

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/1876/P	Michael John Brace	30/07/2023 15:03:31	COMMNT	<p>27 Meadowbank London NW3 3AY 28th July 2023 Planning Department</p> <p>Dear Sir Re Planning Application 2023/1876/P We have lived at 27 Meadowbank, on Ainger Road for over forty years and our patio backs onto the same garden as No.34. We object to the application as above for the following reasons. From our patio it can be observed that the sun sets in line with and behind No.34 Meadowbank. If permission is granted for the fourth and fifth storey to be built the garden together with the patios of numbers 27 and 28 Meadowbank will be denied the late afternoon and evening sunshine which we have enjoyed these past forty years. In our view there is a purpose to the symmetry of the estate as a whole which was designed and built to provide high density accommodation, with communal gardens to provide privacy between houses and a place to enjoy fresh air and sunshine to all residents of the estate (66 houses have access to the gardens) . If the existing fourth storey at 34 Meadowbank is raised and a fifth storey (6 storeys including the basement) added then the symmetry will be broken. If a precedent is set other houses may decide to follow suit resulting in the present sunshine and light enjoyed by the gardens in the estate being lost forever. This is clearly an example of overdevelopment which would have a detrimental effect on the whole estate. Yours faithfully MJ and Mrs C Brace</p>
2023/1876/P	Paul Johnson	28/07/2023 16:41:11	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir or Madam, Planning Application 2023/1876/P - No 34 Meadowbank I should like to strongly object to the latest planning application submitted in respect of the above property which will transform an original 3 storey house constructed as part of an integrated estate into a 6 storey property that is a massive overdevelopment of the site and totally inappropriate for the facilities and infrastructure of the Meadowbank estate. The disingenuous piecemeal approach to planning applications being adopted seeks to minimise the overall impact of the developments since 2008 that have been undertaken or are currently being sought and I believe all the applications should therefore be considered in totality rather than as separate applications as is currently the case. Paul Johnson</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/1876/P	Tim Brinkman	31/07/2023 13:14:02	OBJ	Comments - Planning Application - 2023/1876/P 34 Meadowbank, Primrose Hill, London, NW3 3AY

Respondent: Tim Brinkman
Resident of 36 Meadowbank

Dear Sir / Madam,
I wish to comment on the following aspects of Planning Application 2023/1876/P regarding 34 Meadowbank:

- (1) Amenity - Overlooking & Privacy;
- (2) Amenity - Daylight & Sunlight;
- (3) Amenity - Outlook;
- (4) Amenity - Noise & Vibration;
- (5) Discrepancies in the submitted application.

(1) Overlooking & Privacy

(a) The separation distance between 34 & the rear of 28 and 29 Meadowbank is specified in the para AA.2(3a) of the applicants Planning Statement as being 17.5m. This is less than the 18m expressed in para 2.4 Camden Planning Guide Amenity (a formal Supplementary Planning Document - SPD) - 'to ensure privacy, it is good practice to provide a minimum distance of 18m between the windows of habitable rooms in existing properties directly facing the proposed (either residential or non-residential) development, assuming a level topography...The 18m should be measured between the two closest points on each building (including balconies).

(b) The development will afford enhanced views into the properties from 27 to 31 and 46 to 50 Meadowbank;

(c) The large cherry blossom tree in the communal garden at the rear of 34 Meadowbank is deciduous & therefore unable to provide year round privacy & screening for the residents of 29 and 30 Meadowbank.

(2) Daylight & Sunlight

(a) The applicants Planning Statement provides: 'A daylight and sunlight report has been included with this application, which assesses the impact on the rear of numbers 27 to 31 Meadowbank, the front of number 32 Meadowbank and the rear windows of number 46 to 32 Meadowbank as well as the communal gardens. The parameters assessed were the daylight (vertical sky component - VSC), sunlight (annual and winter probable sunlight hours). The report follows BRE guidelines e.g. windows must be no less than 27% and less than 0.8 times its former value, a minimum of 25% annual probable sunshine hours, and at least 50% of any garden or open space receiving no less than 2 hours of direct sunlight on 21st March. The results of the analysis

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

demonstrate that in all instances the numerical values set are achieved.

No details have been provided for the date at which the assessment was made, the number of assessments made so as to comply with the minimum of 2 hours direct sunlight for at least 50% of the communal garden on 21st March.

Cumulative Impact – if houses 32 to 38 all erected the same additional storey as 34 then it is arguable that the 21st March sunlight metric in the communal garden would not be met.

(b) The Camden Planning Guidance stipulates at :

Para 3.17 "The right to light is a legal right which one property may acquire over the land of another. If a structure is erected which reduces the light to an unobstructed property to below sufficient levels, this right is infringed. A right to light can come into existence if it has been enjoyed uninterrupted for 20 years or more, granted by deed, or registered under the Rights of Light Act.

Para 3.18 "Planning permission does not override a legal right to light. There also may be instances where development built under permitted development rights compromises light levels to an existing window. In both instances, where a right to light is claimed, this is a matter of property law, rather than planning law. It will be for the parties affected to seek legal remedy. The Council will have no role or interest in any private dispute arising and it will be for the owner or occupier affected to seek legal remedy."

It is arguable that this development impacts the quality & quantity of light in the communal gardens, a space owned by the Meadowbank Estate and enjoyed by its residents since 1972 (for more than 20 years) that thereby legally impacts the residents and owners of all 69 houses on the estate.

(3) Outlook

Camden Planning Guidance Para 2.14
"Developments should ensure that the proximity, size or cumulative effect of any structures avoids having an overbearing and/or dominating effect that is detrimental to the enjoyment of their properties by adjoining residential occupiers."

If all the houses in the block, 32 to 38 Meadowbank are to be treated equitably then the cumulative effect of them all undertaking the development proposed in application 2023/1876/P should be considered at the outset. It would be inequitable to treat the first house to undertake this development any differently to the last one.

(4) Noise & Vibration

Camden Planning Guidance Para 6.1
"Noise and vibration can have a significant impact on amenity, quality of life and wellbeing."

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Para 5.12
At any given time, there are likely to be areas of the borough with particularly high concentrations of individual construction sites. Collectively these have the potential to cause unacceptable adverse impact to amenity. The Council will therefore expect that CMPs should consider the cumulative impacts that could arise from the site and other construction sites within the vicinity. The Council has a good working knowledge of the extent of current and future construction activity within specific areas and developers are encouraged to work with the Council to identify potential problems.

