

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1313/P	Steve and Lynne Jones	22/05/2022 19:38:10	OBJ	We live opposite number 5 Tanza Road. In common with other homes in the even side of Tanza, we currently enjoy a limited view of the Heath from between the semi detached homes opposite (in this case between numbers 3 and 5) and a generous flow of light. The height and pitch style of the proposed sideways will be detrimental to that flow and view. The style does not appear to be in keeping with sideways on other homes in Tanza and is likely to set a precedent to allow them which would affect more of the even number homes,

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1313/P	Suzanne and Joel McDonald	20/05/2022 15:47:39	OBJ	<p>1. We are writing regarding the ongoing works at 5 Tanza Rd NW3 2UA, situated on the Heath side of Tanza Rd, with rear garden adjoining Hampstead Heath. The application to vary</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> indicates, in one drawing only (D38), that the proposed single side extension is intended to be built directly onto and co-opt the party boundary wall between the two properties and incorporate it as the side wall of the extension (This was not clear from the initial application, or this one, and it is argued no such permission was granted by 2021/0478/P); seeks to significantly increase the height of the roof of the extension, the front elevation of the extension (the design of which has significantly changed from the approved version) and the overall proportion of the extension; and seeks permission for a full side extension incorporated into the house rather the stated purpose of a 'covered side passageway' for the purposes of storage/a bike shed.

CHARACTERISATION OF THE VARIATION SOUGHT

2. It is stated in the summary to the application and as posted on the street that the CHANGES INCLUDE an increase in the height of the extension by 250mm and a set-back of 800mm from the front elevation of the building (to align with No3). However, the drawings are not consistent with each other or with this summary, being a substantial under-representation of the height increase and a substantial over-representation of the set-back. The proposed treatment of the boundary wall is also unclear. We would ask that to the extent any variation is made it is specific and does not reference the drawings, as it appears that the request does not accord with the drawings.

RELEVANT GUIDELINES

3. In reviewing this application, we have had regard to the fact that 5 Tanza Rd is in the South Hill Park Conservation Area (SHPCA) as well as being subject to the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan, The Camden Local Plan and other guidelines. Among the most relevant considerations from these guidelines are the distinctive characteristics of the area (for example the sloping roofs), the importance of the street views to Hampstead Heath and the effects of developments on neighbours.

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT (January 2021 amended August 21)

4. As background, the description of the enclosed side passage as set forth in the Design and Access Statement submitted with the original planning application (as amended) is helpful.

- The heading refers to the enclosed side passage as a "Side store".
- Under 'Use' it is described as 'a covered storage passage in the side passage for bikes and other storage'.
- Under 'Layout' it is described as 'an ancillary garden purposes area with the side partial enclosure of the side passage to form a bike store and garden storage'.
- The plan drawing on page 1 under Layout does not show any building on the boundary wall, with the addition wholly within the No.3 side of the boundary wall.
- Under 'Scale' it is stated that 'The intention of the proposal is to preserve and enhance the rear and front elevation' and 'The new front elevation will remain unaltered. The photo of the front elevation under 'Scale' is taken from an angle (rather than front on) and does not show the passage which is intended to be covered. There is no mention of the side passage extension under the heading 'Scale'.
- Under 'Landscaping' it is stated that 'There will be adequate storage for bicycles in the proposed covered side passageway similar to No. 3 next door'.
- Under 'Appearance' although it is stated that the proposals would not involve alterations to the external

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

rear and side elevations – that relates to the roof works. There is no discussion of the effect on the special character and appearance on No5 of the side passage works.

5. All of the above implies a minimal change to create a partially covered side passage for the purpose of storage, with no visible effect on the front elevation or the side elevation and that it will be contained within the no.5 side of the boundary wall.

6. There is no discussion of the effect of the proposed covered side passage on No.3 Tanza Road.

7. The original drawings are unclear. The revised drawings (although still unclear) show that the intention is to build a full side extension to the house and goes beyond the stated purpose of a covered passageway for storage and beyond the dimensions of the approved planning permission. It should be considered as a fresh application. Both the original and the revised drawings are inconsistent with the newly proposed treatment of the boundary wall between No 5 and No 3. We believe that the summary description of the application and the drawings are at best inconsistent and at worst incorrect and misleading. The proposed extension is out of harmony with other similar additions and has made no attempt to reflect the special character of the house, its location, the neighbourhood or to comply with the guidelines in place.

