From: anna gruetzner-robins
Sent: 17 March 2023 15:29

To: Planning Planning; Meric Apak (Cllr); Georgia Gould (Cllr); Jenny Headlam-Wells

(Cllr)

Subject: Objection to Planning Application 2022/429/P 139-147 Camden Road

I am writing to object to the Planning Application as above. The proposed height of proposed extension completely changes the character and impact of the existing property in a detrimental way and the manner in which the developers have presented their case grossly underestimates the impact on us. Further, there have been a number of significant changes in circumstances since permission was granted on the existing building, and the change in

## Impact on our amenity

guidance.

The application claims that the building is not tall, and the new extended height responds to the adjacent Camden Courtyards residential complex. However, that building has no significant impact on our amenity.

1. Visual Privacy and Overlooking- The properties on Rochester Road, Wilmot Place and Rochester Mews ("the Residential Properties"), which includes my house, will suffer significant the proposed extension seeks to add two stories to the building with added balconies. Both the interior and exterior spaces of our property and the other Residential Properties will be significantly more overlooked as a result. Our are at the back of our property which will be directly affected by this. Further, the residents of the new developed will be able to at the back of the houses and into the garden.

We note that when permission to develop the building was granted in the first place (for Application Ref: 2007/0524/P), one of the decisive factors was the fact that there was significant tree coverage on the boundary between the residential properties and the back of the building. In the original planning decision, it was decided that as there was considerable tree cover in the rear gardens of the potentially overlooked properties, no unreasonable overlooking was expected from the balconies. This was safeguarded by the fact that because the development would have an adverse effect on the existing trees and the fact that the Council wanted to limit the negative impact that would have on the amenities (see reason 14), a condition requiring details of the means of ensuring no significant harm to the trees was imposed. Unfortunately, in reality the safeguarding has since been rendered entirely ineffective. Last year the developers of the existing building made applications to remove the boundary trees ( Application Nos. 2022/3175/T, 2022/0378/T, 2022/0377/T, 2022/0375/T). This was because it was said that the trees were affecting the structure of the boundary wall between the existing building and the gardens at the rear of the Residential Properties. The beautiful mature trees which provided a full screen from the majority of the balconies and a significant amount of privacy to the Residential Properties have now been removed and it will take decades for the new trees to grow. The impact of the removal of the trees has been detrimental to our privacy as it has left us and our neighbour exposed to the eyes of the residents and offices of the existing building. By increasing the development by two stories we will suffer significantly more overlooked and our homes will become significantly less private as a result.

- 2. **Overshadowing and outlook** the new proposal will impact on the look of the Conservation Area and its beautiful gardens which are enjoyed by a wide ranging number of people, and it will cause significant overshadowing. T
- 3. **Sunlight, daylight and artificial lighting levels** There can be no doubt that adding two storeys will have a negative impact on daylight, sunlight and overshadowing. We already live in quite a congested area building height wise and the amount of light that we get is already extremely limited due to overlooking by other buildings (including the existing development). T The proposed development is not in accordance with the most recent guidance published by the Building Research Establishment (currently the Building Research Establishment's Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight A Guide to Good Practice 2011).
  - a. **Daylight** the daylight that is received inside our property especially in the winter months is already limited.
  - b. **Sunlight** Currently the existing development blocks most of the morning sunlight as the sun comes over the building. In March there is less than 2 hours of sunlight already. With the proposed new development this will be reduced to nothing. In the winter it is rare to get any sunlight, but it is limited to the morning. The surrounding buildings also have an adverse effect on our sunlight and therefore the little sunlight we get which comes over the building in the morning is crucial to our enjoyment of the land. Again, sunlight is an important amenity and significantly affects our mental health.
  - c. Artificial lighting levels The artificial lighting levels will increase by double at night due to the fact that the flats are intended for residents and the proposal intends to double the number of floors. The proposal for a fully glazed top floor and a "glazed lantern" on top of the building will create light pollution in the surrounding area at night. Given the removal of the trees this is impacted significantly in the evenings. This will be detrimental to the many birds in the gardens.
  - d. **Noise and vibration** The **noise** from residents of the building is already significant. The residents barbeque and socialise on their balconies which sit at the rear of the existing building. With two extra storeys that noise will only increase and further disrupt our enjoyment of our property.

## Impact on the character of the area

The proposed development, by reason of its height, bulk, mass, footprint and detailed design, would be detrimental to the streetscape and the character and appearance of the neighbouring Rochester Terrace Conservation Area, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and polices DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies. We are concerned about the appearance of the design of the proposed application as it is not in accordance with the requirements of policy D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and policy 2 of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan 2016.

The proposed design is out of character with the setting, context, form and scale with the neighbouring buildings. It was originally found to be in keeping with the character and design of residential properties in the Rochester Terrace Conservation Area, this would no longer be the case if the extension is permitted because the proposed new height alters the character and impact of the building on the area.

The Rochester Terrace Conservation Area has wider historic beauty and value which is worth preserving. The existing is slightly conspicuous. The proposed two storey addition will be far more visible and intrusive. This will significantly alter the development's impact on the character of the immediate area and will alter the skyline. The application claims that the building is not tall and the new extended height responds to the adjacent Camden Courtyards residential complex. However, that building is of a totally different character and has no visual impact from the properties on Rochester Road, Wilmot Place and Rochester Mews. The proposed new size and height of the extension will make the building unsightly, oppressive and totally out of keeping with the character of the neighbourhood.

Further, I am concerned that the proposed new design will have a negative impact on the Rochester Conservation Area. The Conservation Area has been described as cohesive and compact with architectural integrity and charm that survives overall with some minor changes. The guidance is very strict on the impact of new extensions in the conservation area. Given the proximity of the development to the conservation area, the impact of the proposed changes will be significant and not in accordance with the guidance.

## Impact of works on property and residents/ Noise and vibration

The construction is bound to be intrusive, disruptive and noisy.

The guidance for extension to residential properties is very restrictive. For example, double storey extensions are not permitted as well as dormer extension to the top floors. For this reason the application should be turned down.

For these reasons, I do hope that you take heed of the existing planning regulations, and remember the well being of the local community, and turn down the application.

Yours faithfully,

Professor Anna Robins 43 Rochester Road, NW1 9JJ