

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2997/P	Lucas Hadjilucas	10/09/2023 17:21:08	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to the proposed development. It would alter the functionality and layout of Kenmore Court in a mostly negative way, destroying the landscape and symmetry of the original design.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The proposed design will remove a significant portion of the limited green space available in the court as well as the loss of one or more long standing trees in the area. The proposal leaves marginal room for this to be compensated as they are effectively building on top of the garden. Any surviving hedges or trees will be pressured for their reduction and removal. This likely goes against conservation area policies. The area is not currently a hard surface area but part of the court landscape.2. The structure will further impede the natural light of windows of nearby ground flats and will also restrict the view and maintenance of the flats above. Whilst residents have been enjoying the clear, unobstructed view of greenery, it will now be an ad-hoc rear roof that in addition damages the character of the building. Depending on its construction the roof is also likely to radiate heat upwards to the balconies above.3. The alteration also bring concerns about the structural integrity and over-utilisation of resources as this was not part of the original design. In addition, any proposed roof lights or sound coming from the structure will inevitably disturb residents of flats above.4. There are also security concerns as the new structure will make it far to easy for someone to gain access to the balconies above. <p>Overall, I feel this application will have negative impact for many of the residents of the court as well as the surrounding conservation area. It will degrade and compromise the character of the block as well as unfavourably cramp the limited open space. Hence, I object to this proposal and would strongly advocate to issue a refusal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2997/P	Dr Olga Sobolev	10/09/2023 08:00:06	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>As a co-freeholder of Kenmore Court, I am presenting serious objections to the application for planning permission for the proposed extension on the following grounds:</p> <p>This extension involves:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Serious loss of amenities – local 'green' environment/landscape The information presented on the Application regarding the absence of Trees/Hedges on the development and adjacent area is wrong. There are protected trees and extensive hedges in this area that are essential for the 'green' environment of Kenmore Court. The loss of these amenities will have a serious impact on the local community. 2. Instead of looking onto the green garden/landscape other flats will be looking onto the dirty roof – covered with bird droppings and other debris. The above creates considerable sanitary problems for the flats on the first floor, which have windows directly above and in close proximity to the flat roof of this extension: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the height of the roof is 300 cm, which brings it right under the windowsills of the first-floor flats. 3. This flat roof creates insuperable and intolerable security problems for the upper floors of the building, especially for those on floor 1. 4. NB! Access will be lost to the outer walls of the building, which is essential for maintenance, repair and building works, scaffolding and cleaning (e. g. windows). 5. Flat 1 (adjacent ground floor) – the bedroom has only one window. Daylight will be lost thanks to the proposed wall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fence that the applicants built without consent/planning permission already blocks the light to this window. • The height of the fence is only 180 cm; the roof will be significantly higher – 300 cm - blocking off daylight to this bedroom window of flat 1. 6. The proposed 'patio door' on the left side of the extension (in the middle of the fence) encroaches on the parking space that belongs to flat 1. Flat 1 has two parking spaces in front of their entrance; and if both places are used by cars, this entrance will be blocked, creating a safety hazard. Not to mention that the land in front of this entrance belongs to flat 1. 7. The extension will disfigure the appearance of the building. This is not a 'cultural heritage' building, but it is a purpose-built block of flats with its own integrity and its own specific architectural design (largely based on the symmetry of the two blocks that constitute the building). Adding an extension 'box' to one of the blocks will disfigure completely the appearance of the building. <p>Overall, this extension will be seriously detrimental to the safety and sanitary state of the community and will result in the loss of its 'green' landscape. I hope that you will be able to give my objections serious consideration.</p>

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

Yours faithfully
Dr Olga Sobolev

2023/2997/P	Wendy Biss and Richard Perkins	08/09/2023 16:42:59	OBJ	<p>The grounds of our objection are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The proposed development will alter irrevocably the appearance of Kenmore Court, destroying the symmetry of the original design.2. It will impede access to the exterior of flats 4, 6 and 8 above for the maintenance of brickwork and windows.3. The proposed roof lights will disturb residents of flats above when trying to sleep.4. The hedge adjacent to flat 2 and the trees shown on the application plan have substantial amenity value for residents of Kenmore Court. The development will reduce the former and prejudice the latter. After the existing garden shed is moved from the site of the proposed new bedroom, the garden area remaining will be so small that the trees are likely to be seen as an obstruction and removed.5. Successful application 2023/10790/T to remove a tree from the garden indicated ('Proposed Land Use') that a replacement tree would be planted. The proposed development prevents the planting of a replacement on the site of the tree removed, and there is no indication in the present application that a replacement will be planted elsewhere.6. The Certificate of Ownership in the application indicates that only one of the owners of other flats in Kenmore Court has been notified of the application. The individual concerned is a non-resident owner of another ground floor flat who can be expected to use a favourable decision in this case to justify an extension of his own premises.
-------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------	-----	---