Para 5.13
In order to mitigate any cumulative impacts, the Council will encourage developers to co-ordinate their construction activities with other construction sites, such as managing noisy working hours and coordinating deliveries to minimise impact on the highway network.

A number of residents in neighbouring houses work from home and carry out their professions. The potential cumulative effect of the proposed works under applications 2023/2723/P and 2023/1876/P is to result in levels of noise, vibration and reduced air quality which will have a quantifiable economic impact on residents carrying out professional services from their homes in addition to a reduction in the amenity value of their dwellings.

(5) Discrepancies in the Application

The submitted plan includes the following discrepancies which provide uncertainty as to outcome & raises questions as to which dimensions were specified in the BRE Light assessment especially the 25 and 35 degree assessments:

- (a) PD3210 02 → Proposed eaves height specified as 10.923m
- PD3200 02 → Proposed cumulative storey heights equate to an eaves height of 9.790m
- PD 2200 02 → Existing cumulative storey heights equate to a current roof ridge height of 8.860m
- PD3210 02 → shows the existing eaves height to 798mm lower than the proposed eaves height of 10.923m → this would imply that the existing eaves height is 10.125 m and not 8.860 as per PD2200 02
- PD3100 02 = shows the proposed roof ridge line to 3105mm above the existing ridge line → providing a new ridge height of 13.230m based on the existing ridge level 10.125
- PD3210 02 → shows the total height will be 13m which is inconsistent with the 13.230 which can be calculated from PD3100 02 or the 11.965m which can be calculated from PD2200 02.

Summary

- (i) Overlooking & Privacy – this development does not meet the good practice guidance in para 2.4 Camden Planning Guidance – Amenity;
- (ii) Daylight & Sunlight – the development does not consider the cumulative impacts of all house 32 – 38 undertaking the same development especially on the 2-hour sunlight requirement for at least 50% of the

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

communal garden on 21st March;

(iii) Outlook - the application does not consider the visual impact on the terrace of this unique roofline or the cumulative impact of all the houses in the terrace undertaking identical development. This precedent could lead to the development of structures which have (para 2.14) "...an overbearing and/or dominating effect that is detrimental to the enjoyment of their properties by adjoining residential occupiers.;

(iv) The cumulative effect of the works under applications 2023/2723/P and 2023/1876/P will be to cause noise, vibration and air quality impacts which could result in economic loss to neighbours pursuing their professions from home;

(v) Discrepancies in the plans submitted under application 2023/1876/P raise questions as to the accuracy of the light assessment and raise uncertainty as to the final dimensions of the completed project & therefore its impacts.

Regards,

Tim Brinkman

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/1876/P	Paul Filer	28/07/2023 11:07:52	COMMI	28 Meadowbank NW3 3AY

The Planning Department
Camden Council
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

28 July 2023
Dear sir

Re Planning Application 2023/1876/P
34 Meadowbank

I wish to object to the above application for the following reasons:

1. Overdevelopment of the property

This application, following a previous roof extension applications and together with the already approved basement application, will turn what was built as a three storey house into a six storey one. If this precedent is allowed, then the consequences for the Meadowbank estate are serious. It is generally agreed that its original layout was high density, so to allow one property to double in size (by expanding up and down) will have a significant detrimental impact on the built environment. What will happen if all householders follow suit?

2. The application is for more than one storey

What is being proposed is either:

(a) The demolition of the existing fourth storey and replacing it with a new fourth storey and fifth storey in the roof, in which case it is a two storey development.

or

(b) The raising of the roof of the existing fourth storey and the creation of a fifth storey in the roof, in which case it is more than a one storey development, say one and a half.

In both cases it is more than a simple one storey extension as the applicant misleadingly claims. Thus there is good reason to regard this as excessive development.

3. Overlooking of neighbouring properties

Relevant to overlooking is the Camden Planning Guidance Amenity Statement section 1. It states:

Section 2.2. Interior and exterior spaces that are overlooked lack privacy, which can affect the quality of life of occupants.

Section 2.3. The places most sensitive to overlooking are typically habitable rooms and gardens at the rear of residential buildings

Section 2.4. To ensure privacy, it is good practice to provide a minimum distance of 18m between the windows of habitable rooms in existing properties directly facing the proposed development...measured between the two closest points on each building (including balconies).

Overlooking at the rear of the property

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Note that the applicants planning form at Page 6 Impact and Risks section states: 'There is a separation distance of approximately 17.5m from the principal rear building line of the property and the rear building line of 28 and 29 Meadowbank opposite.' Thus this ignores the balconies as required in Section 2.4 above, meaning the distance is well below the good practice figure of 18m. The whole terrace from 27 to 31 Meadowbank will find their houses overlooked by the proposed skylights/windows on the top storey, which is surely unreasonable intrusion. This is after having to accept being overlooked by the additional fourth storey for which planning was obtained a few years ago.

Overlooking at the front of the property

Four photos were uploaded as part of the application in support of the double storey The captions, all read:

Large tree obscures view of roof from neighbours gardens and windows

However, the large tree referred to is a deciduous tree and so sheds its leaves. Thus the view is not obscured for most of the year ie autumn/winter when no leaves and spring when in bud. The building of an extra storey will make the overlooking worse for these middle garden houses, not as written in the application. The nearest houses, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51 and 52 are really quite close and will definitely be overlooked for most of the year. The tree would not provide permanent year-round cover sufficient to mitigate the loss of privacy arising from the proposed development.

Thus the application does not comply with Camden's Amenity Guidance Statement in that the separation distance is below the recommended level at front and rear. It also overlooks the most sensitive places. Whilst this non-compliance should be sufficient to refuse this application, consider also the even more serious impact if the rest of the estates householders took advantage of the precedent.

If you are unwilling to reject this application then please accept this compromise on the question overlooking and light into the top storey: permit light in through skylights/windows at the front but reject the skylights/windows at the rear. This will allow sufficient light into the floor, have some protection from overlooking for the houses at the front via the tree and no overlooking for the terrace of houses at the rear.

4. Loss of light to the neighbouring houses and communal gardens

The application states that the loss of light to the neighbouring houses and communal garden is within the prescribed limits. However, it is evident that if all the houses were to take advantage of this precedent then the result would be different. The overall effect on the neighbours and especially the communal gardens would be significant. Again, whilst the loss of light may seem acceptable for one householder application, it is clearly not if all take advantage of the precedent.

