

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:        |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|------------------|
| 2023/5037/P     | Janice Bowmer    | 09/03/2024 20:49:06 | OBJ      | Dear Blyth Smith |

I am the owner and resident of flat two, 23 Hampstead Lane, which is a ground floor flat directly above flat A (Thornton and Pascall).

The property, number 23 Hampstead Lane, consists of four self-contained flats. Pleasant View Property Management Ltd is the maintenance company owned by the four lessees for the purpose of managing and maintaining the property. It is also responsible for protecting the integrity of the building and ensuring that all lessees comply with the terms and leases and covenants. It is clearly stated in the lease and in the Pleasantview lease that Pleasantview must give prior written approval for any structural changes, and this must be done before any application is filed. This was made clear to Thornton and Pascall before they bought their flat in 2023.

It was a surprise, therefore, to see that plans for a lower ground floor rear extension had been submitted to Camden Council [2023/5037/P] without any agreement or approval from Pleasantview or the Freeholder Martin Brilliant.

This repeats a similar objection I have made to the application 2015/1217/P. I do hope that this application will be roundly rejected as it suffers from many of the same problems as application 2015/1217/P, which was in fact a lot smaller and less damaging to the amenity of our homes, as well as the character & beauty of the area. I have no issue with any proposed internal works and feel happy the new owners want to improve their home and the building, however this development will have various adverse effects on myself and the other flats.

As the planning application relates to the lower ground floor rear extension, I have concerned myself exclusively with this issue from here on. I have to say that the application does not provide sufficient explanation for the proposed changes to make it easy to understand, but I would make the following comments.

It is worth mentioning there is an inconsistency with the plans, as the plans on page 1 show the incorrect position of the main bedroom which is located at the front of the property, when on page 2 shows the main bedroom correctly located at the back. To make clear the living room has always been located at the front of the property & not where it is shown on page 1.

The proposed extension would effectively sit directly below my main bedroom and second bedroom windows, & next to my garden access, giving me a sense of enclosure. This would detract from my current open aspect to the rear, resulting in a loss of amenity. Added to which, the proposed height of the roof extension means the roof would be within a metre of the bottom of my bedroom windows. As the proposed building would come right up to my access to the garden, anyone (including burglars) would be able to easily access the roof which approaches my windows. This would be very intrusive for me and compromise my security and privacy. If this proposal were to be accepted, I would be forced to put security bars on my windows and would feel very unsafe in my flat.

The proposed lower ground floor rear extension and glass roof will also affect my privacy as it will give a direct view into my main bedroom. They could potentially use opaque glass, a non transparent material, or agree to

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

use some form of blinds to block their view into my bedroom, however this would still allow easy access to my bedroom window. This building has been targeted for burglary previously to which basement flat had a burglary incident a few years ago. Considering burglary in this area is more than 500% over the national average this would be of great concern & cause me to feel unsafe.

There is also a lack of clarity about the appearance of the proposed roof. I do not feel it's appropriate for a roof that will constitute my main view from my bedroom windows at this close proximity. In my experience, these types of roofs require maintenance to survive and are likely to give me an unkempt and depressing view, again resulting in a loss of amenity. They could potentially agree to maintain this roof and parts in direct view of my windows to reduce these effects. This would nevertheless be detrimental to the overall appearance of the property and have a negative visual impact as it would harm the amenity and enjoyment of the whole of my rear outlook.

I am concerned about the roof and light pollution. There is no indication in the plans as to whether these would be openable. If they were openable or were made openable in the future, this could create significant noise pollution, especially at night, due to the close proximity of the proposed new living room to my bedroom. In any event, the choice of glass roofing material would undoubtedly be a source of light pollution, and this would be unacceptable to me. We could agree on the lights being turned off in the evening or come to some compromise to prevent this, but I am not sure how this would be enforced. The Camden planning guidelines state that light wells must not cause undue harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties and that light wells should be set away from the boundary of neighbouring properties. The fact that my flat is directly above the proposed light well & glass roof, is a far worse situation for me, as Thornton and Pascal intend to change the current layout and use this extension with glass roof as living room & kitchen space.

The current plans show the living room is located at the rear of the property on page 1 which is incorrect, as the living room is and has always been located at the front, shown correctly on page 2.

We have a collective responsibility to maintain the building, including painting, clearing guttering, and general maintenance. At current scaffolding costs would be low as it would require a simple scaffold going up. This extension would dramatically increase scaffolding costs for any future maintenance as it would no longer be a simple scaffold & would require a complex more expensive scaffold framing over the proposed glass roof. We could potentially agree that any increase in scaffold costs due to this extension would be their responsibility which would be fair & acceptable.

The rear garden is shared by me and the basement flat (with our own private areas) and was again designed with the amenity and enjoyment of the residents in mind. Historically, the rear of the garden is in Hampstead Lane which looks back onto Fitzroy Park represents a corridor that is particularly rural in outlook, with mature trees and back-to-back gardens and a low existing level of light pollution.

I am also concerned that this will affect the value of my property due to all the reasons above causing loss of amenity, and involves removing a large portion of our shared garden which is of considerable beauty. This large-scale development will also take a long time, meaning noise disruption for extended periods.

