

Subject: Re 2021/5625/P Proposed rear extension at 42 Well Walk

Date: 4 February 2022 at 14:46:41 GMT

Dear Elizabeth,

Re 2021/5625/P dated 27 January 2021 and posted on the Council's website on 28th January

Thank you very much for alerting me and my neighbours in 40 WW to this latest application for a certificate of lawful development for a rear extension to 42 Well Walk. I do appreciate your advice and help. Thank you too for allowing us time to make comments.

Given the issues we have all had with applications from 42 WW and given the uncertainties and disruption caused by Covid, I am copying William Bartlett.

I wanted to take the opportunity in this letter to draw your attention to three matters of relevance to 42 Well Walk:

1. the incomplete planning history available on your website;
2. my concerns as to what may arise in future applications; and
3. my concerns with the existing application, and the extent to which it falls within the scope of permitted development rights.

Publicly accessible planning history

May I draw your attention to the fact that two previous applications, 2020/5983/P and 2020/5984/P, both of which were quashed on appeal, are missing from the list of applications for 42 Well Walk. This means there is not a full planning history of the site, which could mislead planning officers and other visitors to the site.

Application Number	Site Address	Development Description	Status	Date Registered	Decis
2021/5625/P	42 Well Walk London NW3 1BX	Erection of a single-storey rear extension.	REGISTERED	27-01-2022	
2021/0502/P	42 Well Walk London NW3 1BX	Erection of centre single-storey rear extension and two single-storey rear extensions.	FINAL DECISION	04-03-2021	Refus
2020/1226/P	42 Well Walk London NW3 1BX	Erection of a single-storey flat-roofed rear extension.	FINAL DECISION	29-04-2020	Refus

Concerns regarding potential future applications

I am concerned that possession of a PD certificate may be taken to add weight to any subsequent applications. I fear the applicants want a full-width extension.

I have therefore scrutinised the plans in detail, as any full-blown planning application could refer to features included in the LDC.

You confirmed in our telephone conversation on 31st January 2022 that a full-width extension would require full planning permission as the council had determined that side extensions on this site were inadmissible under PD.

The LDC Report for 2021/0502/P stated:

There is a canted bay at the rear of the Property, which forms part of the original dwellinghouse, and which, in the Council's view, incorporates side elevations.

Comments; PD fails under A.1(j) and A.2(b)

I have taken advice from my solicitors who agree with this analysis.

Extent to which the existing application falls within the scope of permitted development rights

You told me that this application – 2021/5625/P – would probably be granted, as it appeared to meet the criteria for permitted development. Having discussed with my planning lawyers, I am not yet convinced of this and I understand that my neighbours at 40 WW share similar concerns.

I understand that Ian Trehearne, acting on behalf of 40 WW, has asked for a dimensioned drawing, which I support.

I have been advised by my planning lawyers to ask for clarification on the following points.

1. The depth of the proposed extension

In Drawing 255 the doors to the new rear wall extend slightly beyond the point to which the 3-metre mark has been measured. To ensure that the development would meet the requirements under Paragraph A.1(f), which provides that development will not be permitted if "*the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would have a single storey and (i) extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse by more than 3 metres in the case of any [non-detached] dwellinghouse*" could Camden please ask the applicant to submit revised plans.

2. The height of the extension varies in different plans, yet remains marked as 3000mm to the eaves

The height of the extension is also very important, because (a) of the difference in the ground levels between 42 and 44, and between 42 and 40 Well Walk, and (b) the pitched roof would raise the height to 3397.

Please would the planning officer request detailed scale drawings of the existing section, the proposed section and the existing and proposed rear elevation, also showing the height of the party wall with 44 Well Walk.

In the section the extension appears higher, in the rear elevation, lower.

I am very concerned, as although the height of 3m is within the guidelines for PD, it would have serious implications for me in 44. Please see drawings 300 and 456 of the existing and proposed rear elevation. Nos 42 and 44 WW are a mirrored pair. The height from the ground to the balcony on the upper ground floor of my property is approximately 2590. The balcony of 42 is immediately adjacent, and yet the drawings of the proposed rear elevation show the 3-metre mark at the level of the balcony.

The section drawing of the proposed extension, however, shows the 3-metre mark slightly below the level of the upper ground floor window cills.

May I draw your attention to the fact that the section drawing is taken from the 42 WW side looking towards 40 WW. The wall shown beyond the proposed roof of the extension is at 40 WW. The party wall between 42 and 44 is not the same height as the party wall between 42 and 40; it is much lower, particularly where it joins the houses, but is not shown.

I should welcome a site visit, as this would show why I am concerned about the height. Given the discrepancies in the drawings, I also consider it important that an officer carry out a visit to 42 WW in order to (a) measure the points which are 3000mm and 3397mm above ground level where the extension is proposed; and (b) measure the precise height from the ground to the upper floor balcony at 42 WW. This will provide clarity as to how accurate the drawings are.

3. There is currently insufficient information to be satisfied that the proposal complies with Paragraph A.3(a)

To ensure the materials are in keeping with the original house, as required in a conservation area/Article 2 (3) Land, see Paragraph A.3(a) I should also like Camden to ask for additional information about the materials that would be used, e.g. the type of brick, the colour, and to supply images of them, and details of the glazed timber doors. The existing French windows in 42 WW replace a single sash window in the centre of the lower ground floor bay. 44 WW still has the original single sash window. (I would be happy to supply a photograph.)

4. As previous applications 2020/5983/P and 2020/5984/P had roof lights I should like confirmation that none is included in the current application.

This is another matter of concern, because of light pollution. A large development at 14 Gainsborough Gardens permitted a sizable conservatory, with a structure like a greenhouse, which is obliquely below nos 44 and 42, and directly behind no 40. Because Well Walk stands above Gainsborough Gardens, which is quite dimly lit by historic streetlamps, light from the plain glass roof has a major impact on the houses above.

5. There is a minor mistake in the drawing of the rear elevation.

There are three windowpanes on the top floor, not four. See drawings 300 Existing rear elevation and 360 Proposed rear elevation. But for the sake of accuracy, revised plans should be submitted.

I should like to place on record a request that if an application for full planning permission is sought by the owners of 42 Well Walk the planning officer in charge of the case should make a site visit, and that the officer should also visit my property, 44 Well Walk, which adjoins 42 Well Walk and is its mirrored pair.

Thank you very much for addressing my concerns, and I should be grateful if you would continue to keep me updated on the progress of the revised plans and the application.

With best wishes,

Marguerite.