

Please ensure that the following questions are answered in the Planning Officer report. Councillors and residents will then be better equipped to decide whether to support or object to this development and the residents (or their representatives) can decide whether they need to make a deputation or not at the next relevant Planning Committee meeting:

1. I wrote to the Planning Officer on June 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018 to (a) clarify whether there was an updated Design & Access Statement, Heritage Impact Assessment and/or Comparative Elevation based on the revised plans, (b) to confirm whether Camden believes the new drawings could be relied on by residents (and in effect Councillors) given past issues (October 2017) around the accuracy of Comparative Elevations<sup>1</sup> submitted by the applicant and then finally (c) get a view on whether Camden would support any further encroachment on the view of the Grade II listed Chapel e.g. reinstating the side extension at a later date. I received a response from Mr Tulloch copying Mr Bushell on June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2018 (hence my delay in sending in my comments). The answer to (a) was “no” i.e. no new documents but no explanation why that was acceptable to Camden and how it was compliant with the relevant NPPF rules 128 & 134, (b) confirmation that the drawings were accurate this time but no explanation how we could be sure that was the case given that Camden did not pick up the inaccuracies themselves last time and (c) that Camden’s view is that “given all that has happened it [reinstatement of the side extension in a future planning application] is not something we [Camden] would support”. ***It is critical that Camden’s Planning Officer Report tries to compensate for the lack of the applicant’s Heritage Impact Assessment on the setting of the Chapel demonstrating to residents that proper consideration has been given to conservation issues, that the development was scaled back to lessen the impact on and harm to the heritage assets. This will give residents confidence that heritage assets are important to Camden and that this represents the maximum width i.e. encroachment or narrowing of the gap that Camden would permit on the view now or in the future.***
2. Please explain why none of the following have been updated (1) Design & Access Statement, (2) Heritage Impact Assessment and (3) Comparative Elevation to reflect the impact of the new development on the setting of the Grade II listed Chapel making it very hard for residents to assess the impact of this development on the setting of the Chapel. ***Andrew Derrick’s Heritage Impact Assessment dated Dec. 2017*** appears to be the only actual Heritage Impact Assessment available on the planning portal which still suggests this revised development causes harm to the setting of the chapel and still does not demonstrate any public benefit. There is no reference on the planning portal to the Planning Officer’s report which would give residents the opportunity to better understand this application; could it be posted on the planning portal? ***We look forward to read the Planning Officer report to better understand the implications of this development on heritage assets i.e. in the absence of the applicant making any effort or being required to do so, how this application complies with NPPF 128 & 134, the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum Policies #3 on Design & Heritage including 8.12 which specifically mentions the Rosslyn Hill Unitarian Chapel as a site that should be protected.***
3. Please confirm and show on a comparative elevation how much wider the proposed development is than the existing house i.e. encroaching on the view of the Chapel than the current house. It looks like the proposed development narrows the gap by 1.8m i.e. new house at 7m width is 1.8m wider than the existing 5.2m house even with no gap. The previous proposal was acknowledged by Camden to “encroach into this view”<sup>2</sup> but did not demonstrate any public benefit. ***Please confirm exact encroachment with a comparative elevation, that related measurements are correct and then explain the public benefit.***



4. Please ensure that it is clear in your report that when this application was presented to the Planning Committee for approval on Sept 14<sup>th</sup> 2017, that councillors made their decision with respect to “harm” based on what Camden planning team referred to as inaccurate drawings (5.10 of the Planning Officer report) i.e. the new house was placed further away from the Grade II listed Chapel than in reality and did not show the secondary gable. The encroachment of the proposed development was therefore significantly more than presented to councillors that evening and may have led to a different outcome. ***Please show councillors visually, confirm why and on what basis you believe drawings are accurate this time.***
5. I hope, in summary, that the Planning Officer will use the next Planning Officer Report and Planning Committee meeting to provide the information the Planning Committee need to make its final decision on whether to approve this application or not.

<sup>1</sup> The Camden Planning Officer report dated Jan. 25th 2018 stated in 5.10 that “Following the further revision to the scheme to omit the side extension and amend the plans so that they accurately showed the relationship of the proposed building.”

<sup>2</sup> Planning Officer Report for the Jan. 25th 2018 Planning Committee meeting discussed encroachment on the view in 7.13.