The application also says there will be no loss of garden area however it clearly shows on the architect plans the removal of the ground floor level garden section replaced with the extension & stairs with light well.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Thornton and Pascall also expressed intentions to remove all of the grass in their half of the garden and replace with paving, which is essentially removing 50% of this shared garden area which will no doubt effect the ecosystem. & cause loss of biodiversity.

This is a conservation area & I believe that this proposed building & materials [glass roof with aluminium framing, metal steps & black metal balustrade] would not respect and preserve the historic pattern, and that it would harm the existing open and rural character of the garden and its amenity. My partner and I enjoyed almost 20 years of a peaceful and rural rear outlook. Now that my partner has passed away, I am concerned for my future in a flat where my privacy and sense of security could be severely compromised. I'm afraid, therefore, that for this and the above reasons, I must strongly object to this planning application.

Yours sincerely  
Janice Bowmer.

---

2023/5037/P Ms V Fox 10/03/2024 23:49:29 OBJ

Objection

I am resident at Park Villa, 21 Hampstead Lane and have lived here for over 20 years.

[I have a garden boundary which abuts with 23 Hampstead Lane.]

I object to the proposal on the following grounds:

Light Pollution

The proposed conservatory extension has a large glass roof area and is designed to accommodate an open plan lounge connecting to the kitchen. The glass roof will generate a significant amount of light pollution which will affect the evening / night darkness. The gardens along the back of Hampstead Lane at present create a green corridor without light pollution and run in parallel with the large rear gardens of Fitzroy Park. Together they create a rural aspect which will be harmed by the presence of such a large glowing light box.

Noise

It is unclear as to how much of the roof glass will be openable. However such a structure will require ventilation in summer which will be an issue because this extension is clearly intended as living accommodation. The noise from voices, music etc will also be magnified by the hard finishes of the conservatory to an unacceptable level.

The previous owner of this flat obtained planning permission in 2015 [now lapsed] for an extension that had a green roof [sedum]. I note that the applicant has omitted referencing this permission in the Design and Access statement. [I also note that the area block plan is incorrect and misleading, claiming ownership of a part of the garden owned by the ground floor flat.]

Although the previous permission was not implemented, the key feature was the green roof which had been negotiated together with the neighbours and the other occupants in the house to deal with the issues of light pollution and noise. I would have no objection to an application that had a flat green roof as it would uphold and respect the amenity value of the dark, quiet rear aspect which is highly appreciated by all the neighbours in the local vicinity and the occupants of the other three flats.

I am also concerned by a parallel application made by the same owners for a large garden room to be erected on the remaining small section of garden that is within their ownership at a higher level. This will also create light pollution, having double and triple opening glass doors on two elevations and high level windows on the remaining two. The application makes it clear that its use would be for living purposes. This structure, coupled with the extension, will build over a significant proportion of the flat's outside space and would constitute a very unwelcome backland development.

| Application No: | Consultees Name:                       | Received:           | Comment: | Response:   |
|-----------------|--|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2023/5037/P     | Pleasantview<br>Property<br>Management | 09/03/2024 20:44:46 | OBJ      | <p>Dear Blyth Smith,</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of Pleasant View Property Management Ltd, the management company owned and operated by the lessees of the 4 flats at number 23 Hampstead Lane. This company is responsible for the maintenance of the property. It is also Pleasantview's duty to protect the integrity of the building and ensure that the conditions of the leases and covenants are adhered to for the amenity, safety and benefit of all residents.</p> <p>I am reaching out to object to planning application 2023/5037/P. It is clearly stated in the Pleasantview lease for 23 Hampstead Lane, that Pleasantview must give prior written approval for any structural changes, and this must be done before any application is filed. Thornton and Pascall were made aware of this, however still filed this application without necessary consent from the residents of Pleasantview or freeholder Martin Brilliant.</p> <p>This development would have numerous negative long lasting impacts on the lessees of this residential block &amp; neighbouring homes, &amp; for these many various reasons outlines in previous statements this development should not be granted permission.</p> <p>Your time &amp; consideration on this matter is very much appreciated.<br/>Pleasantview Property Management</p>  |
| 2023/5037/P     | Pleasantview<br>Property<br>Management | 09/03/2024 20:13:38 | OBJ      | <p>Dear Blyth Smith,</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of Pleasantview Property Management Ltd, the management company owned and operated by the lessees of the 4 flats of No. 23 Hampstead Lane. This is the company responsible for ensuring legalities surrounding the lease with correct procedure is upheld, and for maintenance of the property. Pleasantview's duty is to protect the integrity of the building and ensure that the conditions of the leases and covenants are adhered to for the amenity, safety and benefit of all residents.</p> <p>I am reaching out to object to planning application 2023/5407/P. It is clearly stated in the Pleasantview lease for 23 Hampstead Lane, that Pleasantview must give prior written approval for any structural changes, and this must be done before any application is filed. Thornton and Pascall were made aware of this, however still filed this application without the necessary consent from the residents of Pleasantview or freeholder Martin Brilliant.</p> <p>This development would have numerous negative long lasting impacts on the members of Pleasantview, lessees of this residential block of 23 Hampstead Lane &amp; neighbouring homes. For the many reasons and various issues outlines in previous statements concerning this proposed extension, we implore that this development should not be granted permission.</p> <p>Your time &amp; consideration on this matter is very much appreciated.<br/>Pleasantview Property Management</p> |