MAIN CONCERNS REGARDING THE PROPOSED EXTENSION

8. We highlight 7 main concerns relating to the side extension as proposed.

- a. The height of the party wall.
- b. The height of the extension roof.
- c. The level of the front elevation of the side extension.
- d. The extension does not accord with other houses on Tanza Road with an enclosed side passage and is not of a similar nature.
- e. The extension will adversely affect the street view and the views from the street to Hampstead Heath.
- f. The extension will adversely affect the access of No. 3 to natural light.
- g. The height of the party wall and the side extension will create a significant sense of enclosure to No.3.

THE HEIGHT OF THE PARTY WALL

9. The current boundary wall is in two parts. The front part of the boundary wall, adjacent to and most visible from the street, is lower than the rear boundary wall which is set well back from the street. It is intended to build up the low boundary wall towards the street and co-opt it to form the side wall of the extension and for the front and rear elevation (facades) and the top of the extension to be built yet further above the new level of the party wall and above the current height of the rear boundary wall.

The Approved Drawings.

10. The drawings approved in the Decision dated 14 September 2021 including D12A, D19, DS17C and D18C do not show any proposed building on the party wall. To the contrary these drawings all show the extension contained wholly within the No 5 side of the party wall. This is evident also from a close examination of a zoomed-in digital copy of D18C. It shows faintly in greyscale the boundary wall at a low level behind the street pier. The street pier is double the width of the boundary wall. The boundary line of No5 and No3 runs through the middle of the boundary wall. The side wall of the extension (also in faint greyscale) abuts the wall but does not build on it. There is, as yet, no permission to build on the party wall as none of the approved drawings show any increase in height to the party wall.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The New Drawings

11. As with the drawings attached to the first application, the new plan elevation drawing D12D and the new front elevation D18A do not show any building on the party wall and indicates the extension is contained wholly on the No 5 side of the party wall.

12. D18A is the revised D18C. The front elevation and roof are increased but the party wall remains unbuilt on. However, it does now appear that there is an intention to build on the whole width of the party wall and to co-opt the party wall as the external wall of the extension. See particularly D38 and D39 submitted with this application (but not submitted with the original application and not approved). D38 has some errors. The existing party wall is in fact 2390 above the floor of the No3 shed (not 2160). The intention is to increase this wall by a further 850. This would form the new boundary wall between No5 and No3, with the height of the wall from No3 being 3240 from the floor. The front façade of the extension (not drawn on the section D38 nor shown in any detail) will be a minimum of 3419 above the No3 floor (2541 plus 878). It appears that it will be 500 nearer to the street than the No.3 shed façade (The set-back of the extension is also unclear from the drawings). The height of the party wall, the roof and the façade will have a significant effect on available light to and an enclosing effect on No.3. No mention of the effect on No.3 of the extension has been made in the application.

13. The applicant relies upon the Decision dated 14/9/21 as providing permission to build on the party wall. The approved drawings do not show any building on the party wall. We object to the party wall being built upon as proposed in D38. Planning department guidance on this issue would be helpful.

14. Furthermore, the proposed increase in height of the party wall does not take account of the No3 drain and guttering from the No3 roof. The proposed wall would be built right through the drain. No mention of it or proposal as to how it is to be dealt with is included in the application or drawings.

THE HEIGHT OF THE EXTENSION (1. The Roof height and 2. The front Facade)

15. We object to the proposed height of the extension. There are 3 heights to consider.

- a. The height of the party wall (see above),
- b. the height of the roof itself – 2462: 362 higher than the approved height, and 3340 above the floor of No 3.
- c. the height of the front façade – (at least) 2541: 440 above the approved height and a total of 3419 above the floor of No.3

16. The drawings do not accord with the request to increase the height by 250mm, are incorrect and or misleading and require detailed analysis. We cannot find a dimension showing the stated increase of 250 on any drawing. An analysis of the drawings as to height is at Appendix 1.

