

[REDACTED]

From: Hope, Obote
Sent: 07 February 2018 08:12
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 2017/6650/P. -- 89 Hillway LONDON N6 6AB. -- 2nd objection letter to newly amended plans attached
Attachments: ISAACS ii obj letter JAN18 .pdf
Importance: High

Please log as an objection.

Thanks.

From: Philip Andrews [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 01 February 2018 18:05
To: Hope, Obote <Obote.Hope@camden.gov.uk>
Cc: Rob Isaacs [REDACTED]; Abbie Sharland [REDACTED]
Subject: 2017/6650/P. -- 89 Hillway LONDON N6 6AB. -- 2nd objection letter to newly amended plans attached
Importance: High

Dear Obote
please see the attached 2nd objection letter to the above planning application and its revised details made on behalf of the adjacent neighbour (Mr Rob Isaacs) at no 91

NOTE that I am attaching the objection in letter format as there is no longer a way of uploading an objection, as before, via the application on Camden's website.

As such please confirm safe receipt of this latest objection letter

Kind regards
Philip



PHILIP ANDREWS
Director

philip@vvhplanning.com
01483 28 40 28 // 07919 40 40 42
www.vvhplanning.com

This e-mail is for the above addressee(s) it may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not an addressee you must not copy, distribute, disclose or use any information in it or any attachments. If you have received it in error please notify the sender and delete it immediately.

1 February 2018

WvH Planning Ltd on behalf of
Robert Isaacs
91 Hillway, London N6 6AB

Site address: 89 Hillway LONDON N6 6AB

Proposal: ****AMENDED DESCRIPTION**** Erection of infill extension to the rear at ground floor with additional rooflight, installation of metal balustrade with door for a proposed roof terrace to the flank elevation at first floor level, enlarged ground floor side extension towards the front elevation, installation of a chimney stack and new velux conservation rooflight associated with the amendment of planning permission 2017/0558/P dated 05/04/2017 and variation of condition 2017/4379/P dated 14/11/2017.

Revised drawings: received and made public on 19/01/2018

Council Ref: 2017/6650/P

Case officer: Obote Hope

Dear Mr Hope

As owner of the property immediately adjacent to the application site, Mr Isaacs has been able to view the latest amended plans as submitted on 19/01/2018 with particular reference to details that delete the previous 1st floor side extension and replace it with a 1st floor enclosed outside roof terrace area with its associated front and rear balustrading.

Mr Isaacs acknowledges that in removing the 1st floor side extension from the proposals will address the on-principle material concern that side infill would have eroded the character of the Holly Lodge Conservation Area by closing the gap between the two houses at first floor level. **HOWEVER**, the retreat/reduction being proposed to alleviate this concern will, similarly, not satisfy the basic test of preserving the character and appearance of the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area. The newly introduced side roof terrace area, with front and rear balustrading, will provide a highly visible and an incongruous feature that can again be considered to diminish the area's distinctness, and forming the roof area into a raised terrace would be particularly harmful to the historic character of the estate. As such it is reasonable that the current application, as amended, should be refused.

It is further requested that the LPA should take a consistent approach in dealing with such applications and in particular when considering roof terraces. Mr Isaacs' own application at no 91, ref 2017/4770/P, that included a relatively small rear roof terrace was, following consultation with the Estate's conservation area advisory committee (CAAC) and on advice from officers, was reduced to effectively provide a small Juliette-type balcony area only. It would therefore be inconsistent if officers took a contrary view to the proposed details here, particularly when the proposed roof terrace here is at the side and is therefore also highly visible from roadside views in front.

It is also relevant that on previous advise, the existing rear balcony/terrace areas at no 87 do not provide precedent for new roof terrace areas per se. On specific officer advice during the course of Mr Isaacs' own recent application, as referenced above, it was clearly advised that this particular terrace area *"was constructed without planning permission and would not be used as material consideration"*.

The overview of the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area attached to Mr Isaacs' previous objection is still relevant but will not be repeated again here.

In summary the proposed amended details to replace the side infill extension with a raised side roof terrace area with its associated front and rear balustrading will be highly visible from both adjacent rear garden areas and also from front roadside positions such that it will create an incongruous feature detrimental to the character of the conservation area. In addition, it will also provide a large open outdoor raised terrace area that will be detrimental to neighbour amenities and would also be inconsistent with recent planning recommendation and decisions and also contrary to current guidance for development in the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area.

As such it is reasonable that details associated with the current amended application should be refused.

Kind regards

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Philip Andrews.

Philip Andrews