Also relevant is the Camden Planning Guidance Amenity Statement section 3. It states as a key message: Levels of reported daylight and sunlight will be considered flexibly taking into account site-specific circumstances and context.

And in 3.14: The Council notes the intentions of the BRE document is to provide advice to developers and decision makers and therefore it should be regarded as a guide rather than a policy.

Thus the potential cumulative impact should be taken into account, taking note, as the Amenity Statement provides, of the site-specific circumstances and context. On which basis this application should be refused.

5. Impact of roof line in the estate

Contrary to the suggestion in the applicants Planning Statement, the existing roofline of all the houses in

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Meadowbank originally built with a pitched roof has never been breached before. The roofline was variable in places as individual houses were built on different levels. However, each straight row (for example 46-50, 52-58, and most relevant here 33-38) was built and remains at the same roofline level. This application will set an unacceptable precedent for breaching the roofline of the existing terrace of houses. What is proposed here would extend by 2.1 metres above the roofline of 33-38. Even though that is within the 3.5 metres allowed by AA.1(g), matters like this can still be taken into account by the planning authority when considering the impact of the application for prior approval under AA.2(3) of the GDO (see CAB Housing Ltd v Secretary of State [2023] EWCA Civ 194 - Court of Appeal).

6. Impairment of built environment of Meadowbank
Camden has a responsibility to maintain the built environment in the borough. The Camden Planning Guidance Amenity Statement in Section 1.1 states it is a formal Supplementary Planning Document, which is therefore a 'material consideration' in planning decisions. It goes on in 1.3 to state: Standards of amenity (the features of a place that contribute to its attractiveness and comfort) are major factors in the health and quality of life of the borough's residents.

7. Conclusion
This application is a clear case of overdevelopment leading to excessive overlooking of neighbouring properties, loss of light to homes and communal gardens, all of which would be made even worse for the Meadowbank estate by the precedent set for others to follow. It is generally accepted that the estate was built as high density and Camden, at the very least, has a responsibility to prevent this from getting worse. Granting permission would demonstrate no concern for the built environment of the Meadowbank estate or its standards of amenity.

There was much concern expressed by the planning committee about the application by 34 Meadowbank's owners for a basement. I believe the above concerns about this loft extension are important matters of principle which are too important to be dealt with by delegated authority and should be debated by the full planning committee.

If you do not feel able to reject this application or bring it to the full planning committee, then at least consider a compromise solution for the top storey by permitting light in through skylights/windows at the front but rejecting the skylights/windows at the rear. This will allow sufficient light into the top floor, have some protection from overlooking for the houses at the front via the tree and no overlooking for the terrace of houses at the rear.

Yours faithfully

Paul Filer

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/1876/P	Miss M Feeny	31/07/2023 16:16:54	OBJ	<p>I live at no 39 Meadowbank. I have read all the objections made by my neighbours and I wish to support all the objections and in particular the detail provided in the objection from No 28</p> <p>Namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overdevelopment of No 34 and the risk that this will set a precedent for other properties on Meadowbank which is already high density Overlooking of neighbouring properties Loss of light to neighbouring properties Impact of roofline in Meadowbank Impairment of the built environment in Meadowbank
2023/1876/P	Adrian Hollis	30/07/2023 19:19:15	OBJ	<p>OBJECTION</p> <p>Meadowbank estate is recognised as being a high density development. This application has not considered the scale, massing or height in relation to the adjoining or similar buildings. Any additions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale to maintain continuity, rights of light and privacy.</p> <p>Properties within the central triangle in the same style as No34, which include but not exclusively Nos 46-51, none have extended above the original ridge line of the terraces.</p> <p>The two communal gardens to the front and rear of No34 have several properties adjoining the gardens some with 2nd floor private terraces, all these properties will be hugely affected by any upward extension beyond the ridge line.</p> <p>Reference made to a tree acting as a barrier: The estate management maintenance plan includes pollarding and/or removal of vegetation as deemed appropriate therefore it is unreasonable to consider a tree which sheds leaves as being a permanent barrier and should be disregarded.</p> <p>The impact of such an over development in a densely packed estate will be untold if permission is given by setting a precedent for others to follow. The need for space cannot always be accommodated by expansion when moving would be a more appropriate solution.</p> <p>We request that this application be reviewed by a full planning committee and scrutinise in conjunction with the basement and rear extension planning application already made by owner/ developer of No34.</p> <p>Please note that we are in agreement with all objections made in respect to Planning Application 2023/1876/P</p>

Application No: 2023/1876/P
Consultees Name: Barry Moody
Received: 28/07/2023 17:53:08
Comment: OBJ

Response:
 Planning objection
 34 Meadowbank
 Application 2023/1876/P

I am objecting to this application on the grounds set out below.

The proposed development does not fall within the definition of class AA (permitted development) Contrary to AA.1(d), the existing dwellinghouse has already been enlarged by the addition of one or more storeys above the original dwellinghouse. The applicants Planning Statement seeks to argue that the loft does not constitute a storey because of the definition in AA4(2), but that definition refers to any accommodation within the roof of a dwellinghouse. The existing loft is not within the roof - it may be the same height as the roofline, but it plainly sticks out from the original pitched roof.

The proposed development would have an adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining premises by reason of its design and external appearance

If the local planning authority accepts (contrary to the above) that this proposal does fall within class AA permitted development, the applicant has to seek prior approval under AA.2(3). It is now established that the local planning authority has a very wide discretion when considering such matters, following the recent Court of Appeal decision in CAB Housing Ltd v Secretary of State [2023] EWCA Civ 194. I would ask for the following to be taken into account and given due weight:

1. The proposed development represents a gross over-development of the site. A property originally constructed on three floors will, following the implementation of the basement consent and the current application, become a six floor property on an estate (Meadowbank) which is already high density. This will impact adversely on the built environment.
2. Amenity will also be affected by loss of privacy and light. All the considerations set out in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Amenity CPG should be taken into account. In particular, close attention should be given to the recommended separation distance of 18m (referred to in paragraph 2.4). I do not believe the applicant can comply with this in relation to the rear building of 28/29 Meadowbank opposite.
3. The applicants photos are captioned to suggest that the view of the extension will be largely obscured by a large tree. That tree is deciduous and will offer no protection during the winter months.
4. The suggestion in the applicants Planning Statement that raising the height of terraced property should be uncontentious takes no account of the local planning authoritys discretion, as confirmed by the Court of Appeal case. The existing roofline of all the houses in Meadowbank originally built with a pitched roof has never been breached, even by the existing dormers, as the photos confirm. The roofline is variable in places as individual houses were built on different levels. However, each straight terraced row (for example 46-50, 52-58, and most relevant here 33-38) was built and remains at the same roofline level. It should be maintained.
5. Inconsistent planning advice has been given by the local planning authority down the years regarding the status of the Meadowbank private roads and footways, and whether they are or are not (highways). The applicants assertions on this should be treated with caution.

