
From: barbara witton [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 December 2019 13:52
To: Planning
Cc: Patrick Garland; Pat; [REDACTED] Rea, Flick (Councillor);
Subject: SUBJECT: PLANNING APPLICATION No.2019/5340/P 4 RANULF ROAD

From:
B.A.Witton
Flat 4
7 Ranulf Road
NW2 2BT
12 December 2019

To:
Planning Department Camden

Dear Madam or Sir

The present planning application for 4 Ranulf Road No. 2019/5340/P proposes changes to the original planning application No.2008/4523/P granted with certain binding restrictions on 7/8/09.

1. In addition to having a binding covenant to be car free, it also required the "installation of the cycle parking prior to the occupation of the new dwelling" in order to conform with Camden's Parking Standards for cycles. The original application specifies an enclosed external store i.e not part of the PassivHaus. This is shown on the approved plans of 2008 as an external bike/recycling store measuring c.1.8m x c.1.8m. This is the area that the new application shows as the 3rd bedroom.
2. It is unclear how this space, small as it is, would fit into the original PassivHaus specifications. Furthermore, how it would be made to do so without affecting the integrity of the original design, as it appears from the plan that the original PassivHaus wall would have to be demolished.
3. It is unclear how the proposed space accommodating waste storage & collection can also accommodate the requirement to install cycle parking to conform with Camden's Parking Standards for cycles, or to ensure the security of any cycle stored there. The space is far short of being equivalent to the originally approved space.
4. Allowing the conversion of the existing designated "Bike/recycling store" into residential use would set a precedent for others to exploit & give rise to the perception that "beds in sheds" were possible.
5. The original application was approved because planners stated in the Delegated Report that: "The building is designed to sit inconspicuously within its garden setting, set back from the street with a new boundary wall treated as a green (planted gabion) wall." Extending the existing building line by 2.3m means that it is no longer set in this manner. It is not sympathetic with the character of the neighbourhood.
6. The application acknowledges that extending the building line by 2.3m to enlarge the master bedroom no longer makes the building inconspicuous as it increases the visual bulk with the creation of the terrace above & the request for additional screening to ensure privacy from the street .
7. By extending the master bedroom, the balcony above is also extended by 2.3m creating a very large balcony of c.3.3m x c.8m designed to hold a 8 seat table for out-side entertainment. This is not only out of character with the neighbourhood but further impinges on the privacy of the

neighbours in houses 5,7 & 9 as the enlarged terrace will overlook them, giving a direct view into the rooms opposite, especially those of No 7. Neighbours have already found their privacy invaded.

8. The house originally took away open garden space from the area when built. The proposed extension takes away almost half of the present front garden, destroying the garden setting, which was considered important to the granting of the original planning permission (see 5 above): it builds out onto this further reducing garden space and setting a precedent for others.
9. Extending beyond the existing building line is an over-development of a small site originally planned as a 2 bedroom home that was approved, as the 2008 Delegated Report stated: "The new dwelling house is considered to provide a good standard of residential accommodation for future occupants of the site in terms of layout, room sizes, daylight and sunlight, and outlook."

The planning application should therefore be rejected for the reasons stated above.

Yours faithfully
B.A.Witton