposals; or how they relate to the existing house of the Applicant at 30 Ornan Road; or to its terrace of three houses; or to my clients' house next door at 34 Ornan Road; or to other residential properties behind and in front of 30 Ornan Road; or to the street frontage; or to the Conservation Area as a whole.**

I will illustrate the background to my opinion (as above) in the remainder of this letter, where I include a review of the Applicant's drawings of the proposals. What follows is not exhaustive, but I highlight various important points of material consequence, which fully justify my opinion as above.

**On the Council's website, the following drawings are displayed:**

- Of the building as existing: 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, (there is no drawing 06), 07, 08, 09, 10.
- Of the proposals: 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.

**Drawing no. 11:** Proposed Plan of Extension

- There is no north point.
- This drawing shows slot windows facing 34 Ornan Road. This is wholly inconsistent with drawings 13 and 14, which show the slot windows facing 28 Ornan Road and no slot windows facing 34 Ornan Road.
- The extent of the rear roof terrace is unclear on this drawing.
- The larger roof terrace is shown on this drawing at the front of 30 Ornan Road. This is wholly inconsistent with drawings 12, 13, 14 and 17, where it is shown at the rear.
- No 'privacy screens' are included on this drawing, even though these are mentioned on other drawings, and in the 'Planning and Design Report'.

**Drawing no. 12:** Proposed Roof Plan

- There is no north point.
- The roof overhang ('canopy') is shown on this drawing at the front of 30 Ornan Road. This is wholly inconsistent with drawings 13, 14, 15 and 17 where the roof overhang is shown at the rear of 30 Ornan Road.

**Drawing no. 13:** Proposed Side Elevation (viewed from 34 Ornan Road)

- The roof overhang ('canopy') is shown on this drawing at the rear of 30 Ornan Road. This is wholly inconsistent with drawing 12, which shows it at the front, and drawing 16, which doesn't show it at all. (Cont/....)

- The provision or otherwise of privacy screens is unclear on this drawing, and is inconsistent with other drawings in this regard.
- There are no slot windows shown on this drawing. This is wholly inconsistent with drawing 11.

**Drawing no. 14:** Proposed Side Elevation (viewed from 28 Ornan Road, with flank of no. 26)

- The positions of the 'Property Lines' (ie boundary positions) on this drawing are wrong. This mis-represents the relationship of the subject property with other properties.
- The roof overhang ('canopy') is shown on this drawing at the rear of 30 Ornan Road. This is wholly inconsistent with drawing 12, which shows it at the front.
- The drawing shows slot windows facing 28 Ornan Road. This is wholly inconsistent with drawing 11, which shows the slot windows facing 34 Ornan Road.

**Drawing no. 15:** Proposed Front Elevation

- This is a confusing drawing and it does not properly represent the design as described elsewhere and drawn elsewhere.
- The drawing is difficult to read, regarding positions of elements and different materials in the proposed extension.
- The drawing is inconsistent with other drawings regarding the position of the roof overhang ('canopy') and the position of the larger roof terrace.

**Drawing no. 16:** Proposed Rear Elevation

- This is also a confusing drawing and it does not properly represent the design as described elsewhere and drawn elsewhere.
- The drawing is difficult to read, regarding positions of elements and different materials in the proposed extension.
- The drawing is inconsistent with other drawings regarding the position of the roof overhang ('canopy') and the position of the larger roof terrace.

**Drawing no. 17:** Proposed Section BB

- This drawing shows the roof overhang and the larger balcony to the rear of 30 Ornan Road. This is wholly inconsistent with drawings 11 and 12.

**Drawing no. 19:** Artist's Impression

- This drawing cannot be accepted as an application drawing, because it shows the same roof extension added to other properties, which do not form part of this Planning Application.
- I understand that the Applicant has no control over these other properties.

I will also make some remarks about other parts of the application documents. This is not an exhaustive review:

- In the Application Form, in Section 3 on Description of the Proposals, the Applicant states that there is only one roof terrace, at the rear. From what I can gather from the drawings (even though there are material errors and inconsistencies, as outlined above) it appears that there are two roof terraces proposed, at front and rear of 30 Ornan Road: both of different size.
- These details on roof terraces must be clarified in the Application Form and on the drawings. In particular, the extent of the proposed roof terraces must be clear and consistent on all the drawings, together with clarity and consistency about the positions and sizes of the larger and smaller roof terraces (front and rear).
- In the Application Form, in Section 9 on Materials, the Applicant mentions 'Concrete'. This is inconsistent with the application drawings where there is no mention of 'Concrete' as an external facing material.
- The 'Planning and Design Statement' ought properly to be titled the 'Design and Access Statement'. In any event, the sub-title of the Applicant's 'Planning and Design Statement' is incorrect and mis-leading. It refers to the proposed extension being at First Floor level. It is at Second Floor level.
- The 'Planning and Design Statement' submitted by the Applicant is not prepared in accordance with the Best Practice Guidance document published in 2006 by CABE (now part of the Design Council). The CABE document was prepared and published to accompany the government's circular titled "Guidance on Changes to the Development Control System", effective from 10 August 2006.
- The artist's impressions of the proposals as contained in the Applicant's 'Planning and Design Statement' are inconsistent with some or all of the application drawings; in particular with regard to the positions of proposed roof terraces, the positions of the roof overhang ('canopy'), the positions of windows, and the positions of privacy screens and other details.
- There are also many illustrations of other buildings in the 'Planning and Design Statement', which do not form part of this Planning Application. These illustrations are not adequately titled, and serve to confuse the reader regarding what specifically the design proposals consist of.

**In conclusion**, my strong view is that the seriousness of the errors and inconsistencies in the application drawings and other related documents is such that it is impossible to carry out any form of proper professional analysis and review of the proposals; as is necessary to formulate a well-considered opinion on the appropriateness or otherwise of the proposals. This, very understandably, is what my clients have instructed me to do. And currently I am unable to carry out their instructions for the reasons stated.

Under the circumstances, and given that the period of public consultation is now well advanced, I do not consider it appropriate at all for the Applicant at this late stage to be permitted by the Council to amend and substitute drawings and other information within the timescale and process of this current Planning Application.

In my opinion, if the Applicant wishes to pursue this proposal, a new (corrected) Planning Application must be prepared and submitted by the Applicant, following which a new 21 day period of public consultation must take place, following issue by the Council of new consultation letters and notices.

**On the basis of my review of the Planning Application, as summarised above, I formally request the following:**

- 1.) The Council must insist that the Applicant withdraws the Planning Application, with a view to submitting a new (corrected) Planning Application, if the Applicant so wishes; or**
- 2.) The Council must refuse the Planning Application at the earliest possible date.**

**The above requests are made because of the serious material errors and inconsistencies in the application drawings and other application documents, as summarised above.**

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD FERRARO - BA(Hons) DipArch ARB RIBA FRSA

Consultant Architect