

Dear Jaspreet,

(Covering note not for publication)

Thank you for speaking to Richard on Monday. Briefly:

App 2:

We know you forwarded our comments on the Basement Impact Assessment to Campbell Reith, for which thank you. On the engineering side, as highlighted in those comments, we are really concerned that the damage assessment for our house was based on an inaccurate layout and incorrect measurements of the back of our house. Specifically, one of 2 walls (W4) that was identified as being most at risk was described as an external wall of length 2.2 metres when in fact it is an internal wall just 0.8 metres long that supports a steel beam that carries the whole of the weight of that part of the original back of our house. Please could we ask, has a new damage assessment been carried out that uses an accurate depiction of the back of our house?

App 4:

Much of the content in the applicants' latest document repeats what they have said previously, including in their documents for App 1. However, in the recent submission they again make claims about No. 77 as setting some kind of precedent for what is proposed at No. 75 under App 4. So we would like to make the attached brief 1.5 page comments for the record of documents associated with App 4. We have made them as brief as possible.

The problem from our point of view with these multiple, repetitive planning applications is that they all count as separate planning applications. It has been explained to us that should an application be refused by Camden, but the applicants then decide to appeal, it is only the documents/comments associated with that specific application that will be forwarded by Camden to the Planning Inspectorate. Since App 4 is essentially identical to the refused App 1, the only rationale that we have been given for why App 4 has been submitted is because the applicants want to revive their opportunity to appeal Camden's refusal of the full 2-storey rear extension, should App 4 also be refused. You are familiar with the contents of the attachment apart from the point on Para 3.4 and inclusion of the total height of the 8.65m flank wall. But the contents have not previously been submitted by us for App 4 because the applicants did not until now make the comparison with No.77 in their App 4 documents. Hence we wanted to get them on the record in the context of App 4 in case of an appeal. We are sorry this creates another document.

Many thanks,

Teresa Poole and Richard Tomlinson

Dear Ms Chana,

We write in response to the latest comments from the applicants regarding application 2018/3428/P, posted on 5 October on Camden's website.

Para 3.3: Comment: The extension will be visible from other neighbouring houses and gardens apart from No.74 Rd.

Para 3.4: The applicants state that the proposed rear extension at No.75 is substantially set back from the approved rear building line of No.77's 2-storey rear extension, as shown in the aerial montage above.

Comment: No. 77 and no. 75 are situated on either side of the bend in Lawn Rd. As can clearly be seen in the aerial photograph below, the whole of the house at No. 77 is set further back from Lawn Rd than are Nos. 75, 74, 73, 72. So to compare the position of the rear of No. 75 with the rear of No. 75 makes no sense because if the front facades are not aligned then nor will the rear facades be.

Nos 75 should be compared with Nos. 74, 73, 72, all of which have frontages that align with each other, and all of which are paired houses in the same staggered back style with historic outriggers. No. 77 is a flat-back style house, whose main rear façade aligns with its twin at No. 78.



Para 4.10: The applicants reiterate comments that they made in February 2018 relating to the refused App 1 (2017/6726/P) where they tried to draw comparisons with No.77. The dimensions of the proposed rear extension under App 4 are the same as App 1. So we reiterate relevant comments we made for App 1.

There are two different styles of these twinned Arts & Crafts style houses, as described in our original objection.

- Nos. 77 and 78 have flat-backs and form a pair.
- Nos. 74 and 75 have staggered L-shaped rears, and form a pair.

No. 77 rear extension:

- A 4m wide 1st floor extension represents **37%** of the total 10.8m wide whole original host building, i.e. just over one-third.
- As a flat-backed house, the depth of the rear extension from the principal rear facade of the house is 4m.
- The pitched roof does not span the whole 4m rear extension width, thus greatly reducing its impact.
- BCAAC and BRA had no objections to the rear extension at no. 77.

No. 75 proposed rear extension:

- The transformation of the back of no. 75 comes about because there are already two 2-storey outriggers, one containing the existing kitchen and one containing the existing garage. It is the *totality* of the proposed rear projection that creates excessive mass, scale and overbearing development. Building a 2-storey rear extension onto an existing outrigger has a very different impact to building onto the back of a flat backed house.
- As no 75 has a staggered, L-shaped rear, at 1st floor level this will create a two-storey mass with a depth of 8.65 metres from the principal rear façade. This compares with 4 metres for the equivalent measurement at no. 77.
- The overall total rear projection at No.75 will be around 6.4 metres wide, which is approximately 60% of the total house width, compared with 37% at No.77.
- The totality of the flank wall on the outrigger nearest to No.74 will be increased to create a wall 8.65 metres in depth from the principal rear façade of the house and 7.8 metres high in total, including the roof.
- No. 74 will look directly onto this 8.65 metre wide by 7.8 metre high two-storey high wall and pitched roof, which at the principal rear façade is approx. 3.6m from the property boundary.

Comparisons with no. 77:

- Comparisons with No.77 are not relevant because of the different design of the rears of the houses. No. 77 is twinned with No.78, not with No.76.
- There is a very different juxtaposition of No.77 in relation to No.76 (compared with Nos 75 and 74) because of the bend in the road and the way No.76 was constructed as a unique standalone detached house to fill the space between two terraces on either side of the bend in the road. When this row of houses was built in the 1920s No.76 was positioned very close to No.77 at the rear and has always been very overshadowed at the back by the historic original 2-storey north side wall and pitched roof of No.77.
- In contrast, the design of the carefully proportioned rears of the paired staggered back twinned houses in this row, including Nos 74 & 75, were originally laid out precisely to create a sense of openness and to avoid any sense of enclosure and overbearing for the paired, symmetric house next door.

No 77's planning approval does not provide a precedent for the mass, bulk and scale, and negative impact on neighbouring amenity that is created by the rear redesign proposed at no. 75, which is unprecedented along this row of houses.

Teresa Poole and Richard Tomlinson
74 Lawn Road