



APPEAL BY:  
Mr Dante Mody

AGAINST THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN COUNCIL'S REFUSAL  
TO GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION FOR:

*Erection of part single storey, part two storey rear extension and conversion of  
ground floor retail store room (Class E) to provide a 2 bedroom flat (Class C3)*

AT  
67 Mill Lane, London, NW6 1NB

London Borough of Camden Council's Reference: 2022/0694/P

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS: RESPONSE TO LPA STATEMENT

January 2023

RJS PLANNING

T: 0208 3543582 M: 07884 138682 E: info@rjsplanning.co.uk  
RJS Planning. 15 Vale Court, Ealing Road, Brentford, TW8 0LN

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This statement has been prepared by RJS Planning, on behalf of Mr Dante Mody, in response to the statement of the Local Planning Authority.

## **2.0 RESPONSE TO COUNCIL'S STATEMENT**

2.1 The council state that the Officer's Delegated Report sets out their position and reasons for refusal. The appellant has responded fully to the Report within their appeal statement and therefore, the following paragraphs will respond where appropriate to the council's address of points raised by the appellant.

### **Design**

2.2 The appellant reiterates his claims that the proposed extension would be a sympathetic addition to the host building.

2.3 Details were submitted within the supporting statement of extensions to the rear of Mill Lane, however, the appellant did not suggest these extensions were of a high quality unlike that proposed at the appeal site. The appellant highlighted the existing extensions by way of demonstrating that extending to the rear of no. 67 would not be out of character when taking into account the wider context of the site.

2.4 It is evident that the extension proposed at no. 67 would differ from those existing extensions in terms of design, scale and materials.

2.5 Consequently, the appellant asserts that the extension proposed at no. 67 would respect current design policies and guidance and the size, scale and materials proposed would result in appropriate additions to the host building which would not cause unacceptable harm to the adjoining terrace or wider area.

### **Standard of accommodation**

2.6 The council acknowledge that the relabelling of the first floor room would address concerns regarding internal floor space.

2.7 Regarding outlook and light, the proposed dwelling has been designed with large clear glazed windows and a rooflight which will ensure adequate light reaches all areas of the property. The property would also overlook the courtyard garden which as shown in the appellant's statement would respect the prevailing pattern of development.

- 2.8 The outlook proposed from the new flat would not differ that significantly from the existing outlooks from the rear windows of properties along Mill Lane and thus, the proposal could not reasonably be considered to be materially harmful for future occupiers.
- 2.9 In addition, a landscaping scheme could be included for the courtyard thus further improving the outlook for future occupiers.
- 2.10 Given the above points the standard of accommodation would be suitable for the proposed number of occupants and would comply with the overall aims of national and local planning policy.

### **Car-free development**

- 2.11 The appellant acknowledges why a Section 106 agreement is necessary to secure car-free development and therefore, again reiterates his willingness to comply in order to overcome the council's third reason for refusal.

### **3.0 SUGGESTED CONDITIONS**

- 3.1 We consider that any conditions deemed reasonable to this particular case will be acceptable.

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 The appellant states that the scheme comply with the aims of the NPPF, policies A1, D1, H6, T1 and T2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and policies 2 and 4 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015.