17. There is a side gate already in the passageway. This current height of the side gate (2120) provides sufficient headspace for a “covered storage passage”. It is unclear why any additional height above the level of the current side gate is required, let alone the further additional height requested in this application. D39B attached to the current application indicates that the side passage floor will be raised (no dimension is given). It is not known if the additional height is requested as a result of the choice to raise the floor level.

18. This proposed extension is not in keeping with similar structures on Tanza Rd, is in conflict with the

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Design Statement and contrary to guidelines. The proposed extension has the design and size of a significant side entrance and an addition to the house. Given the stated purpose of a 'covered storage passage' as stated in the Design and Access Statement, such a substantial increase in height and the additional heft is unjustified. No attempt has been made to reduce the impact on the streetscape, the views from the street to Hampstead Heath or to minimise the adverse effect on light and sense of enclosure of No3 either by sloping the roof or by use of a lighter construction. The roofline makes no attempt to match the characteristic sloped roofs of the main houses and the other side passages on Tanza Rd.

THE FRONT ELEVATION, SCALE AND PROPORTION

19. There is no other house on the Hampstead Heath side of Tanza Rd that has built an extension of similar proportion as appears in the proposal. In this recent application an effort has been made to push back the front of the extension from the same plane as the front elevation of the house. The narrative indicates that the front of the extension will be pushed back 800 from the front elevation of the house. However the dimension of 800 on D12D appears to be from in front of the front porch pier, not the main elevation of the building. It will be approximately 500 from the main elevation. We understand from discussions with the owner that this may indeed be an error in the drawing. However, we are commenting on the drawings as submitted.

20. It is stated that that the side extension will be 'in line with No.3'. There is no side-elevation or plan drawing showing the relation between the front elevation and No.3. However, the No 3 side door is set back 1020 from the main elevation. Therefore the proposed front elevation will be 500 further forward towards the street than the No.3 side passage façade and at a height of approximately 1111 above the existing party wall. The fact that the facade (a proposed height of 3419 above the no3 floor) starts nearer to the street contributes to the adverse effect on light and the sense of enclosure to No3.

21. As well as taller and more forward than other side passages on the Heath side of Tanza Rd, the proposed addition will be wider. Including the co-opting of the party wall the proposed addition will be 1405. (From D38 - 1180 plus 225.) This width contributes to the proposal's heft and failure to be proportionate.

22. It appears from D39B that the front elevation is to be built across the middle of an existing window at lower ground level.

23. Other side extensions on Tanza Rd are set significantly back from the street and at lower level to preserve the front elevation and proportion of the houses. The importance of that fact is acknowledged in the Design and Access Statement which states that 'The intention of the proposal is to preserve and enhance the rear and front elevation'. It goes on to say explicitly 'The new front elevation will remain unaltered'. This is incorrect.

24. The Design and Access Statement includes a photograph taken from an angle which does not provide a complete view of the front elevation, and specifically it excludes a view of the side passage where the proposed extension will in fact alter the front elevation.

THE EXTENSION DOES NOT ACCORD WITH LOCAL ARCHITECTURE

25. The extension does not accord with other houses on Tanza Road. On the Hampstead Heath side of the road, of those houses that have a covered side passage, all of the roofs are sloped - not flat - as proposed for No.5. All are also set back from the front of the main building, some as far as half-way along the building.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

None of the extensions on that side of the road co-opt and are built fully onto the boundary wall. The effect of building wholly on the boundary wall adds to the width and heft of the structure. The proposed structure is 1405 in width.

26. The proposed extension is different in height, structure, roof line, and proportion to other covered side passages. The proposed extension is a flat-roofed, flat-fronted, full-brick extension to the house. There has been no attempt to slope the roof, as is common and in keeping with the characteristic steeply sloped roofs of the houses and other covered passage ways. The construction is full-brick. There has been no attempt to use a lighter structure or materials to reduce the impact of the extension as is common on Tanza Rd (many incorporate glass roofs and timber construction). It cannot be characterised as a 'covered side passageway' as stated in the Design Statement.

