# Date: 1 December 2022

**Planning application Reference:** 2022/4042/P

Proposal: New rear terrace extension at 2nd floor level

**Summary:** On the assumption that the proposed development is intended to be cumulative - ie additional to the works covered by application 2022/1553/P - we **object** to this proposal: it would additionally result in a development which would unacceptably dominate the rear of the original house.

# Comments:

1. We have issues with the technical adequacy of the drawings
   1. Application 2022/1553/P showing significant rear extensions was recently approved, but this application does not show the approved proposal as 'existing'. As it must be presumed that the current proposal is for a further enlargement, the approved extensions need to be shown for the cumulative effect of extensions to be considered. If the current proposal is meant to supersede the granted approval, that should be stated.
2. The bulk of the proposed development is inappropriate in relation to neighbouring buildings
   1. The proposed rear roof extension at second floor level coupled with approved lower extensions would dominate the original house. No other nearby house in this terrace has an extension at this level, and the space between the rear of the York Way buildings and those in Marquis Road is already quite confined.
3. The proposed development fails to support the rhythm of neighbouring houses
4. We have concerns over the roof terrace
   1. The design and access statement states that the floor 2 rear roof has been used for many years as a terrace. It should be clarified if this application is meant to regularise that use, for which we have found no evidence of planning approval.
5. The proposed development does not make adequate, permanent provisions for controlling to an acceptable level potential light or noise pollution.
6. Clarification is required over whether this proposed extension is meant to supersede the lower extensions approved in July 2022 (application 2022/1553/P), or is intended to be a further addition.
   1. One of the grounds given by Camden Planning for accepting the previous application was the comparable extensions to neighbouring houses.
   2. Here, no nearby houses have second floor rear extensions, and we consider that the revival of a historic precedent (perhaps pre-dating conservation area status) found in a few buildings further away in the terrace would be harmful.
7. Assuming this proposal is meant to be cumulative, we would object as it would additionally result in development which would unacceptably dominate the rear of the original house.



**Signed: Date: 1 December 2022**

David Blagbrough

Chair

Camden Square CAAC