

## **ADDENDUM I – REPORT ON THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS**

Date sent: 16.08.16

APP/X5210/D/16/3156572

Appeal against refusal of planning permission for a roof extension at 30 Ornan Road.

LPA ref 2016/3305/P.

Addendum to submitted (on 15.08.16) Written Representations Statement of Case.

We have just (yesterday, 15.08.16) submitted our full Statement of Case as required and have received acknowledgment of our appeal (referenced above). Based on that Statement we would now like for the Inspector's and the public's convenience to attach the letters the Council received in connection with the planning application, and make some comments on them. We have obtained these from the Council's website. We hope this is helpful. We have also sent this to the LPA today.

### **1.0 LETTERS OF SUPPORT**

1.1 There have been 3 letters of open and strong support for the proposal (docs 1, 2). We hope we will be excused if we focus on these in some detail as they include the immediate adjacent (no 28) and opposite (43) neighbours who are directly affected. The 3<sup>rd</sup> letter of full support is from 10 Belsize Avenue nearby.

1.2 Mr. and Mrs. Hill at no 28 consider this proposal to be a...  
*"...modern, simple and transparent design which will blend well with the nature of architectural styles found nearby in the street and add interest to the townscape"*...and... *"...in fact articulates*

*the currently flat and boxy house and terrace, thus improving its appearance and interest. Mr. Maurice has taken care to set in the building from all sides behind the existing protruding parapet and that makes it subservient to the main house whilst allows sufficient space for us to propose a similar extension should we wish to in the future”.*

2.2 Mr. Kandel who lives opposite at 43 Ornan Road comments: *“...I live at 43 which is opposite. I would greatly welcome a more consistent view across the street. The houses directly opposite are both elegant 4 storey homes and the 3 terraced homes look out of place as 2 floor homes. It would be great to create a more consistent approach to the eyeline. I support.”* (letter also on the same doc 1 – “detracted” by the LPA’s system).

2.3 Further strong and welcoming support comes from Mr. and Mrs. Blitz at 10 Belsize Avenue who also seem to have captured precisely what we were hoping we were doing with this extension in their...

*“Letter of Support”:*

*... “We are happy to fully support this planning application.*

*The three houses – 26, 28 and 30 are some of the few houses on Ornan Road that look tired and unattractive and add no value to the streetscape.*

*The interesting, innovative design of appropriate scale the owners have submitted would be a welcome addition to our architectural eclectic area.”*

(Doc 2).

2.4 It is evident that these most affected residents who hold a positive and progressive outlook do share our vision that the proportionate and innovative extension will improve not only the house and the street but the conservation area also as a whole and open the way to encourage the other two “tired” houses to do the same.

## **2.0 LETTERS OF OBJECTION**

2.1 As is (very) normal, letters of objection were also received. **A key letter is on behalf of the Villa, again most near, which very interestingly however, does not raise any objection or comment on the principle, or indeed the design, of the extension whatsoever, but simply raises concern over potential sideways overlooking of the glazed rooflight they have placed on an extension they have built at ground floor and the garden (Doc 3).**

2.2 We take this lack of in-principle or design objection from our immediate and most prominent neighbor as most encouraging and as explained in our Statement of Case **we would ensure that any such overlooking would be limited if not entirely erase via screening to be agreed** (indeed, with the Villa) and a form of which is already proposed in wood to grow plants on which we actually thought would make it attractive, and which could in any case take a number of other forms, including obscure glass which would overcome the LPA’s concern over it being “obtrusive”. To reassure the occupiers there and to also address the real extent of any valid planning concern we wrote to the LPA in response to this and copied the Villa while the applicants are in communication with its occupiers regarding this. (Doc 4).

2.3 We also attach for your ease of reference all the other objections received (which you would receive from the LPA in any case). We do not, however, propose to repeat ourselves regarding the basic design issue which we feel we have adequately covered as we see it and in the policy framework that prevails as well as in the significant difference of this proposal to that dismissed at 28. Most if not all of these comments refer to the design and they tend to be of the usual preference to retain the status quo at all cost, not sharing the need and efforts to improve and innovate our homes and cities.

2.4 As regards the issue of overlooking we feel we have addressed this adequately in our response to the Villa (Doc 4). The approved rear of the 3-house extension would have led to more direct overlooking so the LPA has accepted this to be of a normal degree one finds in terraced and close bordering houses and gardens. In fact we planned to protect from sideways overlooking a great deal more now by proposing a corner screen at both ends of the terrace (which, incidentally, unlike the LPA we also thought could indeed look very attractive to all and from longer views if in good wood and planted with climbers!). This degree of overlooking diagonally is to be found in most of London's streets and certainly in this one.

### **Attached**

Doc 1 – Letters of support from 28 and 43 Ornan Road.

Doc 2 – Letter of Support from 10 Belsize Avenue

Doc 3 – Letter of overlooking concern from Villa next door

Doc 4 – Response email to above letter also sent to LPA

Other attachments – Letters of objection.

-----