

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------|--|
| 2017/3934/P | Matt Bailey | 61 Netherhall Gardens | 25/08/2017 18:09:08 | OBJLETTE R | On behalf of our client, Mr O Shevchuk, owner of 61 Netherhall Gardens, we hereby wish to register a formal objection to the above application at 59 and a half Netherhall Gardens, for the erection of a hipped roof over the existing flat roofed dwelling house with two front and three rear dormer windows. |

Prior to lodging this objection we have already contacted the applicant directly with our concerns, and have asked that these be taken into account in the scheme design. We have now been informed by the applicant's architect that our suggested amendments cannot be taken into consideration - hence we must therefore bring to your attention the issues raised in our discussions.

First and foremost I would note that my client supports in principle the extension of Chalcot House to create a pitched roof – indeed this is typical of many houses surrounding the property as identified in the supporting documentation. However, the proposed design incorporates two large south-facing dormers to the front elevation which are considered inappropriate both in terms of 1) design and 2) potential impact to residential amenity at number 61 Netherhall Gardens.

Design

Camden Local Plan Policies D1 and D2 provide a number of criteria against which applications should be assessed in terms of Design and Heritage. These include respecting context and character, materials, and preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.

It is acknowledged that the existing building already features dormer windows above the eastern garage wing, however this section of the house is much more subservient in scale and the ridge height proportionally lower than what is proposed above the main house in this instance. The insertion of dormer windows (with associated roffing and cheeks) leads to a rather top heavy appearance to the main roof.

As a general rule one would approach dormer windows with the intention of achieving a degree of symmetry in elevational terms – that is not possible here due to the shape of the existing house and is evident on the elevation above.

Furthermore we would note that the image on page 4 of the “Planning Statement” document submitted with the application, intended to illustrate the proposed development, does not include the proposed south facing dormer windows and is therefore somewhat misleading.

Our collective view is that the inclusion of dormer windows to the front elevation in this case is detrimental to the character of the building, and the wider Conservation Area.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Even in the event that officers felt the inclusion of dormer windows in this location could be supported (and we maintain they should not), the size of the proposed openings in this case are excessive. The Design and Access Statement submitted with the application refers to the dormers being “designed to be subservient to windows below” which implies that the issue of size had been raised during pre-application discussions.

It is clear simply by viewing the elevation above that the proposed dormers are not subservient to the windows below, rather they appear much larger due to the heavy nature of their surrounding construction and roof forms.

Amenity

Camden Planning Guidance CPG 6 “Amenity” provides clear recommendations in relation to overlooking and privacy in section 7. The document states that “the location of new windows should be carefully designed to avoid overlooking.”

Our view is that the proposed south facing windows, which overlook our client’s garden space, are unnecessary and could be replaced with conservation style velux windows or removed completely if the internal layout was amended slightly.

Conclusion

In summary, whilst our client is not adverse to the extension of their neighbour’s property in broad terms, it is considered that the proposed dormer windows to the south elevation, due to their positioning and size, are harmful to the host building and character of the Conservation Area, and also cause harm to the amenity and privacy of occupiers of number 61 Netherhall Gardens through increased overlooking.

On this basis, the scheme is considered to conflict with Camden’s Local Plan Policy D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) and supplementary guidance on Amenity contained within Camden Planning Guidance 6. We would therefore respectfully request that the Council refuses the application unless amendments are made to remove the two south facing dormers from the scheme design.

This is a matter of extreme importance for our client and we would therefore ask for confirmation of receipt of this objection as soon as possible, and request also to be kept informed of the officer’s recommendation in advance of a decision being made.

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|

Kind regards

Yours sincerely

Matt Bailey
Director

Total: 2