Wendy Biss and Richard Perkins

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2997/P	Nicola Gol	11/09/2023 18:16:46	OBJ	<p>As owner of Flat 1 Kenmore Court, I would like to submit my objection to the planning application 2023/2997/P for flat 2 Kenmore Court, 28 Acol Road based on the following:</p> <p>A. There has been no consultation with myself, the adjoining neighbour, to the proposed extension. This is despite having a face to face meeting at the beginning of July and exchanging contact details with the applicants.</p> <p>B. The dwarf boundary wall is currently at a height that allows me to open my car door in my 2 parking spaces. Increasing the height of this wall to create the extension will prevent me being able to use my 2 parking spaces as I would not be able to open my car door resulting in needing to use on street parking</p> <p>C. The plans show the reuse of an existing patio door to the left of the extension creating an outside space and gate. The only access to this gate and door would be via my property which the applicant has no right to and I will not be giving them right to access.</p> <p>D. The access route to from the main road to the parking area and garages for all residence is already very tight and any extension walls should be set back onto the applicants property so as not to impede the access further. Current dwarf boundary wall allows a wing mirror to pass over it.</p> <p>E. My back bedroom will look directly onto the proposed extension. This will block light to my property and potentially cause further problems with condensation due to lack of airflow through and around the property</p> <p>F. There should be no roof overhang from the extension onto my property. This would not be accepted.</p> <p>G. Rain water from the extension roof must not drain onto or across my property. Management of rainwater has not been detailed within the application.</p> <p>H. My property is in use constantly and it is not be possible for builders to access the plot via my property either by foot or vehicles and any scaffolding can not be erected over the boundary wall. The application is requested to provide details on how this building work will be undertaken without impacting access and use by myself and other residence.</p> <p>I. Due to the original material of construction of the building (concrete and brick clad) I am concerned about the structural impact removing over half of the ground floor rear side of the building will have on the integrity of the remaining structure long term. I do not see anything within the application that considers this.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2997/P	Tim Herbert-Smith	10/09/2023 16:22:11	OBJ	<p>These comments are made on behalf of CRASH, the combined residents association of South Hampstead. The proposal amounts to a substantial overdevelopment of the ground floor area , comprising an area larger than the existing flat & taking up more than 50% of the current open space. The application photographs fail to show the whole of the existing rear garden, but the contention that the extension will cover the existing patio with little loss of green space appears unfounded. The proposed bedroom 2 will be built on part of the current garden leaving only a small green area.</p> <p>The applicant claims that the development will not affect any existing trees , but the photos show substantial trees on the garden boundary & more detailed information should be supplied to support this contention. No proposals are included to meet environmental concerns such as a green roof & provision for collection of rainfall.</p> <p>While the extension may not be visible from the street, it will be visible to adjoining occupiers . The proposed flat gravel finished roof will be considerably less attractive than the existing patio & garden. Given the paramount importance of preserving gardens & green areas in the Conservation Area, it is considered that this proposal is inappropriate & should be refused.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2997/P	Kenmore Court Freehold Ltd	11/09/2023 15:05:44	PETITNOBJ E	26-28 Kenmore Court, Flat 2 Acol Road London Camden NW6. Single storey rear extension at ground level with alterations to the fenestration. Ref. 3AG 2023/2997/P

This objection to the above application is submitted by Kenmore Court Management Limited, the freeholders of the property. The freeholder is strongly opposed to the proposal, which is inconsistent with many of its policies and it should be refused by the Council.

The location of the proposed rear extension is very small in scale, but the effects between individual flats and on the wider environment are disproportionately great. It is notable that no pre-application advice was sought from the Council, and the application depends in part on information which is incorrect. The proposed extension is overdevelopment, and would have a significant adverse effect on the adjacent flat on the ground floor of Kenmore Court. It would result in loss of amenity and outlook, and create significant security problems for upper floor flats above it. It would remove green space and would be likely to result in loss of trees, which are of importance in this part of the conservation area.

Fig 1 Fig 2 Fig 3

1. The immediate environment and inaccuracies in the application

The site forms part of the block enclosed by West End Lane, Acol Road, Woodchurch Road and Priory Road, where the postwar development of Sidney Boyd Court has introduced substantial hard surface uses into the interior. They are half a storey higher than Kenmore Court rear area, which also includes access ways and garages at the rear. This is not an arrangement which would now be allowed. The fact that less than half of the rear of Kenmore Court is green space and that this proposal would remove approximately one quarter of it is important. All remaining elements of green space at Kenmore Court are a very limited resource, and thus, particularly valuable.

