



23 May 2018

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: 23 Perrin's Walk, NW3 6TH
Planning Application: 2018/1673/P

This letter is sent to object to the above planning application and to set out our reasons for the objection.

On reviewing the planning history for the subject property, it can be seen that the present applicant has made serial applications for planning permission, notably in 2006 (2006/5692/P) and 2009 (2009/5862/P), before the present application (2018/1673/P).

Planning "creep"

The 2006 planning application was for the "*erection of a staircase enclosure ... to facilitate the use of the flat roof of the dwelling house as a roof terrace*".

The 2009 planning application described the roof development as an "*extended conservatory*".

The present (2018) application is said to involve the "*enlargement of [the] existing roof top extension*". In reality, the proposed works would involve the construction of a new storey on the property when viewed from Church Row, with a fully-glazed extension spanning the entire width of the property, to include a study/bedroom, bathroom and store.

It is clear from the planning history of the subject property that the present application is the latest in a series of steps in pursuit of incremental expansion. That is not an end to which planning policy should lend itself.

If granted, the resultant property would be dominant, intrusive, unbalanced in its layout (see, loss of amenity space), and disproportionate (whether the subject property is regarded in isolation, or in proximity to adjacent houses).

Dominant

The proposed extension would add considerable bulk to the rear elevation of the subject property. The property overlooks residential gardens. As the subject property has no back garden of its own, the rear elevation looks down

immediately onto other private gardens. It does so at a point where the distance between the houses on Perrin's Walk and Church Row narrows.

Intrusive

The addition of a further storey at the back of the subject property would intrude on the privacy of many back gardens. It would, literally, overshadow those gardens, creating a hemmed-in, and cramped, feel to what is now an open self-contained space.

Loss of Amenity Space

The Design and Access Statement accompanying the 2006 planning application justified that application on the ground that “[g]iven that there is no suitable outdoor amenity space to this 3 bedroom family property, the applicant wishes to use the roof as a terrace”.

The 2009 planning application acknowledged in the accompanying Design and Access Statement that the previous works in 2007 (*i.e.*, undertaken consequent on the 2006 planning application) had provided “good amenity space for the occupiers of the house”.

As already noted, the subject property has no garden. As such, the **only** private amenity space is its roof terrace. The Design and Access Statement submitted with the present application recognises that the existing terrace “has proved to be a private and sheltered space for **family use** [emphasis added] and enjoyment of private amenity space”.

If the present application is granted, the additional bulk added to the living accommodation at the property will be at the direct expense of the **only** private amenity space available to the property. The amount of amenity space lost will be substantial. From the available plans, it is apparent that the amenity space would shrink by over one-third if the proposed works are carried out.

The stark contradiction, inherent in increasing the size of the residential element of the property while - at the same time - diminishing the amenity space available, is not even acknowledged in the application for permission, let alone justified. The proposed extension would create a study/bedroom and a bathroom. The property would, accordingly, change from a “3-bedroom family property” to a 4-bedroom family property and, thus, while capable of housing a larger family, would substantially *reduce* the only private amenity space available to such a family, including - in particular - children.

Disproportionate

The rear elevation would be wholly unbalanced, with a new dominant glazed top storey. The proposed construction would substantially detract from the architectural integrity of that elevation.

The 2018 Design and Access Statement claims that the proposed development would be "*in line with the recently consented scheme at number 24 Perrin's Walk*". No further detail is provided in support of that assertion and, on consideration of the works being undertaken at No. 24 Perrin's Walk, it is impossible to see how that assertion can be made good. The works at No. 24 will result in only a small increase to the visible bulk of the rear elevation, and will add no windows that overlook any rear gardens.

Conclusion

For all the reasons set out, the proposed extension is wholly inappropriate. The planning application should be refused.

Yours faithfully,

Michael Patchett-Joyce and Marika Cobbold