

Planning - Development Control
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square
c/o Town Hall, Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE

planning@camden.gov.uk

21 October 2021

Our ref: SH8327/120553/1/4158-3766-1490.1

Dear Planning Team

32 Crediton Hill, London NW6 1HP

Planning Application

We act on behalf of the owner of the 32 Crediton Hill, London NW6 1HP and in support of the accompanying planning application take this opportunity to express our client's disappointment with the quality of the Council's pre-application service in connection with the proposed works.

Pre-Application Enquiry Background

Our client submitted a pre-application enquiry to the Council on 4 May 2021 and were advised that they should receive a written response within 5 weeks. In fact, it took over **14 weeks** until a decision was received on 13 August.

During this period, the only response received to repeated attempts to make contact was from the case officer on 1 July to explain that there had been a delay in the validation process but with an assurance that feedback from consultees would be provided once received.

Despite this assurance, nothing was then heard until 12 August when the case officer confirmed the advice would now be provided by a colleague since he was due to leave the Council. It was on the following day that the written response was finally received having had no opportunity to discuss the proposal in advance.

Lewis Silkin LLP
5 Chancery Lane
Clifford's Inn
London EC4A 1BL

Office details
T +44 (0) 20 7074 8000
F +44 (0) 20 7864 1200
E info@lewissilkin.com
W lewissilkin.com

Sara Hanrahan
T +44 (0) 20 7074 8327
F + () 4 4020 7864
E sara.hanrahan@lewissilkin.com

DX 182 CHANCERY LANE

Furthermore, the advice received was poor, contradictory and did not consider the context of the Property or precedent decisions.

Our client's architect immediately contacted the Council about the contradictory advice and discussed the matter with a different case officer on 17 August. He received verbal confirmation that further advice would be provided to resolve the issues. This advice was expected by the end of August but it has now been over 8 weeks and still nothing has been received despite numerous calls and emails.


Conclusion

This delay has been costly for our client and having been left with contradictory advice on so many points we were left with no choice but to progress with submitting this planning application without having received the clear input expected from the pre-application process. In particular, we received no feedback at all on the queries raised in relation to (i) boreholes (ii) an external flue to the sauna and (iii) inclusion of rooflights to the roof of gable end facing the street. We also received the following incorrect assertions:

- First floor rear extension: the report states that this would be inconsistent with the rear building line and without precedent. Whereas there is no consistent rear building line as there are various stepped sized rear extensions with differing depths.
- Rear dormers: the report states the proposed enlargement of the rear dormers would be out of keeping with other dormers. There are, however, numerous examples of enlarged dormers.
- Front dormer: the proposal for a front dormer was not supported on the ground that apart from the odd exception they are not common. In fact, the opposite is true, out of the surrounding properties from Nos.2 – 20 over half have front dormers.
- Outbuilding: the size of the proposed outbuilding was not supported on the basis of being larger than surrounding outbuildings. However, No. 36 has an outbuilding with the same proportions.

Accordingly, this letter has been written to express not only our client's overwhelming disappointment with service to date but also, given the background to date, to ask that the assigned planning officer revert to us in advance if there are any parts of the design that are not supported so that we have chance to amend the current application.

Yours faithfully



Sara Hanrahan
Partner