



Samir Benmbarek  
Planning Officer  
London Borough of Camden

Dear Mr Benmbarek,

**Flat 1, 10 Strathray Gardens, Swiss Cottage - Application Number 2018/4949/P**

We write in response to an objection from a freeholder at the above and would confirm the following:

Freeholder objection - This is currently being addressed. The applicant did advise them of the project by email and the design and access statement confirms that they have consulted with the neighbours, it does not say that they have their approval, indeed this is not expressed anywhere in the application. The applicants are again in dialogue with them and have set a meeting for Friday evening.

1) The application does involve significant structural change and this will be addressed once we the structural engineer on board; it would be a waste of money to appoint an engineer and not receive planning consent.

2) The proposed plan does increase the floor space by 24 sqm. It does this principally by extending to the side not the rear. In fact the rear line of the extension is the line of the current structure. The lady who has objected I understand is on the fourth storey and with the sedum/glass roof would have minimal impact on her views. The side windows from the fourth storey would not provide a vista that would see the side extension. Please see the attached drawing which means that the occupier of the fourth floor would have to be at the window and peer down at the extension at an angle of 34 Degrees and its even more difficult to the side elevation; this is not a normal sight line.

It is true that the side and rear extension would prove problematic in terms of maintaining the rear and side elevations and this will be considered once we have the structural engineers on board, and has been considered in line with the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015. It will be implemented and we would suggest that this is more a matter for Landlord Consent rather than planning.

3) The removal of the wall to the rear elevation; Original surface area is c 90sqm and we propose to remove 18sqm which is 20% of the rear elevation. The side elevation surface area as existing is 161sqm and we propose to remove 9.8sqm C 6% of the wall area. This is as opposed to the 50 and 33% stated within the objection. The engineers will not be appointed until we know the likely planning outcome, again this is not a planning issue.

4) Whilst we propose to remove the bay we have retained the brick bond, but introduced crittal style and structural glass to form a contemporary structure which will compliment the host building rather than the adhoc extension that exists.

5) It is a subjective matter whether the proposal will be a poor substitute? I suggest that the proposals complement the host whereas the current extension is totally alien and detracts from the beauty of the host building. We cannot see how the proposals intrude upon the neighbours as the foot print does not extend beyond the rear line of the existing extension and where it is extended to the side the impact is reduced as the proposed side elevation wall is shorter than the boundary wall with the glazing angled to meet the side elevation of the host building.

---

5 Oak Passage Chambers, High Street, Hastings, East Sussex, TN34 3EH  
T: 01424 439648 | E: ronan@hardingbond.co.uk | W: www.hardingbond.co.uk  
Registered in England and Wales No. 09380608



Regulated by the RICS



It is interesting that the council in 2009 agreed that there would be a 1.9m gap between the structure and the boundary to ensure minimal impact on daylight but since the building faces east both rear elevations receive morning light and this will not diminish, further when the sun goes around it axis the host building blocks out the evening sun. The higher level of proposed structure is on the same foot print as the original extension and the infill element is sloped resulting in zero loss of light.

The hardstanding area between the two properties does not currently serve a purpose as it is moe of a corridor and permanently in shade; it is unlikely to be maintained and by giving it a use and introducing a support mechanism for maintenance of the structure above it supports Camdens policy which we refer to within the D&A Statement.

The statement that there are upper level windows suggests that the writer has not considered the rear elevation or section B:B as it would become clear that there are no upper level windows.

6) the writer is correct the bay has been removed at lower ground level, but it is retained on the first through to forth. Realistically the applicant will be the only ones that can see the bay which is predominantly obscured by the current extension. It may however be considered by Camden as an asset to the conservation area but that is one for them to decide upon. Looking at the mood boards prepared by the interior designer the bay pillars could be retained and form a natural break in the open plan area as such these could be conserved, stripped of plaster and from a conservation and aesthetic point of view; a beautiful feature.

7) the new structure is in fact taller than the original extension but the tallest section is too far away from the southern building and will have no loss of light to the northern boundary property. Indeed this boundary has a stair from the garden to the first floor which provides a physical and visual barrier between the buildings. The leylandi hedge will remain and will be maintained which will maintain the biodiversity of the Belsize Conservation Area.

We have purposely set the hight of the new extension at the cill level of the first floor as this is a visual break within the rear elevation, this also provides the applicant with a flush ceiling within the family room

I am surprised that the writer thinks that the application will result in the 'significant loss of green space'; the proposals remove the unused hardstanding and not green space; it is an area of unused space that serves no function and therefore a place with no requirement for maintenance.

I trust that the provide a suitable rebuttal to the objection and look forward to a positive outcome of the application as I feel that a refusal will mean the applicant will sell the property which will mean Camden have not dealt with their obligations under their core strategy.