Barry Moody
 44 Meadowbank

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/1876/P	Michael John Brace	30/07/2023 15:11:33	COMMNT	<p>27 Meadowbank London NW3 3AY 28th July 2023 Planning Department</p> <p>Dear Sir Re Planning Application 2023/1876/P We have lived at 27 Meadowbank, on Ainger Road for over forty years and our patio backs onto the same garden as No.34. We object to the application as above for the following reasons. From our patio it can be observed that the sun sets in line with and behind No.34 Meadowbank. If permission is granted for the fourth and fifth storey to be built the garden together with the patios of numbers 27 and 28 Meadowbank will be denied the late afternoon and evening sunshine which we have enjoyed these past forty years. In our view there is a purpose to the symmetry of the estate as a whole which was designed and built to provide high density accommodation, with communal gardens to provide privacy between houses and a place to enjoy fresh air and sunshine to all residents of the estate (66 houses have access to the gardens) . If the existing fourth storey at 34 Meadowbank is raised and a fifth storey (6 storeys including the basement) added then the symmetry will be broken. If a precedent is set other houses may decide to follow suit resulting in the present sunshine and light enjoyed by the gardens in the estate being lost forever. This is clearly an example of overdevelopment which would have a detrimental effect on the whole estate. Yours faithfully MJ and Mrs C Brace</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/1876/P	Adrian Hollis	31/07/2023 17:39:42	OBJ	<p>Objection to Planning Application 2023/1876/P (It appears that my comments have not been processed and made visible please see below again) Meadowbank estate is recognised as being a high density development. This application has not considered the scale, massing or height in relation to the adjoining or similar buildings. Any additions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale to maintain continuity, rights of light and privacy.</p> <p>Properties within the central triangle in the same style as No34, which include but not exclusively Nos 46-51, none have extended above the original ridge line of the terraces.</p> <p>The two communal gardens to the front and rear of No34 have several properties adjoining the gardens some with 2nd floor private terraces all these properties will be hugely affected by any upward extension beyond the ridge line.</p> <p>Reference made to a tree acting as a barrier: The estate management maintenance plan includes pollarding and/or removal of vegetation as deemed appropriate therefore it is unreasonable to consider a tree which sheds leaves as being a permanent barrier and should be disregarded.</p> <p>The impact of such an over development in a densely packed estate will be untold if permission is given by setting a precedent for others to follow. The need for space cannot always be accommodated by expansion when moving would be a more appropriate solution.</p> <p>We request that this application be reviewed by a full planning committee and scrutinise in conjunction with the basement and rear extension planning application already made by owner/ developer of No34 Meadowbank.</p> <p>Please note that we are in agreement with all objections made in respect to Planning Application 2023/1876/P</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/1876/P	Michael John Brace	30/07/2023 15:11:31	COMMNT	<p>27 Meadowbank London NW3 3AY 28th July 2023 Planning Department</p> <p>Dear Sir Re Planning Application 2023/1876/P We have lived at 27 Meadowbank, on Ainger Road for over forty years and our patio backs onto the same garden as No.34. We object to the application as above for the following reasons. From our patio it can be observed that the sun sets in line with and behind No.34 Meadowbank. If permission is granted for the fourth and fifth storey to be built the garden together with the patios of numbers 27 and 28 Meadowbank will be denied the late afternoon and evening sunshine which we have enjoyed these past forty years. In our view there is a purpose to the symmetry of the estate as a whole which was designed and built to provide high density accommodation, with communal gardens to provide privacy between houses and a place to enjoy fresh air and sunshine to all residents of the estate (66 houses have access to the gardens) . If the existing fourth storey at 34 Meadowbank is raised and a fifth storey (6 storeys including the basement) added then the symmetry will be broken. If a precedent is set other houses may decide to follow suit resulting in the present sunshine and light enjoyed by the gardens in the estate being lost forever. This is clearly an example of overdevelopment which would have a detrimental effect on the whole estate. Yours faithfully MJ and Mrs C Brace</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2051/P	Burnell	30/07/2023 20:15:04	OBJ	<p>With reference to the Planning Application 2023/2051/P at 150 Abbey Road NW6 4SR</p> <p>I notice that the plan has again been modified, now with a third plan submitted, as though those proposing the plan are trying to avoid objections. However even the modified plan is still objectionable on grounds previously stated. Please note this application to expand flat 8 would still be a major, not minor development to create a maisonette, complete with new plumbing and requiring substantial floor joists. It would require the Building Inspector's attendance.</p> <p>The points raised by apparently redacted comments are important and should be made note of. I wonder if those proposing this modified plan hope it gets through and then revert to the previous plan by knocking through the partition between the two top-floor studio flats, on the quiet without scrutiny.</p> <p>It is claimed that precedents have been set for roof lights with other houses along this row of Victorian houses in the Priory Road Conservation area. However the applicants in those cases were owner occupiers of existing maisonettes of the top two floors so an extension into their lofts was minor in scale. In the case now being considered the owners intend to let flat 8. They may own flat 7 but the tenant would have to suffer noise and vibration from a staircase through the thin partition wall that separates the two top floor flats, as well as through the floor that would overhang them.</p> <p>I am against the setting of a precedent at 150 for fear of similar applications at 148 in the future affecting the Leaseholders of the other flats in the block, and possibly reducing the relative value of their property. Consultations with other tenants of these houses have revealed significant disquiet in the community.</p> <p>To reiterate, a similar plan was rejected, permission declined in 2017, ref 2017/1056/P on the grounds of overcrowding and permission was declined in 2015, ref 2015/5545/P, by reason of their appearance (roof lights) and siting would detract from the appearance of the building to the detriment of its character and appearance and as a consequence would undermine the character and appearance of the group of properties which it forms part and this part of the Priory Road Conservation Area.</p> <p>Sincerely</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2341/P	Robyn Verney	31/07/2023 19:40:23	OBJ	<p>The proposed development, by reason of its scale, design and siting, at high level in a prominent location, would result in a visual eyesore which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the local buildings and the street scene. I am a frequent visitor to family and friends in the area.</p> <p>The cabinets on the site would create a visual obstruction to nearby residents, causing an undue sense of enclosure and harming outlook, contrary to policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017. The siting of the cabinets would cause obstruction to anyone with mobility problems such persons with disabilities or parents with small children in pushchairs. This is a public footpath and the cabinets on the footpath would cause a loss of amenity to people.</p> <p>Has the Council carried out any risk assessments, health and safety assessments, and/or formal Environmental Impact Assessments? The Council has a duty to ensure the safety and well-being of residents, if these assessments haven't been done - why not?</p> <p>There is evidence that 5g technology will result in significant increases in carbon dioxide (CO2) being released into the atmosphere, it appears that the Government and Councils are not taking climate change seriously and policies being put in place that are completely contrary to the climate change action plan.</p> <p>The French Climate Council states that an extra 7 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide could be released into the atmosphere by 5G https://www.france24.com/en/europe/20201220-deploying-5g-will-lead-to-spike-in-co2-emissions-french-climate-council-warns</p> <p>Analysis has been carried out that shows the huge amount of extra power that will be used by 5g masts. We are all being told to reduce our energy consumption, to "save the planet", and yet each 5g mast requires as much electricity as (50/73 homes). 5g is NOT green, and people are expected to accept the most hypocritical proposals, that are harmful to human health.</p> <p>5G's Waveform Is a Battery Vampire - IEEE Spectrum https://www.fiercewireless.com/tech/5g-base-stations-use-a-lot-more-energy-than-4g-base-stations-says-mtn https://envirotecmagazine.com/2021/11/08/how-green-is-5g/</p> <p>Council Planning Departments have been deemed as 'competent authorities' with regard to 5g and the impact of this technology. This means they could face liability for any harm to people.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2341/P	J. Philipps	29/07/2023 14:42:55	OBJ	<p>CONSTRAINTS: Grade II Listed Buildings. / Listed Buildings. (Other Constraints) Large, green Private Open Space designated a borough Site of Conservation Importance by English Nature. HAMPSTEAD CEMETERY - Registered Historic Park or Garden. / Registered Historic Park or Garden. (Constraints) Hydrological Constraints Layer - Underground Development Constraints Surface water flow and flooding - Underground development constraints/Surface flow</p> <p>Adjacent to a heritage asset Hampstead Cemetery by railings, mature trees causing immense damage to environmental aspects of cemetery/area and wildlife.</p> <p>This mast proposal is sited immediately adjacent residences and community spaces.</p> <p>- The site is densely populated and the proposed antenna will be obtrusive and cause harm to the amenity of the area.</p> <p>- Its height would be an eyesore and overbearing to residents. It is out of character with surroundings.</p> <p>In close proximity to 'sensitive receptors': two nurseries, a children's play centre used by many of the local primaries, opposite a residential home for elderly - all within 500m of the proposed mast - Children are more vulnerable to microwave radiation than adults, see for example, Prof Tom Butler, "On the Clear Evidence of the Risks to Children from Non-ionizing Radio-frequency Radiation" - www.radiationresearch.org/articles/on-the-clear-evidence-of-the-risks-to-children-from-non-ionizing-radio-frequency-radiation-the-case-of-digital-technologies-in-the-home-classroom-and-society/</p> <p>In close proximity to 'sensitive receptors': homes (within 500m) - Transmitter density required for 5G means that more people will be exposed to radio frequency electromagnetic fields (RF-EMFs), and at levels that emerging evidence suggests, are potentially harmful to health, argues Professor John William Frank, Usher Institute, University of Edinburgh. 5G uses much higher frequency radio waves than in the past and it makes use of very new—and relatively unevaluated, in terms of safety—supportive technology to enable this higher data transmission capacity, points out Professor Frank. www.bmj.com/company/newsroom/stop-global-roll-out-of-5g-networks-until-safety-is-confirmed-urges-expert/</p> <p>The proposed installation would be overbearing and obtrusive, contributing to visual clutter and ruining the view from nearby residential properties. The National Design Guide states that any new developments should integrate into the surrounding area, which this proposal clearly does not. It qualifies as 'incompatible and unacceptable use of land'.</p> <p>The 3 large cabinets will cause clutter / obstruction by narrowing access on footpath and being too closely located to a zebra crossing. They may also provide easy access for those intent on accessing cemetery after hours increasing anti-social and criminal behaviour.</p> <p>Appearance: The proposed mast will be obtrusive, ugly and incongruous with the surrounding character and appearance, resulting in detriment to the visual amenities of this area, as well as a harmful impact to the outlook of the area. The mast will have an imposing and overbearing impact on the amenity of the nearby area</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

