

From: Tom Woof tom.woof@prospus.co.uk 
Subject: 2021/5201/P 83 Lawn Road single story rear extension
Date: 15 December 2021 at 13:52
To: Obote Hope Obote.Hope@camden.gov.uk
Bcc: Christopher Jones chris@jones-associates.co.uk, Kate Bellwood admin@katebellwood.co.uk, Charlotte Paton charlotte.paton@hotmail.co.uk, Bramen Singanayagam bsinga@googlemail.com



Dear Mr Hope

I have seen the response from Mr David Thomas of Belsize CAAC to this proposal. Those comments object to the proposal with claims of excessiveness and unjustifiability, without providing any evidence to support his view. Home owners have no necessity to justify their proposals in this way. As I have pointed out in the submission, existing PD rights allow a larger extension in floor area at the rear of the property than is proposed in this application. Therefore, if works under PD of a certain size are lawful and considered appropriate by the Government, then it follows that lesser works could not be considered excessive. Nor could they be unjustified, given that no justification is required for exercising PD rights.

The objection goes on to offer some design advice about lowering the eaves, again without evidence or reasoning. The design proposed is to provide a green roof which would be less effective with a sloping roof. Furthermore, the existing building does not have sloping roofs in the rear outriggers, so to introduce them for this proposal would be an odd design choice and could lead to an increase in the rate of surface water run-off.

Finally, the objection refers to the potential for problems of light pollution as a result of the deep rooflights proposed. This reasoning is strange. It is the roof lights that will reduce the need for internal lights to be switched on. The objector's logic is tantamount to saying that windows cause light pollution, which, in an urban setting, is an inappropriate conclusion to draw. In any event there would be no lights directed up through the roof lights and the LPA could suggest a condition to that effect – if it was otherwise considered a matter for refusal. However, I do not think such a condition would pass the relevant tests set out in planning guidance. The objector does not clarify what the 'problems of light pollution' would be, which makes it an unspecified and vague objection and consequently difficult to defend.

Please let me know if you require any further information to assist you with this proposal

Kind regards

Tom Woof
Director



T: +44 (0)7759670265
E: tom.woof@prospus.co.uk
www.prospus.co.uk
Prospus House, Furrow Green Farm, Wharton, Kirkby Stephen CA17 4LQ

Prospus Group Ltd, 14–18 Hill Street, Edinburgh EH2 3JZ

Prospus Group Ltd is registered in Scotland, SC526558. The information contained in or attached to this email is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not disclose or retain this message.



RTPI



Chartered Town Planner