

Printed on: 25/10/2018 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/4295/P	Hogan Lovells on behalf of Mr & Mrs Berendsen	19/10/2018 11:45:26	OBJNOT	<p>This objection letter has two appendices. Appendix 1 is a Report from Planning Potential and Appendix 2 is architectural sketches. We have been unable to upload the appendices to this portal. These have been sent to the Council together with the letter by email (dated 19 October 2018) and by post. The following is the text of the cover letter (without appendices). We act on behalf of Mr &amp; Mrs Berendsen.</p> <p>the subject of the above Applications. Our clients OBJECT to the Applications. The planning application proposes the construction of a double storey flat roofed extension to a listed building in a conservation area ("the Proposal"). The Proposal, if granted, would have a significant and detrimental impact upon our clients' amenity and enjoyment of their property. The design of the Proposal will also impact negatively on two listed buildings and the conservation area. The Proposal is not in conformity with the development plan and national and local guidance.</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>As you are aware, the law requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Such material considerations can include national policy and national and local guidance. It is our clear view that the Proposal does not accord with the statutory development plan or the Council's recently adopted guidance.</p> <p>Our clients have instructed planning consultants to carry out an independent assessment of the Proposal against the relevant national and local planning policies. Please find attached, as Appendix 1 to this letter, Planning Potential's report.</p> <p>You will note that our view is corroborated by Planning Potential's independent review, as set out in their report.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <p>¶ The Proposal does not accord with the Camden Local Plan 2017 and, in particular, policy A1 (Managing the Impact of Development). This policy states that the Council will seek to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. The Proposal will have an adverse dominant presence when viewed from our clients' property. The height and bulk of the Proposal will impact negatively and will be overbearing. Its two storeys, in very close proximity (less than one metre) to the listed boundary wall between the properties, will have a stark visual impact from the rear windows of Grove Lodge and, in particular, from its garden. At Appendix 2 we have set out architectural sketches, commissioned by our client, which demonstrate the dominance of the Proposal when seen from the first floor rear windows of our clients' property. The sketches also show the impact of the "block" form of the extension, protruding well above the listed boundary wall, in the direct sightline of our clients' garden. Although the Proposal is 5.2 metres above the existing terrace level of Grove Lodge, the height will increase to 6 metres when our clients implement their consent to develop at the rear of their property.</p> <p>¶ The Proposal does not accord with policy D2 (heritage) in the Camden Local Plan 2017. This states that the Council will resist proposals for alterations or extensions to a listed building where this would cause harm to the special architecture and historic interest of the property. By the construction of a flat roof extension of approximately five metres in height, the proposal is far from sympathetic to the host Grade II eighteenth century listed building and the Hampstead Conservation Area generally. The scale, massing and form of the modern extension, with its flat roof, is heavy-handed and unsympathetic to the architectural quality and character of the host building. Equally, it will have a detrimental impact on the setting of our clients' adjacent grade II listed property. The main façade of our clients' property is the rear façade. The sketches at Appendix 2 show the clear harm to the setting of the listed Grove Lodge when the modern block-like extension is viewed with the backdrop of the rear façade of our clients' property.</p> <p>¶ The Proposal does not accord with the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2018 and, particularly, policies</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>DH1 and DH2. These policies reinforce that any development should respond positively and sympathetically to the existing rhythm, proportion, height, scale, massing, materials and storey height of the surrounding buildings. The Proposal clearly does not comply with this and is out of place with its bulk, height and massing. Further, it detracts from the architectural significance of Netley Cottage.</p> <p>¶ The Proposal does not accord with Camden's Planning Guidance on Design (2018). This Guidance is a material consideration in the planning process. It has recently been adopted and is highly relevant in relation to rear extensions. The guidance states that rear extensions must be subordinate to the host building and in particular states (paragraph 4.13) the height of the extension should not exceed the height of one storey below the roof eaves/parapet. The Proposal, being two storeys, clearly contravenes this guidance.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, our clients have no objection to the extension of Netley Cottage in principle and would not object to a ground floor and/or basement development. Our clients have communicated this to the owner of Netley Cottage. In fact, when our clients purchased Grove Lodge there was an understanding (documented in a legal Agreement) that the owner of Netley Cottage would pursue a basement extension. The Proposal goes well beyond what was originally discussed.</p> <p>Our clients are happy to invite the Planning Case Officer to their home to better demonstrate the significant and negative impact the Proposal will have on their property.</p> <p>We urge the Council to apply correctly the policies in the statutory development plan and its own recently adopted guidance to reject the Applications.</p>

---