causing local residents unnecessary distress, upset, anxiety and fear of harm from the radiation impacting the quality of life in the local area. Against NPPF para 126.

Site: This eyesore would spoil local views and the area. The mast installation may create a visual distraction and impair visibility of road users especially pedestrians, and its associated equipment cabinets would clutter and degrade the look and feel of the area.

There are thousands of credible studies showing harm from this radiation. There are NO safety studies on effects to health or the environment and biodiversity of the cumulative exposure to this novel technology 24/7 over a lifetime. Lawsuits have proven that mobile masts cause health consequences. Please consider and provide risk assessments for both thermal and biological effects to include both wildlife and humans including foetuses, children, adults, elderly, the sick and those with metal implants. icbe-emf.org

INVALID ICNIRP DECLARATION:

1) The "Code of Practice for wireless network development in England" ('Code') provides the required ICNIRP Declaration in Annex C which states, immediately above the section to be signed:

"SHALL BE OPERATED TO BE IN FULL COMPLIANCE with the requirements of the radio frequency (RF) public exposure limit of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP)..."

However, a DISCREPANCY exists between the above 'Code' ICNIRP Declaration and

2) The ICNIRP Declaration provided by the applicant which states:

"IS DESIGNED TO BE IN FULL COMPLIANCE with the requirements of the radio frequency public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection..."

The statement 'IS DESIGNED TO BE IN FULL COMPLIANCE' does NOT conform to the statement required by the 'Code' or the NPPF (also see 3) below) and is therefore INVALID.