The two photographs at Figs 1 and 2 show the rear of Kenmore Court before and after the enclosure of the rear space where the extension is proposed. The small tree closest to the building has been removed. The window to the right of the new fence is not part of flat 2. To the right of this is the retaining wall of the boundary with Sidney Boyd Court.

The site plan forming part of the application is shown at Fig 3. This plan is misleading in that it appears to show the site boundary of the external area appropriated to the flat extending to the western boundary. As will be seen from the photographs this is not the case. The Design and Access Statement forming part of the application is also misleading in that it suggests that the extension will be on hard surface. Again, this is not the case.

Fig 1 makes it plain that the site of the extension was previously part of the landscaping of Kenmore Court. It has been enclosed and taken into private management by the erection of a 1.8m fence which has bird spikes on top which are some 5 cm long. As will be clear from Figs 1 and 2, the results for the amenity of the Kenmore Court are damaging. The integrity of the design of Kenmore Court as a building will be undermined by the addition of an ad hoc rear extension.

The erection of the proposed rear extension will be more deleterious to the outlook from upper floors of the block, in that the view of the garden in the outlook will be replaced by a blank flat roof. The closeness of the

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

surviving trees means that there will be pressure for their reduction and removal. Access to maintain the upper part of Kenmore Court for maintenance purposes will be made more difficult. There is no justification in surrounding buildings for the rear alignment of the proposed extension. The relationship with the westernmost ground floor window of Kenmore Court is already cramped and poor because of the new fence and the high retaining wall, but the extension would fix this undesirable situation with hard built development. There is no justification for the location of the proposed north-west corner of the extension. The line of stores within the boundary of the adjacent Sidney Boyd Court gives no cue for development on the application side of the boundary.

Thus, the proposal does not have the justification accepted by the inspector in relation to 13 Woodchurch Road, where there is a group of school buildings already mentioned in Camden's Conservation Area Management Strategy (CAMS), which the inspector saw as justification both in terms of extent and use, for allowing the appeal, which he otherwise, saw as overdevelopment. (Ref Appeal Decision APP/X5210/W/20/3249994).

2. Conservation Area and other Policy

CAMS states at para 3.3 The open green spaces of the private rear gardens and the communal gardens between terraces of houses remain undeveloped and are a very important amenity for local residents – both for those who look onto the spaces and those who have access to them.

At para 5.24 it says The general canopy/tree character of the conservation area is largely formed of continuous bands of trees spanning rear gardens with intermittent tree cover in front gardens. The general level of tree cover in the conservation area is relatively high and comprised of a wide range of sizes and species.

Paras 7.13 and 7.14 deal with extensions:

....The long, undeveloped rear gardens and private open spaces are central to the character and appearance of South Hampstead Conservation Area, and their preservation is of paramount importanceApplications are always assessed in line with Camden Planning Guidance, however particular care should be taken to ensure that the attractive garden setting of the host building, neighbouring gardens and any private open spaces is not compromised by overly large extensions and areas of hard landscaping..

Compromising of private space is precisely the condition which will emerge in the overdeveloped and cramped rear of Kenmore Court if extensions such as that proposed are allowed.

The general context of conservation area legislation provides at s72 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 that in the exercise of any powers in relation to buildings or other land within a conservation area special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

This proposal would not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area.

The proposal does not achieve the quality design objectives of Camden's Design CPG document. As set out in section 1, above, it will result in a cramped and degraded layout and loss of green space, which is at a premium in this area.

The proposal, similarly, does not achieve the amenity objectives which the Council sets out to protect in policies A1 and A2 of the Camden Local Plan (CLP), and in particular at paras 6.37 and 6.38. The NPPF retains (para 71) the ability for planning authorities to maintain protection of gardens in local plans, and this policy is in the CLP at A2e. relating to protecting open spaces, including gardens, with amenity value.

As set out above, the proposal is not consistent with the conservation area objectives at CLP policy D2e. and h. Para 7.55 states The value of existing gardens, trees and landscape to the character of the borough is described in Policy A2 Open space and they make a particular contribution to conservation areas.

Development will not be permitted which causes the loss of trees or garden space where this is important to

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

the character and appearance of a conservation area.

3. Conclusion

This small proposal results in significant harm to the rear spaces at Kenmore Court. It will result in cramped and over-intensive development and the loss of very limited greenspace. If permission for this development is granted it will make permanent a very unsatisfactory. Would the Council please issue a refusal.

Yours sincerely

KENMORE COURT FREEHOLD MANAGEMENT LIMITED
