

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3274/P	Penny CRAWFORD	11/12/2023 16:43:00	COMMNT	<p>We live right behind the flats, and strongly object. Our daylight would be seriously reduced, as would any privacy. This is a conservation area, the flats were designed to be that height and would look seriously strange with another storey. The residents there already have a total mish-mash of styles up there, creating roof gardens, which I assume they'll then add on top of any extension. The traffic is a nightmare round our streets already, especially at school drop/collection, we are surrounded by schools, the building work, potentially over years, will</p> <p>Seriously add to that problem too.</p>
2023/3274/P	Nick Hoare	11/12/2023 15:27:50	OBJ	<p>I'm writing in objection to the proposed roof extensions of Highcroft 170 Highgate Road London NW5 1EJ.</p> <p>I live at 8a Woodsome Road, a house that backs on to Highcroft. The proposed extension will have a huge effect on life in our house. As well as hugely diminishing our ability to see the sky from our house and garden, and for daylight to reach us, the extra floor, windows and balconies will mean that when the work is completed, we will be significantly more over-looked. Our privacy will be impacted enormously by this; many of the existing buildings currently have roof terraces, but they offer 360 degree viewing. Rear-facing balconies only offer the possibility of well, facing the rear, which is straight into the houses of us and our neighbours, making the proposed changes hugely intrusive.</p> <p>On top of this, the building work will be disruptive. My wife and I both work from home, so the noise, activity, constant presence of people, dust and fumes associated with the processes involved will impact our work AND home lives. This is compounded by the application's request for the work to be allowed to executed house by house if required, which could mean we are living and working next to a building site for years on end. It is hard to believe that this staggered form of development will result in the whole project being consistent in terms of quality or aesthetics.</p> <p>This development (both in its proposed construction and in its finished state) will have a considerable negative effect on us living and working in our home. It will be life-changing for us.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2023/3274/P	F Gaudin	09/12/2023 15:33:30	OBJ	Summary of submission:

The submitted planning application is marred by procedural flaws which make it invalid. The provided site causes confusion, and the applicant may have incorrectly filled out ownership details in the application form. The drawings are not accurate and non-compliance with Camden Local Requirements further compounds the issues. The proposed extension's height would exceed neighbouring buildings, conflicting with policies requiring the preservation of the character of the conservation area. I am also concerned about the applicant's proposed phased construction approach, potentially exacerbating negative impacts on the conservation area. Additionally, the absence of a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment impedes a thorough evaluation of the extension's impact on neighbouring residents. Overall, the application is invalid and should not have been validated in this form. It does not comply with policy and once the required information has been submitted, it should be refused.

#### Further Comments:

I write to inform the Local Planning Authority of a number of procedural issues with the application as currently submitted. I believe that makes the application invalid.

The site address given in the application form (Highcroft, 170 Highgate Road) is not accurate and creates cause for confusion for neighbours wishing to participate in the consultation. The proposals are located above 9-15 Highcroft and this should be the site address.

I understand that properties at 9-15 Highcroft are all in separate ownerships and it is therefore likely that the applicant has incorrectly filled in Certificate A in their application form. This should be queried and rectified if necessary.

The application is also not compliant with Camden's Local Area Requirements for Planning Applications (2020) for a number of reasons and it therefore should not have been validated. There is not sufficient information for the Local Planning Authority to assess the application or members of the public to meaningfully take part in the current round of public consultation based on the information provided.

- The application does not provide existing sections
- The application does not include proposed internal floor plans
- A CIL Liability Assessment form has not been submitted despite the proposed floor space exceeding 100m2
- A Daylight and Sunlight Assessment is required because the proposed extension is located immediately next to a habitable room window at Highcroft
- A Tree survey and associated arboricultural assessment have not been submitted despite the presence of a TPO tree immediately at the back of the site that could be affected by the development. The Trees and Hedges section of the application form has been incorrectly filled in stating that there are no trees nearby.

Even more significantly, the drawing submitted with the application are not accurate. They depict the existing building smaller than in reality which gives the false sense that the proposed roof would be smaller than what is actually proposed and align with the roof of Flats 1-8 Highcroft. This is grossly misleading and should be rectified. If amended drawings are received, they should be consulted upon.

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

Once the drawings have been revised to accurately show the building in relation to its surroundings, it will become immediately apparent that the proposed height of the extension would exceed the height of the adjoining block of flats at 1-8 Highcroft and compete with the nearby terrace of houses at 2-12 Croftdown Road which is defined as a positive building in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Townscape Appraisal. This would result in a discordant feature in the streetscene that would significantly detract from the character of the area and irreversibly harm the conservation area. This is strongly resisted by policy at all levels:

- Local Plan policy D1 that the Council will require that development respects local context and character. Policy D2 states that the Council will require that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area.

- Policy DC3 of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan (Requirement for good design) requires that all developments demonstrate good quality design, responding to and integrating with local surroundings and landscape context. It states that "in Dartmouth Park good design means [...] ensuring that any extensions or modifications to existing buildings are subordinate to the existing development and in keeping with its setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties."

- The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area's Appraisal and Management Statement states that "additional storeys, fundamental changes to the roofline, insensitive alterations, poor materials, intrusive dormers or inappropriate windows can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will be resisted".

Of further concern is the statement made by the applicant in the Design and Access statement that "it is intended that the work will be undertaken in blocks of 2 or 3 roofs, depending on when each house needs to undertake works to its flat roof and when each owner is in a financial position to undertake the works". The construction of part of the extension would contribute towards exacerbating the significant impact the extension would have on the area.

The impact of the extension on the amenity of neighbouring residents cannot be adequately assessed in the absence of a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment which is a submission requirement. Notwithstanding this, there are habitable room windows to the rear of the block of flats at 1-8 Highcroft (to the left on the photos below) which would be directly impacted by the proposed extension which would block daylight, sunlight and significantly impact on the outlook from those rooms as they are located immediately next to the proposed extension.

In conclusion, the application cannot be determined in its current form as it is not a valid planning application. Notwithstanding this, the proposals overall would significant harm the character of this part of the Dartmouth Park conservation area, the amenity of residents living in the adjoining block of flats at 1-8 Highcroft and I believe Camden should refuse the application.

(I will also email this representation to include visuals)