

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5370/P	John and Elizabeth Mayo	04/01/2022 19:07:12	OBJ	<p>4 January 2022 Dear Mr. Lawlor, Planning application 2021/5370/P As discussed with you this morning we are writing in response to your notice to the above application, but also with reference to the earlier application number 2021/2786/P.</p> <p>Firstly, we would like to say that we had no problem with the application number 2021/2786/P which has been rejected. Only one neighbour objected to it and that was to a small skylight that could be adjusted. It was rejected because it changed the front of the House such that the size and design would damage the character and appearance of the host building contrary to planning policy (DH1 and DH2, D1 and D2). But we have researched matters and can confirm:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It does not negatively impact on any aspect of the original design by Clough William Ellis. Both the garage and the right extension at the front were added years after the house was built. 2. The front of the house is overlooked by no one. 3. No green space would be lost by this proposal, since it is already paved. <p>Consequently, we would much prefer it if the applicant could be encouraged to submit a new application that builds upon and improves application number 2021/2786/P with a view to it returning the house to look more like it was intended in 1935, and so that the Close, as a whole, is better preserved. This could involve extending to the front to the current line of the living room (the existing right extension) on both storeys. The proposed gym (plan ref: 2021/3393/P) could be included.</p> <p>The applicant and the Council would then deliver a win-win solution with No.4 returning to its original appearance with a substantial increase in living space that does not impact others and retaining green space in this precious conservation area.</p> <p>Secondly, we object to the new application number 2021/5370/P on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ground floor has already been extended to the front (twice) and to the east. It is to be extended further to the West under Plan reference 2021/3393/P. Extending to the South as well is excessive and an overdevelopment in an already over developed area. Please note, none of the ground floor elevations would be as originally designed. 2. The extension to the South is 14 feet 6 inches deep. Except for the Study where it is only 6 feet deep. It is undesirable to lose green space, but this will happen if this proposal proceeds. 3. The extension would be more proportional, with less green space lost, if the extension was limited to the proposed depth of the study extension. 4. Access will be very difficult. For instance, the Close is covered by an extant lease where access is restricted to private vehicles and the available land, over which rights of way are granted, is limited to a width of 8 feet. The effect of this is to limit the width of any van to less than 8 feet. By calculation, it is evident from the diagrams attached to the lease, that vehicles shorter than 30 feet in length would have to be used. <p>In particular:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) We have seen no proposals that explain how the above access issues will be managed; (ii) It is evident that the underground utilities will be under greater stress and pressure due to moving materials and waste being shuttled, and, as a private Close, the other occupants should not be expected to contribute to repairs wherever damage occurs along the Close. In the application, the applicant does not take

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

responsibility for such damage, which is likely due to the fact that the drains are around 90 years old.

(iii) The lease prohibits any blocking of the (Brown shaded) area over which a right of way exists.; That is in front of No.1, No.2 or No.3. So, no vans can be parked for loading and unloading materials.

(iv) The lease excludes from the right of way any "Non private" vehicles.

(v) There is no pavement for pedestrians along the Close, and there are serious health and safety issues should large heavy vehicles be passing directly in front of the front steps of Numbers 1, 2, and 3. These do not appear to have been considered.

5. The proposed extension to the South (dining room and reception room) will have a negative effect on the semi-rural ambience of Ellerdale Close. The extension will be visible from all levels of our House and garden. Due to the curved nature of the Close, the side windows and proposed structure will be parallel to the back of our house and look up directly into our bedroom and bathroom windows, causing manifest loss of privacy. The proposed new side windows and structure will be less than 85 feet away from our house. It is a bit like back-to-back housing, except in this case it will be back-to-side housing. In a conservation area already negatively imposed upon by the vast scale of surrounding developments, especially 22 Froggnal Way, the extension will further diminish the once peaceful, tranquil nature intended by Clough Williams Ellis when the four houses were designed for Ellerdale Close and currently enjoyed by the occupants of the Close. The extension will also be seen from the rear of many of the houses in Ellerdale Road. Whereas the proposed original application for the North face of the House (front) would, exceptionally, be overlooked by no-one and would enhance the look of the house - removing the unattractive garage (not by Clough Williams Ellis) and returning the house to a design more in keeping with Clough William Ellis' design for the Close as a whole.

6. In Camden Council's Conservation Area Statement for Netherhall and Fitzjohns (page 38) Extensions, Conservatories, Backlands states "Extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. A number of additions have harmed the character of the area and further inappropriate erosion will be resisted. In an area with large plots with open green land there is also pressure for back land development which can reduce the quality of the visual as well as the ecological environment." The negative visual impact of the current proposal is explained in point 5 above and the negative ecological impact of the unnecessary loss of green space and replacement with this rear extension will contribute to surface water run-off and flooding, a problem which we are all so well aware of now. On page 14 of the same statement, Ellerdale Close is described as "a group of four neo-Georgian style houses designed by Clough Williams Ellis dating back from the 1920's or 1930's that provide an interesting contrast in scale and design to the adjoining Shaw building". This interesting contrast is lost if No 4 gets bigger and the "group" of houses are much more in keeping with each other if the earlier application 2021/2786/P were reconsidered as it restores the appearance of No.4 to be similar to the other three houses in the Close.

We would be grateful if you would consider the conservation issues described in this letter and the impact of the proposed development 2021/5370/P on the environment, our privacy and outlook and associated light pollution and refuse consent to this development. We would also appreciate it if the original application 2021/2786/P, which would restore and repair the front of the house, could be reconsidered.

Thank you.