3) See 'Code' Annex D para 53:

"...mobile operators should certify that the installation WILL OPERATE in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency (RF) public exposure guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP)"

THERE IS A VERY OBVIOUS DISCREPANCY BETWEEN THE APPLICANT'S ICNIRP DECLARATION AND THE NPPF/'CODE' REQUIREMENTS AND THEREFORE, I REPEAT, IT IS INVALID AND THIS APPLICATION SHOULD BE REFUSED!

Additionally, The Erroneous ICNIRP Declaration Certificate:

The ICNIRP 'safety' certificate is based on guidelines which categorically do not apply to, or protect anyone with metal in their bodies. Here is the relevant statement from ICNIRP regarding its EMF safety guidelines:

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

'However, some exposure scenarios are defined as outside the scope of these guidelines. Medical procedures may utilize EMFs, and metallic implants may alter or perturb EMFs in the body, which in turn can affect the body both directly (via direct interaction between field and tissue) and indirectly (via an intermediate conducting object)'.

Please also note ICNIRP's disclaimer on their website. They even say they're not accountable for their guidelines. "ICNIRP e.V. undertakes all reasonable measures to ensure the reliability of information presented on the website, but does not guarantee the correctness, reliability, or completeness of the information and views published. The content of our website is provided to you for information only. We do not assume any responsibility for any damage, including direct or indirect loss suffered by users or third parties in connection with the use of our website and/or the information it contains, including for the use or the interpretation of any technical data, recommendations, or specifications available on our website."

The fact that the ICNIRP certificate does not apply to a large proportion of residents with any form of metal in their bodies is an acute safety issue which needs to be taken seriously and addressed. Doing so would NOT result in setting health safeguards different from ICNIRP (as per NPPF) but is in fact applying ICNIRP exactly as stated from a safety perspective.

There are many scenarios in which metal is used in the human body for medical reasons:

Surgical – metal pins, plates, rods, discs, screws e.g. scoliosis surgery and joint replacement of knees and hips. Urinary, gynaecological and intestinal repairs – e.g. mesh repairs and copper contraceptive coils. Cardiovascular – implantable heart loop recorders, stents and pacemakers. Implants to treat and monitor health conditions, deliver drugs or to restore bodily functions e.g. diabetes related products. Magnetic cerebral spinal fluid shunts. Cochlear implants for hearing loss. Dental work – braces, implants, metal crowns, pins, denture arches, mercury amalgam fillings. What about body piercings?

Read full document <https://ukstop5g.freeforums.net/thread/22512/erroneous-icnirp-declaration-certificate>

On 7 March 2022, the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport published a new Code of Practice for Wireless Network Development in England.

Para 20 on Siting and Design states that '...ensuring the impact of new network development is kept to a minimum'. This has clearly not been done in this application. It will dominate all of the structures around.

Para 22 states '...operators should make efforts to reduce visual impacts where possible.' I do not believe the application complies with this.

Para 28 states 'Protecting visual amenity - a comprehensive assessment of the area should be done to ensure that the design solution appreciates the context of its location by fitting with both the site and the wider context setting. Proposals should take into account protected sight lines, landmarks and vistas.'

Para 38 under Planning and visual considerations states 'Mast positioning - all new masts should be sited, as

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

far as is practicable, so as to minimise their impact on their setting, including the landscape and other buildings. The application does not comply with this.

Environmental implications and climate change targets - Carbon footprint: Each 5G mast requires approximately 3 x more power than a 4G mast (as much as 73 typical homes).
www.spectrum.ieee.org/5gs-waveform-is-a-battery-vampire

Local authorities are expected to safeguard the quality of the local environment and some have a statutory duty to help conserve biodiversity and species protection as part of the planning process. Councillors are in a position to help preserve the natural environment for the benefit of future generations and to promote sustainability.

With 5Gs greatly increased mobile traffic, electricity usage from telecommunications could create up to 23% of global greenhouse gas emissions by 2030; power demand would be the equivalent of 36 nuclear reactors or 7800 massive offshore wind farms worldwide. - www.mdpi.com/2078-1547/6/1/117/nfm - www.wsimag.com/science-and-technology/64080-green-5g-or-red-alert

The France, Spain and California Green Parties, the France Climate Change Council, and Greenpeace East Asia have all warned of the climate footprint of 5G. - www.france24.com/en/europe/20201220-deploying-5g-will-lead-to-spike-in-co2-emissions-french-climate-council-warns

The French Climate Council states that an extra 7 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide could be released into the atmosphere by 5G - www.france24.com/en/europe/20201220-deploying-5g-will-lead-to-spike-in-co2-emissions-french-climate-council-warns

Legal firm Client Earth and telecoms consultants Strand Consult have expressed concerns about greenwashing by providers. - www.clientearth.org/media/wbglw3r3/clientearth-accountability-emergency.pdf

WILDLIFE:

Research shows that manmade RF radiation (RFR) may be seriously harmful to wildlife, including vital pollinators such as bees.

- www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0048969720384461?dgcid=author
- www.emfdata.org/en/studies/detail&id=566

- www.mdpi.com/2075-4450/12/8/716?&ml_subscriber=1772077450675623693&ml_subscriber_hash=s0w7

The British Ecological Society has identified RFR as one of the top emerging issues that could affect global biological diversity and conservation. - [www.cell.com/trends/ecology-evolution/fulltext/S0169-5347\(17\)30289-6](http://www.cell.com/trends/ecology-evolution/fulltext/S0169-5347(17)30289-6)

Physicians for Safe Technology have stated that wireless radiation is being increasingly recognised as an environmental pollutant. - www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0013935118300161?via%3DIhdb

Experts have warned that RFR encourages drug resistance in microbes. - www.ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8865432

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Please see this list of studies regarding potential harm to wildlife compiled by the Environmental Health Trust, a US foundation run by the Nobel lead author and eminent environmental oncologist Dr Devra Davis - ehtrust.org/science/bees-butterflies-wildlife-research-electromagnetic-fieldsenvironment/

A field monitoring study spanning 9 years involving over 100 trees found trees sustained significantly more damage on the side of the tree facing the antenna, leaving the entire tree system prone to degradation over time - www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27552133

ICNIRP:

The ICNIRP standards are mainly based on acute warming effects, with more than one degree of temperature increase. By now, in several thousand studies, biological effects such as DNA damage have been demonstrated to occur at exposure levels FAR BELOW these standards.

