

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0981/P	Christian Erlandson	5 Park End NW3 2SE	04/04/2025 09:17:13	OBJ	I am the resident of 5 Park End, London, NW3 2SB. I object to the Planning Application 2025/0981/P, on the grounds of overdevelopment, excessive bulk, and destruction of character of neighbourhood and conservation area.
2025/0981/P	Cllr Linda Chung	Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 9JE	06/04/2025 21:28:58	OBJNOT	I Object to this application, by reason of its scale, bulk and massing. It is overdevelopment of that site, and disproportionate in design and scope. The proposal goes against the spirit of a conservation area. There will be considerable loss of garden, loss of green space and biodiversity. Furthermore, the proposal means considerable loss of amenity to its neighbours, the high walls, bulk and design create an imprisoning, oppressive aspect, and reduce light. I also believe complaints have been raised about the unlawful felling of many trees in the garden. These need to be replaced.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0981/P	Peter Graham	8 South Hill Park London NW3 2SB	05/04/2025 13:41:06	OBJ	<p>Re: Objection to application ref: 2025/0981/P</p> <p>٤ I am the owner and occupier of 8 South Hill Park, next door to the proposed development. I object to the application because the desired outcomes can be achieved without doing damage to the adjacent properties and The Conservation Area. The applicant wants to create a proper second bedroom for one person and replace the conservatory with a solid structure. The minimum space requirements for this is 61m2. The application would create a unit of 85m2, which would result in over-development.</p> <p>1. Scale, bulk and massing The existing extension at no 6 was granted permission in 2010 (2010/0170/P). In the Delegated Report the officer confirmed the Local Authority's position regarding scale, bulk and massing: 'It is considered that the conservatory would be subordinate to the host dwelling in terms of scale and bulk. The proposed use of glazing and timber is considered to be an acceptable addition to the existing building and would retain a reasonable sized garden. The proposed conservatory would not detract from the character of the building or the character and appearance of the wider conservation area.'</p> <p>The proposal now seeks permission to extend from the existing building by between 3.59m and 6.33m and is full width. Under 50% of the original garden will remain as soft landscaping. For additional context the permission at no 10 (2020/1384/P) allowed a side return infill and modest extension to the rear of c1m to align with its neighbour at no 12. To allow this a substantial outbuilding was to be removed to balance the loss of garden space; it is further noted that the garden to no 10 is considerably larger than the subject site at no 6.</p> <p>As such, I believe the proposal to no 6 is not subordinate to the host dwelling and does not retain a reasonably sized garden. See also impact discussed in section 5 on trees.</p> <p>2. Sense of enclosure My garden is already entirely enclosed on three sides, and the proposed extension will block the outlook and light from the only flank from which we do have an outlook and sunlight. The surgery abuts my boundary, enclosing the west flank entirely, with a 2 storey solid brick wall. There is a large garden shed in 10 A which already blocks the outlook and light on the South flank boundary between my property and number 10. Because my garden is now enclosed entirely on three sides, the effect of the new proposed boundary wall increasing a further 3.59m from the back of the main building at my boundary would make my garden like the bottom of a well. The periphery of my garden runs to 42 linear meters, but I only have an outlook of 5 meters. The application would reduce this to 2.5 meters. In addition I would lose all sunlight to my garden. While my existing outlook is small, it is beautiful and open. No other garden in the terrace is confined in this way.</p> <p>3. Structural changes to Conservation Area The proposal seeks to lower the ground floor by 0.5m which will undermine the garden walls thus requiring additional demolition in the Conservation Area. This will impact the foundations of both 4 and 8. The resultant underpinning to the party wall and replacement of the existing walls</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>with a full height new structure is unsuitable to a conservation area. The mirror wall at 12 installed under planning permission 2020/1384/P has been a disaster from every perspective and bears not the slightest resemblance to the adjoining brickwork and ALL our mature planting have been destroyed. Extensive structural works are planned to excavate the depth required and to create foundations that can support the enormous bulk of the proposed extension. Has a structural or flood risk assessment been done to support these proposals?</p> <p>4. Character of the Conservation Area The extension at 10 lines up harmoniously with the extension at 12. The opposite applies to the subject application. It does not match or fit in with either of the adjacent buildings. Further there was no loss of outlook or light caused by extension at 10, because the existing extensions to the north in South Hill Park, the northern exposure, and the mass of buildings in the mews. In the context of all these buildings to the north, the extension at 10 could be seen as in character and of appropriate bulk. The situation is entirely different in relation to the subject application. There are no large buildings to the south. The character of the rear of the terrace changes at my property, giving an open outlook to The Heath over the original low level garden walls, a vital element of the conservation area. There are no major extensions on that side of my property to the end of South Hill Park. These elements of the character of the Conservation area will be destroyed under this application.</p> <p>5. Trees Having highlighted the importance of the trees, the officer notes in relation to application 2010/0170/P, 'the extension and garden shed would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers with regard to sunlight, daylight outlook...'</p> <p>Both trees have now been cut down in their entirety (the photo submitted with the design and access statement in the application is wrong and deceiving, in this important detail). Because the trees have been cut down, an open outlook has been created, blocked only by the shed, which is a substantial structure 2m wide with a lead roof. The further extension proposed would reduce outlook, which needs to be seen in conjunction with loss of outlook and light amenity already caused by the shed, which, with the trees gone, is now blocking light and outlook - an entirely different situation to 2010. In any event it is clear the officer considers the building permitted under the 2010 consent the maximum that is appropriate.</p> <p>6. Reduction of garden, surface water run-off and biodiversity The proposal will result in less than 50% of the original garden being soft landscaping. This will reduce attenuation of surface water run-off further stressing the already overwhelmed drainage system. The further loss of the garden will also reduce potential biodiversity at a time when the government is keen to promote an increase.</p> <p>The photos below show the outlook that will be lost and the new wall from number 10, which is what the new wall at number 6 will be like.</p> <p>In the over thirty years I lived here I have not objected to a single planning application, including the roof and basement level extensions at 6 and 10. Indeed I actively supported the original</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					extensions at basement level. And I would support a new application which was appropriate in bulk and character for no.6.
					Yours sincerely
					Peter Graham
					IMG_1163.jpeg
					IMG_1175.jpeg
