

Jonathan and Susanna
Butterworth 21 College Lane,
London NW5 1BJ

Elizabeth and James Dimond,
21A College Lane, London NW5
1BJ

2nd April 2017

Planning Decision Appeal, Statement of Case
Camden 2016/2793/P

We believe the planners decision to refuse planning permission for the loft extension to our houses to be incorrect and unreasonable for the following reasons:

1. They have incorrectly and unfairly characterised our house as part of an “unimpaired roofline”. College Lane is characterised in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area statement (Document 5) as a narrow path with a mix of two and three storey houses of different widths and plots. Our houses are two storey. The buildings are not listed and the Conservation Group did not object to the plans, neither did any of our neighbours. The Statement on College Lane, explicitly says that “the variations of façade treatment and articulation, and **mix of eaves lines provide valuable interest**”. The proposed development would be entirely in keeping with this varied and higgledy-piggeldy roofline. The decision is also inconsistent as there have been at least five loft extensions permitted in the lane in the last five years at numbers 8, 18, 17, 19 and 16.
2. We applied for similar planning permission over 10 years ago and accepted refusal at that time as there were no recent loft extensions in the lane. However, following the successful applications of others in the lane to do the same work, we put in a similar plan using the same architects and builders as our neighbours. Thus we find the decision to refuse us both **inconsistent and unfair**.
3. The officer report gives the impression that the proposal would adversely affect the surrounding street scene. In fact, now that the modified proposal **preserves the eaves line and the delicate associated brickwork**, the development would be **invisible from the Lane** itself (as can be seen in the photographs in the design and access statement, document 3), and indeed from anywhere in the conservation area. It would be visible from the nearby estate (see photo A) and the very nearby new developments (which have themselves dramatically impacted on the street scene – photographs in document 4) but from those vantage points the intimacy of the Lane is not in any case evident (photographs in the design statement document 3), and the “valuable interest” of the mix of the lane would be preserved.
4. Much is made of the mass of the proposal and the visibility. However, although we accept that the work at number 16 and 17 is smaller, the

works at number 8 and 18 are much more prominent and at least as significant as that proposed for our houses.

5. The planners have incorrectly identified 21 and 21A as part of a group with 22 and 23. While 22 and 23 share the height of the eaves line and roof pitch they are of **different construction and have different architectural styles** (for example, 22 and 23 lack the delicate brickwork on the eaves, and have different window and door layouts). They also go around an angle in the lane, further differentiating 22 and 23 from our homes and making it clear they are not a single four-house terrace as the planners seem to think. In this context, we believe the coincidence of roof pitches is of little value, especially as (as stated above) it is invisible from the Lane, the Conservation area, and most of the immediate vicinity. The proposal puts our roof on a line with neighbors at 20 and 19 as opposed to 22 and 23.
6. After a meeting at the Town Hall with the planners to try to understand their issues, we modified the plans to meet their concerns regarding the eaves line and brickwork, but this has **not been properly considered** or acknowledged in their decision. A visit to the site would have made it clear that after modification, the proposals would have zero impact on the immediate street scene.

The above argument are, we believe, strongly supported by the photographs and drawings accompanying the proposal, and refer also to the letter we sent accompanying the modified designs, which we do not believe was seriously addressed or considered by the planners.



A: View from Ingestre estate

Yours faithfully,

J & S Butterworth, E & J Dimond