Criticism of ICNIRP by the Council of Europe:

'Both the European Parliament (in its resolution 2008/2211(INI)) and the Council of Europe recommend lowering the exposure limits based on the ICNIRP opinions. The Council of Europe in its Opinion of 6 May 2011 on health risks associated with electromagnetic fields (12608):

29. The rapporteur underlines in this context that it is most curious, to say the least, that the applicable official threshold values for limiting the health impact of extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields and high frequency waves were drawn up and proposed to international political institutions (WHO, European Commission, governments) by the ICNIRP, an NGO whose origin and structure are none too clear and which is furthermore suspected of having rather close links with the industries whose expansion is shaped by recommendations for maximum threshold values for the different frequencies of electromagnetic fields.

30. If most governments and safety agencies have merely contented themselves with replicating and adopting the safety recommendations advocated by the ICNIRP, this has essentially been for two reasons:

- in order not to impede the expansion of these new technologies with their promise of economic growth, technological progress and job creation;

- and also because the political decision-makers unfortunately still have little involvement in matters of assessing technological risks for the environment and health.¹ - www.jrseco.com/problems-with-official-icnirp-exposure-limits-for-electromagnetic-radiation/

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2430/P	Fortune Green and West Hampstead NDF	28/07/2023 17:36:34	OBJ	<p>The Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Forum wishes to register a formal objection to this application.</p> <p>We note the various objections that have been submitted by residents neighbouring the proposed structure, and wish to support their objections based on planning considerations.</p> <p>We consider that the ESCP's proposed portacabin building is not of sufficient quality of design to comply with the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development plan, and in particular Policy 2 i.e. and in particular:</p> <p>All development shall be of a high quality of design, which complements and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead.</p> <p>This shall be achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Development which positively interfaces with the street and streetscape in which it is located.ii. Development which maintains the positive contributions to character of existing buildings and structures.iv. Development which has regard to the form, function, structure and heritage of its context, including the scale, mass, orientation, pattern and grain of surrounding buildings, streets and spaces.v. A presumption in favour of a colour palette which reflects, or is in harmony with, the materials of its context.vii. Extensions - and infill development - being in character and proportion with its context and setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties.ix. Having regard to the impact on local views across the Area and the streetscapes within the Area (as identified in A11 and Map 2). <p>We further note that the proposed development is immediately adjacent to the West Green Conservation area. In this respect Paragraph A11 of the supporting text of the above policy says that "Views of, from, and around the Area's conservation areas are of great importance to their setting, and we consider that the proposed structure will be detrimental to such views".</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2440/P	D Perk	28/07/2023 09:37:10	OBJ	This is a general comment which would apply to similar applications for garden rooms. With every development like this there is less capacity for rainwater run-off to be absorbed, increasing flood risk. As climate change will increase the occurrence of more intense downpours I would hope the planning department would take these issues into increasing consideration, regardless of previous developments. It is stated that this room would be used to work from home and not as additional sleeping accommodation so perhaps the footprint of this development could be reduced by excluding the toilet/bathroom.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2510/P	Pam Smith	31/07/2023 14:17:37	OBJ	<p>As I have previously stated, I totally oppose this plan for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The developers have taken no account of all the comments and objections raised by the local community and heritage bodies. As a result, the plan is totally out of character with this historic part of Bloomsbury. The tower is far too tall and bulky and will have an adverse effect on neighbouring buildings eg. St George's Church and the British Museum.2) The proposed demolition of the Travelodge tower will cause pollution and an increase in carbon emissions. This is of particular concern at a time when we are already experiencing the devastating effects of climate change.3) Far too little housing is included in the proposed development. The amount of social housing is far too small and of inferior design. The resident of these flats will be adversely affected by the lack of daylight.4) There is absolutely no need for more offices in the area as there is already a lot of unoccupied office space.5) Finally, I am dismayed that, instead of demolition and re-building, the developers have not considered a more sensitive approach by adapting the existing buildings, many of which are of historic significance.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2542/L	Y King	28/07/2023 11:42:31	OBJ	I would like to object to the proposed new signage. The installation of a large black flag displaying the salon name, I think would be too dominant and imposing, and detract from the beauty of the building. Although there is a pre-existing flagpole there, I don't recall Lloyds Bank ever displaying a flag. I feel it would be an unnecessary addition to the signage.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2627/P	Joanne Scott	29/07/2023 10:37:24	OBJ	<p>I am writing on behalf of Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) North London Branch to object to this development. This proposal may result in the loss of The Admiral Mann public house, adjacent to this property, which is a community asset and much-missed by local residents. The applicant does not mention any measures to protect the public house next door from noise complaints from future residents of the residential units, contrary to policy D12 Agent of Change and policy HC7 of the London Plan 2021, which protects public houses.</p> <p>The Admiral Mann was once a much-loved traditional pub in the community, hosting parties, wakes, and many other gatherings. CAMRA has been contacted by local residents and former customers of the Admiral Mann, who miss their local pub and want to see it open again and they feel that if this development was granted, it would affect the future viability of the pub. A public house is an employment space, community hub and a welcome addition to the night-time economy of the area. Pubs create valued and meaningful connections, which reduce the risks of loneliness. Pubs such as The Admiral Mann are disappearing across London, so need protection. If Camden Council grant permission for this development, measures should be added by condition to protect the public house adjacent to the site.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2820/T	Marie- Hélène and William English	31/07/2023 17:43:42	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir, Dear Madam,</p> <p>I live at 3 Hillway. I am writing to object to the felling of the two ashes mentioned above(2023/2820/T), located in the site of the annexe of 2 Hillway Garage, itself adjacent to the rear part of my back garden.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Please note that the two trees are located wrongly on the map of the Application.- please also note that the trees in question are the subject of an urgent application for a TPO. <p>My comments and reasons for my objections are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The two ashes contribute to the very green aspect of Holly Lodge Conservation Area.- They are mature trees of a very substantial size and height, they are in good health and belong to a rare species.- they are quite visible from at least 4 close public spaces: bottom of Hillway, Swain's Lane, Church Walk and Saint Anne's Close.- they are an essential, beautiful and enjoyable amenity for 1,3,5, 7 and 9 Hillway.- due to their size and their leaves in the summer they protect the close residents from the very intrusive and detrimental sight of the side red brick wall of the flats in Church Walk.- I am not convinced by the argument put forward by the applicant in relation to the asbestos and I am therefore asking for a visit by a professional who can assess the Health and Safety risk properly.- I wish to remind you of the decision made by the Council on 10th June 2010, Application ref 2010/1781P in which - at Par 4- the Council expresses the need for the trees in question to be retained and protected from damage to the satisfaction of the Council. <p>Thank you for your attention.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Marie- Hélène English</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2825/L	Covent Garden Community Association (Elizabeth Bax, Chair of Planning Subcommittee)	29/07/2023 18:01:38	OBJ/NOT	<p>As the amenity society for the area, Covent Garden Community Association must object this application and ask you to refuse it.</p> <p>Unfortunately there are two aspects that make the extension completely inappropriate, as we explain below.</p> <p>We cannot comment on any proposed INTERNAL ALTERATIONS to the listed building, however, because neither the D&A statement nor the drawings explain what they are. Are any historic or important structural elements being removed, for example? We might object if they are.</p> <p>We cannot comment on any proposed ALTERATIONS TO THE FENESTRATION at the rear elevation, either, because in comparing the Existing and Proposed elevation drawings, we cannot see any alterations. If these alterations are indeed part of the application, please provide drawings to show them. We can guess at what they might be from your description ('creating a new window in an existing bricked up opening, and lowering the sill height of an existing second floor window by 400mm'), and we might support them if they are indeed the same as our guess, but we do need to see drawings to be sure!</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Please note that the applicant has used the same drawings and D&A statement on this Application number 2023/2825/L as for Application number 2023/2315/L. The applicant has also used identical text in the 'Description of the Proposal' box on both application forms ('FORMATION OF ADDITIONAL STOREY OF ACCOMMODATION TO CREATE FAMILY ROOM AND ROOF TERRACE WITH MANSARD ROOF TO FRONT ELEVATION WITH 2X DORMERS COMPLETE WITH TIMBER SASH WINDOWS, RETAINING OF BUTTERFLY PARAPET WALL AT REAR AND INSTALLATION OF GLASS BALUSTRADE TO PARAPET WALL:'). So there is likely to be confusion locally, and therefore no comments are anticipated from neighbours on this application. We are obliged to comment on both.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>1. UPWARD ROOF EXTENSION</p> <p>The application describes the formation of an 'additional storey of accommodation replacing the butterfly roof with an extension made up of the following elements; 70 degree mansard roof with two Georgian styled dormer windows to the front, a flat roof laid to falls to the rear'.</p> <p>The listing for 63-69 Endell Street describes them as '14 terraced houses with later shops. C18. Multi-coloured stock brick with stone cornice at 3rd floor level; No.63 has painted brickwork. 4 storeys and 2 windows each.'</p> <p>The mansard roof storey would destroy the balance of this well-preserved terrace of 4 Georgian houses in the Seven Dials conservation area. They all still have the same roof form as viewed from the street. They also have 'butterfly' roofs which are rare should be preserved. The proposed development would harm the listed building, and its context within one of the UK's prime conservation areas.</p> <p>The property was purchased recently; the applicant will have been aware of its status, these features and its location within the conservation area before making the purchase.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

