

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
------------------------	-------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

2023/3277/P	David Mawson & Jane Muncaster	16/09/2023 10:21:25	OBJ	
-------------	----------------------------------	---------------------	-----	--

In our objection below, we refer only to the proposed amendment to widen the terrace from the size agreed to by council planners in the original application.

We live in the raised ground floor flat at 133. The same level as Ms Argwal. Ms Argwal has engaged with us in a constructive manner regarding her wish to increase the size of the terrace and we thank her for this. Unfortunately, as the outline of 131s garden flat rear extension which her terrace will sit on takes shape, we've become aware of how much more privacy we feel we would lose by the edge of the terrace extending to the edge of the original outline of the house (pre side extension). In the proposal by her architects, we feel the architect seeks to minimize the effect on our privacy, compared to that of the garden flat of 133. Her architect submits a photograph of our bay window but from 131s garden which suggests the distance and view into our window will be further away than it actually will be. We have taken a picture with a 50mm lens to more accurately reflect how close the terrace would be to our window, if it were approved. Unfortunately this comment section doesn't appear to have a way of uploading this photo but it is available for viewing. Please let me know how to send it.

The light refracted off our windows referred to by the architect, only applies to a closed window and at certain times of the day. As building work to the extension proceeds, we already need to use a sheer curtain at the side window for privacy, even though the builders have been considerate. As pointed out by the owners of 129 King Henrys Road in their comment and I can confirm this, the owners of the garden flat at 133 are in the middle of a sale, so the new owners will be unaware of this proposed amendment, as it wasn't submitted till after the LPE1 was completed.

Ms Argwals architect cites our balcony as a precedent. Ours is a wooden balcony supported on wooden posts, not a terrace and juts out 1.5m and is 2m wide, so a total of 3m sq. Further there is a well managed mature Hawthorn tree which shields the view of 135 King Henrys Road and vice versa. By our calculations, Ms Argwal currently has permission granted by Camden planning for a 3m 90cm deep X 3m 66cm long terrace, making a total surface area of about 14 sq meters, 4 and a half times the size of our balcony. The amendment proposed seeks to add another 3m 90cms X 2 metres, which we calculate as a further 7 sq metres, so a 21 sq m terrace is proposed. This represents a terrace 7 times larger than our balcony, closer to our window and with no privacy either! We are unaware of any other balcony in the road that occupies anywhere near this much space, so if allowed, this would set the precedent.

Ms Argwals architect states that the proposed increase in size of the terrace will occupy 50% rather than the current 35% that has been allowed but this uses the new footprint of the house adding in its new side and rear extensions being built. Of the original width of the house prior to the extension, the proposed extension occupies all but 2 metres of the total width of the house. This is something closer to 73% of the total, while that already granted is 50%.

Ms Argwal states she will only use the extra space she seeks for potted plants and that she wouldn't use the extra area for amenity space and that she would never stand at (I quote from the document) 'the deepest section of the terrace, which the applicant does not intend to do'. We don't contest this statement but in the future, should the flat be sold, will our privacy be protected from the area not being used for potted plants but purely as amenity space and if a new neighbour so chose, crowded, noisy events in this large space? The architect states Ms Argwals flat has never been sublet while she has been the owner, but it is on record that the flat was Airbnbbed during the pandemic. We fail to see the difference between subletting and Airbnb.

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

As a resident myself of 56 years of King Henrys Road, I know the names of all the people who have so far raised objection to this balcony extension, as they all live in the road, in close proximity to 131, so have a stake in how the local area develops, but I know none of the supporters, including one who states they live in Belsize Avenue, a mile away. We can also vouch for the good character of Ms Argwal, as many of the supporters of this proposal do but that is not really the point. I understand that Camden has an obligation to do the widest possible consultation but ask that proximity is taken into consideration. We have ourselves resisted asking friends in the more general area to add their objection to this application as their views don't really feel relevant in this instance, as they are not the ones affected by the loss of privacy and possible future noise this proposal would represent if approved.

David Mawson and Jane Muncaster

---

2023/3277/P	Dr Alan Barge & Mrs Dena Lipman	19/09/2023 11:46:00	COMMNT	<p>We have several concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A post-hoc variation to an originally-granted planning application</li> <li>2) Loss of privacy to adjacent properties and gardens</li> <li>3) Increased noise</li> </ol>
-------------	------------------------------------	---------------------	--------	---

---