

02 August 2022

Ref: 479/22

FAO: Ms Leela Muthoora

Leela.Muthoora@camden.gov.uk

SUPPORTING LETTER TO ADDRESS CONCERNS RAISED BY THE PLANNING OFFICER MS LEELA MUTHOORA AND NEIGHBOUR OBJECTIONS

Since the application Ref: 2022/2081/P at Flat 1, 41 Glenmore Road was submitted, the appointed planning officer Leela Muthoora has pointed out a few proposal issues. Ms Muthoora has suggested that the council is willing to consider revised drawings if all of the concerns are addressed. We would also like to address some points raised by the owners of 39 Glenmore Road and the Belsize Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

We are referring to emails received on 13th and 21st July 2022 from Ms Muthoora.

Please find attached amended drawings Nos 020 – 026 Rev J.

Below is the list of all raised concerns and how they have been addressed.

1. BCAAC AND PLANNING OFFICER - FRONT TRELLIS
 - The proposed front trellis for privacy was removed from the plans. The front elevation remains unaltered.
2. BCAAC AND PLANNING OFFICER - 3M REAR EXTENSION
 - The 3m rear extension projection is removed. The infill extension is in line with the main building line, which is now unbroken.
3. PLANNING OFFICER - GREEN ROOF
 - It was felt that suggestion to install a green roof is was not mandatory, but just a recommendation
 - As the 3m extension part was removed it was understood that this would compensate the need for a green roof, as there is now no loss of garden space.
 - We note that green roofs add a substantial thickness to the new roof structure. This either leads to the increase of the extension height, which is not preferable by the planning department; or causes a recused ceiling height inside. Currently the proposed ceiling height is a new kitchen is 2.35m. This is below the recommended ceiling height by London Plan. Therefore we prefer to eliminate the green roof options as it would solve the potential problem from the outside as well as from the inside.
4. BCAAC OBJECTION – “THE PROPOSED REAR EXTENSION IS TOO HIGH ON THE BOUNDARY WALL”
 - Please refer to a new drawing No 026.

- The proposed extension is no higher than the existing one. It is only a one storey extension; the majority of it will be hidden by the boundary fence and due to the existing ground slope the extension would sit lower than the neighbouring property.
 - Given that the 3m rear extension has been removed, the height of the infill extension will have a much less significant impact.
 - Given that the extension is now only infill, there would be no loss of light to 39 Glenmore Road.
 - Additionally, there are number of approved infill extensions that are much higher than the one proposed at 41 Glenmore Rd, i.e. Ref. 2018/0070/P, Ref. 2011/2403/P & Ref. 2012/0593/P. We appreciate the officer might state that provided precedents are single family dwelling houses and that a different assessment method was used. However building up to the boundary affects adjacent neighbours and therefore it is our understanding that provided precedent has a substantial weight to demonstrate clear precedents that are approved in close vicinity.
5. BCAAC – “THE PROPOSED REAR EXTENSION EXTENDS TOO FAR INTO THE GARDEN”.
- As mentioned above the 3m element is removed and it is our understanding that it solves the main contention with the proposal.
6. BCAAC - LIGHT FROM THE ROOF LIGHTS WILL BE INTRUSIVE TO NEIGHBOURS.
- This statement was a little bit unclear as there are quite a few precedents on Glenmore Road.
 - We provided a couple of precedent Ref. 2018/0070/P, Ref. 2011/2403/P and Ref. 2012/0593/P. We appreciate the officer stating that both sites are single family dwelling houses, not sub-divided into flats and therefore, the impact on the upper floor windows is not a factor in these examples as they form the same household. However the precedents are clear, they are in the close proximity and they affect not only their own households but immediate neighbours as well. Therefore provided precedents should be taken into account.
 - Due to the reduced rear extension the long rooflight was eliminated. The revised project contains one small rooflight above the kitchen and one opaque above the bathroom. The existing kitchen has a glass roof and therefore the amended scheme doesn't demonstrate a substantial difference comparing to an existing one.
 - The rooflights also now state clearly that blinds will be installed, meaning that in the evenings there should be no light pollution
7. BCAAC – OBJECT TO THE USE OF ALUMINIUM WINDOWS AND DOORS
- It was never an intention to install aluminium windows and no new doors are proposed.
 - Please refer to the revised drawing No 023 which clearly states that the new window is match existing timber ones.
8. THE CONSERVATION OFFICER HAS RAISED CONCERNS THAT THE LARGE, GLAZED OPENING WHICH IS UNCHARACTERISTIC OF THE REAR ELEVATIONS AND THE CA (CONSERVATION AREA).
- Please refer to amended drawing No 025.RevJ. The sill of the window starts at 900mm from FFL and is 1200mm height.

- The initially submitted drawings demonstrated 2 x new windows of 1350mm width. The updated option shows only 1 window with the width of 842mm (please refer to drawing No 023)
 - It is our understanding that this substantial reduction should overcome the issue.
9. NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY 39 GLENMORE ROAD – ROOF WATER DRAINAGE
- This concern is related to Building Regulations stage not Planning.
 - However even the planning stage drawings demonstrate that the proposed flat roof has 2 drainages: one of them being internal and the other one is attached to the rear elevation. Please refer to the roof plan drawing No021.
 - The flat roof has an upstand on all walls. It protects the rainwater from dripping on the adjacent site.
 - Flat roof is a technical term, but it is known it is mandatory to provide a minimal slope leading the rainwater towards gutters. As mentioned above this is part of Building Regulations stage.
10. NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY 39 GLENMORE ROAD – SECURITY AND PRIVACY
- The concern related to jumping from the roof appears unfounded – it would be just as easy from the current chimney breast or existing kitchen extension for an intruder to jump into the neighbouring property. The gardens are surrounded on all sides.
 - Related to privacy, the plans do not include provision for a roof terrace.
11. NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY 39 GLENMORE ROAD – LINE OF JUNCTION
- The flank wall of the infill extension does not sit astride or up to the boundary of 39 Glenmore Road. Because of a small retaining wall between the properties, the flank wall will be built slightly offset from the boundary.
 - The owners are happy to re-erect the existing timber fence or provide a new fence so match the existing one at 39 Glenmore Road
12. NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY 39 GLENMORE ROAD – LIGHT POLLUTION AND LOSS OF LIGHT
- These items have been addressed above. There should be no light pollution or spill given the reduced size of the roof lights and blinds. There will be no loss of light to 39 Glenmore Road given the height of the extension and the removal of the 3m rear extension.

We hope that all of the above concerns were solved appropriately and they are acceptable by the planning department. However if you require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Kind regards

Principal designer
Sigita Vaitiekuniene