As you are aware, we usually try to suggest ways of adapting an application so as to make it acceptable. However, given the features of this listed building and its position in the terrace, we have been unable to do so in this case.

2. ROOF TERRACE / SUNDECK

The application describes the addition of 'a roof terrace of roughly 17.5sq/m with a glazed balustrade to the rear'.

The building is surrounded by other residential units on both sides and to the rear, including family flats. We believe that this development would harm their residential amenity.

A large roof terrace at 4th floor level would be likely to cause issues with overlooking and noise, contrary to Camden's policy (SPG Amenity, 2.11). Unfortunately the applicant has not provided a plan drawing showing the neighbouring buildings, however, we believe them to be far closer than the 18m minimum recommended in Camden's policy (SPG Amenity, 2.11).

One problem with roof terraces and other outside spaces in this part of London is that they are constant sources of antisocial behaviour. Illegal holiday lets are reported to the council very regularly, but even legal holiday lets cause problems. The owner of this building is at liberty to let the flat to holidaymakers for 90 nights of the year, or to let to anyone for 3 months. Sadly, short term tenants often have no interest in their neighbours' wellbeing; we have a great deal of experience of this.

Were any consent granted for a roof terrace in this location, harm to residential amenity could be lessened by two conditions:

- Hours of use restricted to 8am to 9pm. These are similar hours to those for use of balconies etc. applied to several residential units in the Covent Garden area, and to bedrooms with balconies on new build hotels. This is a large terrace and could host parties for large groups of people.
- No music or sound from amplified devices on the terrace, nor to be played within the building so as to be audible at nearby premises.
- Rather than a glass balustrade, a treatment that minimises overlooking such as a fence and high planting.
- External lighting to be switched off at dusk or by 9pm, whichever is later.

Unfortunately, however, we do not believe that it is in any case possible to design a terrace in this location without causing the damage discussed in our section on the Upward Roof Extension above. We therefore ask you to refuse this application.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received: Comment: Response:

Printed on: 01/08/2023 09:10:08

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3096/T	Penelope Isaacs	31/07/2023 10:40:19	COMMNT	<p>My husband Stephen Isaacs and I live and own 42 Ferncroft Avenue NW3 7PE. It has come to our attention that presumably the owner of 44A Ferncroft Avenue has applied to trim a tree in our garden. I say presumably as we have not been notified or consulted by our neighbour about any request to trim our tree and no applicant is identified in the body of the application. There is a principal application on the website by the neighbour for other tree works on his property and the supporting arborist's letter includes our tree as T6. A minor point but I believe his name is Mr Kulik (not Kullick) as stated in the two other applications. There is a third application also in the name of Mr Kullick referencing trees on the other side of his property on Heath Drive. I do not know why no applicant is stated for the tree in our garden but it is not us.</p> <p>My husband and I have no objection in principle to our tree being trimmed on the 44 side of our fence in so far as it overhangs in 44 subject to the following caveats. First we wish to be notified of the date of works, second we wish to be present to supervise such works and ensure that any branches etc are not left on our side of the fence and third there must be no unauthorised access into our garden to facilitate the works.</p>
2023/3096/T	Penelope Isaacs	31/07/2023 21:08:49	COMMNT	<p>Further to my earlier comment today I can see that by scrolling further down that the applicant wishing to trim our tree is indeed our neighbour, Mr Kulick. The position remains that we were not given any courtesy notice of this application and accordingly our caveats remain. We do not object in principle to the tree being pruned where there is overhang but would like prior notice and to be present when the works take place. Further there must be no unauthorised access to our garden. Had we been asked by Mr Kulick for consent we would have granted it subject to these points which we consider to be reasonable.</p>

Total: 11