

From: victoria silver <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 October 2018 16:06
To: Marfleet, Patrick
Subject: Planning Application ref 2018/2794/P, 22 Makepeace Avenue, N6 6 EJ
Attachments: terrace sketch 2.pdf; ATT00001.htm

Dear Patrick,

RE: Planning Application ref 2018/2794/P, 22 Makepeace Avenue, N6 6 EJ

We spoke a week or two ago. I am the homeowner of the above property. Apologies if this communication comes in the wrong form as I am not an expert in planning! However since we embarked on this process of altering our house I have found myself suddenly surrounded by planning documents and guidelines. We have really obsessed over our design and have tried hard to work with our architect to arrive at a scheme that is very much in the spirit of the original house; responding sympathetically to what is already there, so that it sits well in the site.

With that in mind I thought it might be helpful if I responded to the main points from the two objections that were raised when our application was made available for public consultation. We only received two comments. One was from the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Advisory Committee (HLC CAAC) and the other from our next door neighbours at number 24 who represent the other half of the pair of semis we live in.

Before answering the points that were raised I would firstly like to convey our keenness to protect the unique qualities of the estate from ill-judged design and over development. The houses on the Holly Lodge were built nearly a hundred years ago and it seems inevitable that future generations will want to adapt them a little to better suit contemporary lifestyles. However, like the HLE Conservation Area Advisory Committee, we strongly feel that any works done to the properties needs to be considered and sympathetic in order to preserve the estate's special character.

Below I have responded to the main points outlined in the objections.

Raising the roof ridge

Both our architect and the HLE CAAC have highlighted the proposed change to the roof ridge of the property. The HLE CAAC feel our design is not in line with specific guidelines outlined in their Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, saying that the neighbours roof line, which we emulate, was built before their guidelines came in. I am in full support of their guidelines in principle and would, I am sure, have come up with a different scheme had the neighbours not developed theirs already but, since they have, we strongly feel it's important that we must consider our plans in context of theirs and respond sympathetically to their preceding works. As is outlined in Camden's guideline DP24, High quality design should consider - character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings.

After much consideration, we feel the best design solution is to replicate the form of the adjacent loft in order to reinstate a matching pair, reflecting the original character

of the street which was made up of matching pairs or “symmetrical house forms”. Looking around the estate, there are plenty of examples where houses next to each other have been extended in a mirrored way, in keeping with this design principle, incorporating a number of different design solutions.

In the HLC Conservational Area Appraisal and Management Strategy it clearly states that “The simple harmony of the house designs is most often compromised by works to one half of a Semi detached pair that do not match the adjoining half.” (P40)

Rear elevation

As with the above, the design for the proposed rear elevation mirrors that of the adjoining property. Notwithstanding the proposed window design is intended to be more sympathetic to the character of the existing building (without impacting symmetry).

The HLE CAAC pointed out that most of the newer loft conversions have hipped side dormers which they feel is preferable and we are happy to tweak our design in keeping with this guideline and ensure that the side dormer is tiled with clay tiles, if Camden agree that this is the best resolution. Please advise if this is necessary and alternative plans will be provided.

Ground floor extension

Party wall / boundary fence

It would seem more clarification is required in relation to the party wall and boundary treatment in order to address the concerns expressed. The existing configuration and topography are such that each of the individual rear gardens are overlooked by neighbouring properties.

Individual properties have dealt with this issue in different ways. The existing provision between 22 and 24 Makepeace currently comprises of an approx. 3.2m high fence adjacent to the existing raised terraces on both sides, topped with established planting (a Wysteria that we would be at pains to protect) to a combined height of around 4 metres. (see photo on top and bottom right page 5 of the design and access statement). A high screening such as this is necessary to protect the properties from overlooking from the level of the current terraces. We are sensitive to this issue because we are equally affected by it.

It is not possible to solve the issue altogether due to the topography, but our proposal seeks to improve it by replacing the existing fence with a rendered wall for the first 3.5m (the extension) and a fence for the next 3m (the new patio) with a max height of approx. 3m from the sloping ground level, as opposed to the 4m height referenced in the HLE CAAC comments.

By reducing the floor level in the proposed extension, we have sought to further mitigate the existing overlooking from the terrace and living space by following the topography of the garden and reducing the eye level height relative to the neighbouring properties. This intention and the proposed levels are described in the section provided in the application, however our architect has provided me with an additional sketch (attached) which you might find useful. Obviously should you wish to carry out a site visit you are more than welcome.

Glazing

The comments from the HLE CAAC have referenced the west elevation of the proposed ground floor extension. It would appear that there is some confusion as to the location of this window as the window has been deliberately sited so that it faces a blank wall on the adjacent property. Furthermore the proposed window has a much reduced capacity for overlooking when compared to the existing kitchen window (which currently directly overlooks the garden of number 20).

Neighbours concerns

In regards to our neighbours comments, Mr and Mrs Haggerty seem to think the 3.5m extension we are proposing at the back will rob them of some views - however these views are obscured by existing screening measures described above.

We would like to assure them that we would ensure the roof to our extension wasn't accessible (there is a window on that level not a door onto it) and that the lowering of our floor will not affect the stability of their house or our shared building (this is not something that the architect nor the engineer has flagged as being problematic.) It goes without saying that we intend to comply to Camden Contractors guidelines and the building code prescribed by the Holly Lodge Estate if the plans are proposed.

I do hope this is helpful in your appraisal of the scheme. Please do not hesitate to get back to me if you would like any further clarification or would like to discuss anything.

Yours sincerely,

Victoria Silver

