

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Katy Hessel and I own the upper ground floor (Flat 2) at the next door property (no 14). The rear of my property will face directly onto the proposed studio and seriously affect my view from, and the use I can make of my rear sitting room> I therefore wish to object to this scheme in the strongest possible way and put forward the following reasons

Policy A1 (Amenity)

The proposed Garden Studio at 13 Chalcot Gardens will severely impact my privacy as outlined in Policy A1 which seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that would not harm the amenity of residents. This includes factors such as privacy, outlook, implications to natural light, artificial light spill, as well as impacts caused from the construction phase of development.

The proposed Studio is set circa 10m from the main residential building and faces the multistorey residential building removing the privacy of numerous bedrooms and living areas. The impact of this will be felt on either side of the property. While screening may help the basement/garden level properties a screening solution cannot be provided for the remaining 4 floors to the neighbouring 3 buildings that will be impacted. While it is not expected that the developer owners of No13 Floors 3 to 5 will comment on this planning, the outlook from the Studio will also affect future occupants.

While the Studio falls under the category as an outbuilding and incidental to the enjoyment of the main property, the nature of outbuildings and their usage has changed significantly in recent years as shown in this proposal. No longer are they draft sheds used incidentally but are now sunken, heated and insulated "Studios" similar to main residences in comfort. This in-turn means a significantly higher all year round frequency and duration of use (e.g. Increased Working from Home Offices or external lounge rooms). While the incidental enjoyment of outbuilding is completely reasonable, I request that the higher duration and frequency of use be taken into consideration along with the outlook when considering the privacy of the residents the users of the Studio will overlook.

The application references nearby garden studios/sheds as a precedence. It should be noted that Outbuildings windows/sliding glass doors in No11 and No9 do not face the buildings and windows of the residences allowing for their preservation of privacy.

The outbuilding in No.5 is set significantly further back, circa 40m deep and surrounded by large trees which along with the depth provide significant amounts of privacy to neighbouring residents.

In the case of all the outbuildings referenced, they are all set considerably further back in the gardens than the proposed development. They also all benefit from Gardens 3 to 4 times larger than 13 Chalcot Gardens. Their outbuildings relative size (smaller than the proposed Studio) in relation to their gardens, direction of outlooks

and significantly greater soft landscaping & large trees makes them a poor comparative reference point for the acceptability of this proposal.

While the planning for the Studio has been made in isolation it should be considered in conjunction with Planning Granted for Application 2024/1382/P.

The planning was granted for an extension and roof terrace for the same property which also raised a number of privacy and outlook concerns that would fall under Policy A1 (Amenity).

The concerns of privacy and outlook was also supported by the Eton Conservation Area Advisory Committee who recommended not approving the extension (see CAAC Response 10/06/2024). In this circumstance Camden Council providing planning consent based on screening of 1.7meters. This may be satisfactory for immediately adjacent windows and the privacy of the upper floors of windows were not affected. The previous outlook covered a 180-degree angle however with a further outlook now facing the building the cumulative outlook of both proposals in combination gives a 360-degree outlook. When the plans for the Studio are added to this, neighbouring properties would now have to be blinkered by 1.7 meter high screening and following the same logic will have to have screening continuing for a further 10 meters to remove the impact on privacy. Even if screening to a height of 1.7 meters across both boundary walls was acceptable it would still be extremely difficult to preserve the privacy of the remaining 4 floors in each of the affected 4 residences (16 floors and 4 balconies). The remaining outlook of the proposed Studio would still be the upper residential windows even if screened. The proposal for screening with solid structures on a roof terrace adjacent to a brick wall allowed for a solution however the gardens would require soft landscaping which would have to be all year round and given the perennial nature of the UK it is difficult to see how soft screening would be an effective solution for the Ground and Lower Ground Floors.

In relation to the position, direction and the frequency of use given the size and facilities of the studio it should also be considered that gatherings of people will also be more likely in all weather conditions. The Camden Local Plan Policy A4 states:

“The main sources of noise and vibration in Camden are; road traffic, railways, industrial uses, plant and mechanical equipment, food, drink and entertainment uses, and building sites. The top six sources of noise that receive the most complaints in Camden are; music, construction noise, general people noise (e.g. footsteps, gathering), parties, fixed machinery and burglar alarms.”

While I appreciate that this statement would refer to unlikely nuisances, the nature of Chalcot Gardens is that sound seems to travel very well in the open space. Gatherings take place frequently as would be expected and are completely acceptable. However, given the layout of the residences, gatherings tend to happen most frequently inside the buildings or adjacent to the building where comfort and amenities are available. The sound carries away from the building and into the soft landscape at the back. The Studio development would potentially invert these gatherings with covering and facilities provided facing the residents. This will be of particular concern in the summer months where the top-level residences get

significantly hotter than the ground level residences/floors meaning that the windows need to be left open for ventilation and cooling often through the full day and night. Any noise projected onto the buildings and uniquely from the studio would not be broken by sufficient soft landscape and would penetrate the residences creating be of great concern and nuisance.

Personally my living area, all facing the gardens, will now have their privacy seriously impacted. My lovely big windows will now be on view to see through the proposed residential building facing Studio. Privacy in my one living room has previously not been a concern either as all buildings and garden buildings do not face the residential properties. Any sounds will also carry into my bedrooms and living areas particularly if windows are open. I believe the Development of the Studio will seriously impinge on my family's Privacy.

Thanks,
Katy