

## 15 June 2020

Ben Farrant
Planning Solutions Team
Developtætit Manageeænt
London Bæougb ofC
Town Hall, Judd Street
London WClH 9JE

## Dear Mr Farrant,

Re: Planning application 2020/2 139/P: 3 Inverforth Close, NW3 7EX.

We are owners and occupiers of no.2 Inverforth Close and we write to you with reggrds to planning application ref. 2020/2139/P which is currently un&r consideration by Camden Council. We understand that the application seeks a variation nnapprovedapplicationrsf 2016/69J3/P fmaxteosioosaodaller»flm»D no.3 Inverforth Close; namely to add a mansard extension to the rear (easten) elevation of the property.

As stated in our previous letter **regarding approval planning application** iefi **2016/6953/P**, we welcome redevelopment works to the property so that the neighbours can **enhance their dwelling** We do hnwevu have very signifmiit concerns with the amended developomit now proposed, given the scale and **positioning** of the **new manmrd extaision**.

- a. We have reviewed Camden's Planning Guidance on Design (adopted i\4iith 2019), which provides guidance on roof extensions. We believe the maiisaid extensionnow; rpposal is coccept good and good as the scale and butk of fife extension would complaely dominate both the rear roof slope and the rmr elevation of the dwelling, detracting attention away from the original deg of the property. We would also like to point out that the proposwllocation of 4ie new mansard extension is extremely prominait, both when viewed frein cxir property and from within the Close itself.
- b. The shape and cbarmfer of **the mansard would also disregard the Jocai** cceves xt and charactw **of Inverforth** Close and would not be in keeping with the design **features of the neighbouting properties**. We are thue for eof the opinion diat the proposals do not acconi with Camden Locd **Plan policy D1 on** Design

## 2. Impact on the Hampstesd Cooservatiœi Area

a. The Hanipstead Consœvation Area Appraisd sets out thatroof extensiœis ale unlikely to be acceptable where (1) the extension would be detrimental to the form and character of die existing building and (2) the roof is promineit parôcuJæJy in Jœg views. Asre/orredto abovq, &ei,, e«exets='jc,c>æsæd bulk of the mansard roofextension is not subservient to the existing propwiy

and will completely dominate the readily visible rear elevation and roofslope of the dwelling. Such feature are not characteristic of either Inverforth Clos or the Hampstead Conservation Area. The extension would therefore, ii our opinion, contravene the design guidance as set ont within the Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal.

- b. In planning policy tems, the devdopment would fail to premrve (renhance the character and appearance of the Conswvation Are and doc not their fixemy the tests of Camden Local Plan policy D2 on Hwitage. Thee are also no 'public benefit resulting from the proposils which would outweigh this harm to the Conservation Areas required by paragraph 1960fthe National Planning Polky Framework (2019).
- C. We would remind the Council of dismissed appeal ref. APP/X52 10/D/17/3 178473 at our property, no.2 Inverfexth Close, who cair dormer roof extension was rejected due to the resulting impact on die Hampstead Conservatical Are Jhis appeal sets a preceded for 4ie develo; xoentnow propomdatno.3 Inverforth Close.
- S. Impact on the openness of the Metropolitan Open Land
- a. We understand that Camden Council allow for a 20% volumetric uplift for extensions to propefties witii the Metropolitan Open Land designed Although information has not been submitted with the planning application clarifying the increase in volume, we suspect from the proposed height and projection ofthemansanlexinisionthatthe 20% limit would be exceeded which assessed alongside the additions approved under planning application ref. 20J 6/6.953/P. We do not believe die Council can consider the resulting extensions to be 'proportionate' to the dwelling as required by paragniph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

## Impact on our amenity

- a. We believe that the proposed mansard extension to the rear elevation will completely overlmr oerproperty; 1heheigJit of lheprqximdextensien coot4ed widi its projection from the existing roofslope will dominate views fnxn bolh our living and bedroomareas and will be overly prominoit what viewed ftom our front courtyæd arc.
- b. We understand froiiiiiie suhmided dmuineilts that a CGJbas hen provided nf the proposals when viewed from the west showing the front elevation of the property. The proposal alteration viewed from the rear is not howeven shown.

  Webelievethattheprovisi xiofafurthm CGI is imperative for us to fully the extent of the proposals; not least in terms of the itnpactonto our properly, but also in terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- c. We note that a **Sunlight and Daylight** Assessment was submitted as part of the **previousplamingapplication, and** we would question why such reportisal xent **from the current application given that the height and projection of therm fsiope** so close fo **our propwty and to oiir bab (tabler o vn windows (.s being** enlarge (I

- 5. Tree daozage
- a. We would also add that the construction of approval application of. 2017/4730/P currently undwway hasalready resultwlin significant to mature trees on our property that lie within the Conservation Area. We understand the these trees are protected by virtue of their located within a designated Cottservatioa Area.
- b. We would query whether the development is being carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the approvolal Arboriculturd report and would hope & at sudi report would be updat 1 to reflect both the current status off trees and the important proposal swill have on than.

In summary, the extent of themans ard extwifion projx mdwould dominate the nx of form of no.3 Inverforth Close and would harm the charmtmand appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Are. The extension is a disproportion to no.3 and as a result will harm the openneu of die Metropolitan Open Land. We share concerns for our aimity as neighbouring residents, not least due to the pnx nineice of the exteasion and 'its resulting ovwbearing impute, but also due to the potwoial for it to diminish levels of suilight and daylight curroadly enjpyed by our propa; y. There is clear evidence of ongoing daniage to the trees within the Conmruation in which we think is indefensible.

We duly ask that the Council **take our letter into** consideration whilst assessing die application

Akshay & Geetika Shah

2 Inverforth Close London NW3 7EX Evidence of trees being impacted by ongoing construction works







