

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/6025/P	Andrew Kirk	13/02/2019 18:29:29	SUPPLETTER	OBJECTION TO BRECHERS Comments

I am responding to an objection on behalf of Rebecca Simonds by Brechers Solicitors dated 7th February 2019 under reference AG/6242/2.

The reason there is the need for a response is that there are a number of inaccuracies, and in the main the letter is pure fiction.

The objection is based on the following grounds:- 1.Introduction

i) Adverse impact on the Conservation Area: There is little or no impact on the Conservation Area, and the design and attention to detail will in fact "preserve and enhance the characteristics of the chosen location".

ii) There is no loss of residential amenity as the plans and drawings show a scheme which fits snugly into a rooftop scene, and actually improves (compared with adjoining buildings) what is placed on a roof. There is no overlooking, no loss of light, sound insulation will limit any noise and disturbance, and the actual construction will be no more of a disturbance than that of painting and decorating the internal common parts and external timber surfaces, all of which now require doing. There will be no adverse impact on parking as a Section 106 Agreement will be entered into restricting parking rights.

2.The Property

It is very misleading to say "the Conservation Area" is part of a series of identical buildings, as virtually all of the buildings either through original design or subsequent development make them all individual buildings. This is particularly noticeable in numbers 2, 4, 6 and 8. Number 6, is the only single dwelling house now, was previously flats and has been altered beyond all recognition to its original design. There were not many front garden parking areas for three to four cars during the 1890s.

3.Governing Planning Policy: I am sure that Camden planners are fully aware of the current restrictions due to planning policy, statute, together with any likely amendments and variations of the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly with regard to rooftop extensions.

Heritage Legislation

The application complies totally with Section 72(1), particularly in enhancing the character and appearance of a Conservation Area. Under the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") the new development will make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, as well as provide additional residential accommodation much in need within the capital.

Relevant Development Planning Policy – Camden Local Plan 2017: The scheme complies with all the items

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

mentioned (a) – (o) thus securing a high quality design in the development.

Managing the Impact of Development

The particular scheme in question actually improves the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours in that they will all have the opportunity of outside space, which can only be seen as an added bonus to the occupiers. Visual privacy, outlook, sunlight and daylight concerns have all been addressed in the “Daylight Report” showing no material impact.

4.

i) Impact on the Conservation Area:

All the properties on the south side of Froggnal Lane from number 2 to number 36, even when originally built, were all different. Initially these would have been grand houses with servants in, but in subsequent years many fell into disrepair and ended up as tenement blocks, or in today’s language houses in multiple occupation. Again over the years most of these were converted into flats which had little concern for providing quality accommodation. This has meant that the Conservation Area in the main comprises of buildings which now show little resemblance to their original construction. This is particularly relevant to the adjoining buildings 10, 6, 4 and 2.

It should be noted that the extra floor is not outside the original footprint of the building, and that a justification for granting consent is for the provision of badly needed housing in the London area in particular. It is difficult to see how a rooftop development could be a harmful addition, particularly visually, as until recently there were two trees to the front of the building – one which covered the building throughout the year and therefore the front elevation was visually impaired from the street scene. It can only be considered a bonus that a rooftop developments might enhance the whole area if restricted to the design being shown at number 8.

ii) Contravention of Development Planning Policies:

Prior to the building being flats, most of the houses in Froggnal Lane were let out as HMOs. Not until approximately sixty years ago were they divided into what were basic flats, but which destroyed most of the internal architectural features and in some cases even external architectural features. The observation that there are four buildings (numbers 2, 4, 6 and 8) is correct, but as for identical this is clearly not the case as all have been substantially altered over the years by the use of different materials and substantial increases in the original floor plate. The flat will comply with current Building Regulation approval and therefore there will be no changes in access to the second floor flat. There is also no indication to remove leaded lights or original balusters, and these items have obviously been made up.

iii) Noise and Nuisance:

I can see no objection to producing a construction impact assessment, but as previously mentioned the only impact to the existing residents will be as in 1(ii).

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

iv) Overlooking:

The installation of balconies is to improve the quality of the residential accommodation in the existing flats and there will be no overlooking of the second floor.

v) Loss of Light:

Please see Daylight and Sunlight report by WALDRAMs Chartered Surveyors which indicates that there is no loss of light around the building.

vi) Parking: No increase see 1(ii) section 106 agreement.

iii) Conclusion

It is difficult to comprehend that an objection could be put in place which has so many inaccuracies to really put it in the "fake news category".
