

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5364/P	Mr Julian Graffy	24/12/2024 18:36:40	OBJ	OBJECTIONS: Camden Council Planning Application No. 2024/5364/P

I am the owner of 15, Courthope Road. The proposed works at no. 17 include a wrap-around extension at the rear of the property (opposite my own small backyard). The extension would require the demolition of the current boundary wall and its replacement with a longer and higher external structural wall to form the side of a new kitchen at no. 17. That new kitchen would fill the existing narrow gap between the current boundary wall and No. 17.

My objections to the proposed works include, without limitation, the following:

1. The application claims that: 'The overall impact on the outlook and views of No 15 is negligible due to close proximity of the 3 storey outriggers of both properties'. That is not my impression as the current outriggers are already in close proximity and the proposed extension at no. 17 would, effectively, halve the distance, which would have a material negative impact on my property.

2. The new side wall at no. 17 would project 1.8m further than the current extent of no. 15. It would also be significantly higher than the current boundary wall and would be backed by a sloping roof. Collectively, these changes would significantly affect my quality of life and mean that the sole window to my study would be in the permanent shadow of the new kitchen wall at no. 17 (see Section DD on drawing 0350/D/04).

2.1 The current yard is extremely narrow and will be much overshadowed by any increased wall height above the current boundary to a level over the height of my window.

3. The application also claims that the new kitchen wall would only be slightly higher than the existing boundary wall. This appears incorrect, based on what is depicted on the elevation of drawing 0350/D/03/. Note the position of the dotted line on the new wall elevation. To scale, there would be an ~ 40% increase (above the height of the current boundary wall).

4. The new load-bearing kitchen wall would straddle the boundary between the properties and require new foundations (of uncertain depth) that would also straddle the boundary. This presumes an extension into my property that I have not accepted. I really do not want to consent to the demolition of the existing boundary wall. Excavating for foundations would require a slope into my backyard, resulting in a significant narrowing of the pathway outside my kitchen door. I do not want any excavation in my backyard. Building the new kitchen wall would require construction work to be undertaken on/ from my property which I will decline. I also note that no checks appear to have been made to ensure that those temporary excavation works would not damage my drainage runs. Unless construction is actually feasible, planning permission is of no value.

5. The proposed kitchen wall must be a cavity wall and, thus, would be wider than the existing boundary wall. There is no definition of how this is to be aligned relative to the centre line of the boundary wall or to the current face line along my property. Any positioning of the kitchen wall which would result in an encroachment onto my property is not going to be acceptable.

6. As drawn in plan on drawing 0350/ F/01, the proposed new kitchen wall does not align with the existing (internal) party wall, but is shifted over the boundary onto my side. I will not consent to any encroachment onto my property, nor to any bonding of the new kitchen wall into the side of my property.

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

7. The implication of the proposed extension over an open-plan kitchen is that two storeys of the current side wall of no. 17 (together with the floors above the kitchen and the roof) would have to be supported by a substantial new beam. As drawn, this would be ~ 8m long and would support a heavy load. Also as drawn, the beam is only end-supported over a proposed new double French window facing the garden (this is poorly indicated on the rear elevation of drawing 0350/D/03). Self-evidently, this is not structurally feasible since no room depth has been allowed for any cross beam/end structural support. An obvious solution would be to raise the extension roof to provide more space for the structure. Clearly, however, that would have planning implications and would significantly worsen the impact on my small backyard. A review of the new rear elevation also suggests that the lateral sway stability of the perforated elevation is poor. As above, unless construction is feasible, planning permission is of no value.

8. In relation to the proposed kitchen, the architect's description provides that 'no load bearing wall will be removed'. This is incorrect. The external load-bearing wall (ground to first) is being removed.

9. I have no objections, in principle, to the loft conversion. However, I note there has been no assessment so far of any structural implications and, eventually, there must be such an assessment by a professional structural engineer. It will also be essential for no. 17 to comply with the requirements of the Party Wall etc. Act and all other applicable laws and regulations.

10. The scope of the proposed work on the chimney shared by no. 15 and no. 17 is ambiguous. Clearly, the external appearance of no. 15 will be adversely affected if such work (e.g., pointing) is only carried out at no. 17 (see front elevation drawing 0350/D/03).

11. Finally, I note that no written commitment has been received with respect to the full reinstatement of my property in its current state, in the event that any of the proposed works (to which I object) are actually undertaken.
