



2 August 2018

Dear Sir or Madam,

Application No: 2018/1673/P
23 Perrin's Walk, London NW3 6TH

Public notices have drawn attention to a revised application for the subject property identified above. The Notices indicate a date for response of 2 August 2018. The Application Progress Summary on the LB of Camden Planning Applications webpage indicates that Comments are receivable until 19 August 2018. On either basis, this response is in time.

This revised application should be refused.

Many of the points made in our original response are unaffected by this revised application, and still stand (see, Related Documents, redacted response of 30/05/2018 on the LB of Camden website page for Application No. 2018/1673/P). The substance and weight of those points remains undiminished. This further response supplements (and is not in substitution of) our original response, and should be read in conjunction with our original response.

The application in its revised form is inconsistent with and, in material regards, at complete variance with the Design and Access Statement that accompanied the original application made under the present application number, 2018/1673/P.

In particular, the Design and Access Statement contained the following description:

"The design of the extended structure on the roof is based on the original and later idea of creating a small lightweight box which will float above the heavy brick mass of the main building below. ... The extension of the terrace to the rear will have the same metal railings and timber planting boxes as the existing scheme.

...

At the rear of the extended box, the structure is set back so that occupants cannot stand directly on the edge of the terrace or indeed at the opening window of the new room. This means that no overlooking can occur from the terrace or the new room into the neighbours' gardens immediately below. Planters will be maintained between the structure and the edge of the roof to contain mid level shrubs and bushes. These planters are also maintained at the front of the terrace between the railings and the terrace edge. These Mature plants will further add to the privacy issue from the terrace and help soften the impact of the terrace itself. "

In addition to the above narrative, the diagrams, entitled "*Proposed Extended Study*" and "*Proposed Section*" emphasised the fact that the proposed elevation would be set back by "1.3m" (with an accompanying heavy red diagrammatic arrow), and stated "existing planting and timber boxes to be retained"

The need to avoid overlooking has been a long-standing concern, as can be seen from the Design and Access Statement which supported an earlier planning application in 2010 relating to the subject property. That earlier Design and Access Statement contained the following:

The setting back of the usable floor area for the terrace will also mean that no overlooking can occur from the terrace into the neighbours' gardens immediately below. Planters will be positioned between the balustrade and the edge of the roof to contain mid level shrubs and bushes. These plants will further add to the privacy issue from the terrace and help soften the impact of the terrace itself.

Referring to the revised drawing, PER-PL-GA-11A (document created on 10/07/18 at 15.23), the following questions ought properly to be asked:

Q: What has become of the "existing planting"? A: It has gone.

Q: What has become of the timber boxes? A: They have gone.

Q: Is the proposed rear elevation still set back by 1.3m? No.

Those straight-forward Q+As lead to the inevitable conclusion that this revised application must be refused.

That conclusion is fully confirmed by the points made in our original response, to which reference should be made, and the fact that the subject property is (as the Design and Access Statement says) an "original mews to the main properties in Church Row". A property of the disproportionate bulk proposed is out-of-keeping with a "mews" property.

We would wish to make a further important point. The material changes which have just been identified can be confirmed by comparing the terrace plan (PER-PL-GA-08) and the section AA (PER-PL-GA-13) as originally proposed (see, relevant plan and section in "Existing & Proposed (Superseded) 20180312_PER-GA.pdf", document created 7/04/2018, 12.56) with the plan (PER-PL-GA-08A) and section (PER-PL-GA-13A) as now proposed (see, revised drawings, documents created 10/07/2018, respectively at 15.20 and 15.19).

Over and above the immediate application, it is a matter of profound concern to us as local residents, as it should be to the Planning Department of LB of Camden, that a proposed planning development should be changed in material respects without – apparently - those changes being described in a revised Design and Access Statement and where the "now proposed" construction is materially inconsistent with the narrative in the Design and Access Statement that accompanied the original proposal. If such a discrepancy exists (and it seems to), the revised application becomes an attempt to do one thing while saying another. That would be objectionable in principle, and should not be condoned.

While writing, it is convenient to point out another important error in the original application, concerning the Site Plan (PER-PL-GA-01). The Site Plan purports to delineate in red the land parcel of the subject property, 23 Perrin's Walk, but does so inaccurately. The red lining shows all of the garden between the subject property and 23 Church Row as being within the curtilage of the subject property. In fact, the very opposite is true: all of the garden between those properties forms part of 23 Church Row. Thus, any overlooking from the rear of the subject property is not mitigated by the fact that it directly overlooks its own garden. Rather, the issue is aggravated by the fact that it *only* overlooks the private garden of others.

In conclusion, we repeat what we said in our previous letter: 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