THE EXTENSION WILL HAVE AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE STREET VIEW

27. On the Hampstead Heath side of Tanza Rd, where No5 is situated, the gaps between the houses afford a street view of Hampstead Heath. These 'glimpses' between the houses are specifically protected by the guidelines as characteristic. As explained above, the height and width of the proposed addition will significantly obscure the streetview of Hampstead Heath.

THE EXTENSION WILL HAVE AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON NO 3'S ACCESS TO LIGHT AND SENSE OF ENCLOSURE.

28. The partially covered front side passage at No. 3 has an angled glass roof that allows in natural light. This natural light in turn is accessed by windows and glass door to the interior of the house. The proposal is to build up

- a. the party wall so that it will be a total of 3240 above the floor of No.3, an increase of 850;
- b. the roof height so it will be 3340 above the floor of No.3;
- c. the front facade (the western façade of the extension), so that it will be 3419 above the floor of No 3;
- d. the front façade will be 500 further towards the street than the no3 side gate; and
- e. the front façade so that it is 1111 above the current party wall.

29. The significantly increased height and proportion of the extension, constructed of full brick, will significantly block No. 3's access to natural light. No light report has been conducted.

THE EXTENSION WILL CREATE A SIGNIFICANT SENSE OF ENCLOSURE to NO 3.

30. The height increases mentioned in paragraph 28 will create a significant sense of enclosure to No.3. With the boundary wall subsumed into the extension we calculate that the height above the existing party wall of the front elevation is approximately 1111 and 500 further forward than the No3 side gate. These dimensions are not shown on the plans.

SUMMARY

31. We do not object in principle to the construction of a covered side passage at No.5. We object to the proposed plans because they do not conform with the guidelines, make no effort to reflect the local protected characteristics, are not in accordance with the Design and Access Statement. Furthermore, there is a mismatch between the application and the drawings themselves and numerous inconsistencies and contradictions in the drawings making it impossible to understand exactly what is being proposed.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

APPENDIX 1

ANALYSIS OF THE DRAWINGS AS TO HEIGHT (paragraph 16)

1.D19 (approved) allows for the roof height of the extension to be parallel to the bottom of the lintel of the side door to the house at the current height of the side gate. It is indicated to be 2100mm. The façade is approved at the same height. D17C(rear) and D18C do not give dimensions but show the facades at significantly below the front porch height.

2.D18A (front) shows the new proposed height of the front façade is above 2541. The level is broadly at the same level as the top step of the main entrance to the house (which is approximately 1600 above the pavement). The pavement level pier on the right of the property implies that the extension is well below the eyeline. However the party wall behind the pier is much lower. The façade is 440 above what is currently approved, not 250 as requested in the variation request. The drawings appear to differ from the summary provided in the notification.

3.D17Di (rear) does not put a dimension on the new proposed height. However the façade is significantly above the current rear party wall. According to the dimension on the right hand side of the drawing it is over 2511.

4.D39B (proposed side elevation, a new drawing) gives a proposed roof dimension, 2462 which is 362 above the current approved height and again is in excess of the 250mm requested.

5.D39B indicates that the floor is being raised. No dimension is given. It is counter to the purpose of minimising the impact of the extension to firstly increase the floor height. Any argument made with respect to sufficient internal height should take account of the fact that the floor height is being increased.

6.D39B shows in side elevation that the brickwork façade of the front and rear elevations (which are a new design feature and not previously approved) are significantly above the roof height, although no dimension is given. The front elevation will be the most visible part of the extension from the street and entrance to No3. D19 as approved shows a flat roof with no significant front elevation brickwork above the door. The new façade is shown at approximately the same height as the porch at the top of the front steps (approximately 1600 above street level.)

7.D39B incorrectly refers to the 'Level of raised section of the boundary wall as PP'. (see above).

8.D38 (a new drawing) is a section through the proposed extension referencing no3. It is incorrect in some respects and incomplete. The floor of no3 is 230 below that indicated. We have calculated that the roof height will be a total of 3340 above the floor of the No.3 (2462 plus 878). The front elevation (not drawn on the section D38) will be a minimum of 3419 above the No3 (2541 plus 878).
