

Mohammed Ahmed

From: Jessica Coyne
Sent: 26 April 2024 11:14
To: Planning; Blythe Smith
Subject: Comments/Concerns re; Application 2023/5037/P 23a Hampstead Lane

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

Dear Blythe and Camden Planning,

I hope this email finds you well.

I would like to comment on some of the statements made within the revised application of 23a Hampstead Lane's proposed 'Rear Extension'. (2023/5037/P)

I have noticed several inaccuracies that I believe should be flagged.

Point 4.8

The applicants have stated:

The proposed extension is subordinate in scale at less than a third of the deep of the original main house. The proposals are modest in scale, at 4.2m deep with the inclusion of a courtyard garden to the centre of the plan, referencing the historic use of lightwells to basement developments within the locale, whilst ensuring suitable daylighting and ventilation levels to adjacent accommodation.

This statement is misleading, as they reference a “courtyard” placed in the centre, whereas, in reality, it is unfairly and impractically placed right below the window of Janice Bowmer (Flat 23b Hampstead Lane) which will impact on her amenity.

Point 4.8

The applicants have stated:

It should be noted within the delegated report for the neighbouring application at no25 their extension was deemed subordinate in nature and has a much deeper plan.

This statement is untrue. The footprint of my extension (No. 25) lies at a lesser depth than the proposed extension of 23a Hampstead Lane. This is clearly obvious from any perspective.

It is 100% worth noting that my own extension (which was built before I purchased the house) is attached to 1 single dwelling, therefore, Flat 23a's planning application should not be deemed and considered in the same way.

Point 4.10

The applicants have stated:

The extension is at a subterranean level and the adjoining rear garden is under the sole ownership of the applicant. The proposal is enclosed to three sides by either the existing property or with an existing boundary wall present to no25, which is noticeably higher than the proposed extension.

This statement fails to mention the orientation of their steps which will mean anyone ascending will have a clear line of sight into my own home, thus causing an invasion of my privacy.

Point 4.11

The applicants have stated:

The proposed extension falls well below 50% of the applicants amenity space. It also includes a courtyard garden to the centre and patio to the rear which when included in the development still falls below 50% of the garden depth. When including the size of the historic rear garden plot, prior to its subdivision, the extension is below one third of its depth.

The owners of 23a Hampstead Lane have made no reference here to the fact they wish/intend to build a full height permanent structure (garden cabin) in the middle of their garden in addition to their basement extension which essentially garners their above statement false.

Point 4.12

The applicants have stated:

Within the delegated report for the neighbouring application at no25, it was noted their full width extension of greater depth will not obstruct any original architectural features of the building. Therefore the same application should be given to the enclosed proposals.

The above statement is not accurate. The existing extension to my house (no.25) is not at a greater depth to the extension that 23a Hampstead Lane propose. This is clearly obvious from any perspective. Their extension proposal, if built, would be at a greater depth than my extension.

It is 100% worth noting that my own extension (which was built before I purchased the house) is attached to 1 single dwelling, therefore, Flat 23a's planning application should not be deemed and considered in the same way.

Point 4.17

The applicants have stated:

The adjoining property to no25 has a 6m deep, full width part single storey part two storey rear extension with a total depth of 11m when including the patio line from the main wall of the house. This extension is enclosed by a boundary wall which is taller in height than the proposed scheme.

This statement is inaccurate in that the total depth of my extension including patio line is 9m not 11m as implied.

I welcome anyone from Camden planning dept to visit my home so I can demonstrate the details I have outlined.

It is beyond worrying that the false statements made by owners of 23a, have the ability to negatively impact on so many people's properties, homes and families. I hope you will take these into consideration.

Thank you for your time

Yours sincerely

Jessica Coyne