

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/3609/P	John Hendy QC	75 Hillway London N6 6AB	08/07/2014 21:02:06	COMMNT	Re: Application Number 2014/3609/P, 77 Hillway, London, N6 6AB Comments by Mr and Mrs Hendy at No 75 Hillway

We support all the comments of Mr Ruggi at No 79 Hillway which we will not repeat. We would like to add some points of particular concern to us.

The first is in relation to southern flank wall of the planned rear extension to the house and of the patio. The contrast between the existing and planned development can be seen by contrasting the south elevations in plans HIW-300 and HIW-x-301. It shows a new area of wall above the existing glass roofed study (formerly a garage) in our house some 1.5 metres by 1.75 metres. This will overshadow our studio, garden and outlook to some extent.

Secondly, we are concerned that it is proposed that the southern wall of the ground floor extension is to use the existing party wall between us and No 77 and extend it upwards to the first story. It is believed that the party wall is not a cavity wall but simple 9 inch brick work. It would be preferable if the party wall was not used and a new wall was built within the boundary of No 77. This is what we did when converting the garage. This had the benefit of improving sound insulation between the two buildings. If the party wall is used for the rear extension of No 77 then there will be a risk of sound intrusion, albeit not at the level of the study because of our use of a second wall.

The proposed patio is to extend well beyond the existing patio. It is hard to judge from the plans (HIW-X-001 compared to HIW-002) but the planned patio at its southern edge seems to extend some 6.5 metres from the existing west wall of No 77 (some 5 metres from the west wall of the planned extension). The patio is about 1 metre higher than the patio of No 75 and about 1.5 metres above our garden. It is clear that we will lose much privacy unless the fence is made considerably higher for at least the length of the planned patio. This will be visually intrusive if it is effective. But it will need to be effective. Given that the patio extends furthest westwards at its southern side it seems likely that it is the southern end of the patio which will be most in use thus affecting not merely privacy but also noise intrusion (which will equally be an intrusion from our side too). An effective barrier such as a solid wall up to 1.5 metres (to screen conversation at sitting level) topped with a fence (to screen privacy whilst standing) seems necessary. If forced to choose we would prefer the visual intrusion (which could at least be masked by climbing plants on our side) and the unavoidable loss of light to a situation where we are overlooked and overheard.

Our third concern is that the garden studio appears to be of a design, size and height foreign to the estate. It extends well above the level of the existing fences. It will be very visible because of its dimensions and scale and presents a loss of visual amenity for those on the west side of Hillway who currently can see (in summer) nothing but greenery. The windows appear high enough to permit those in the studio to intrude on the privacy of people in the garden of No 75 (and vice versa). The impact on 79 is obvious. However, the suggestion of the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Advisory Committee that the studio, if approved, "may be better located along the southern side of the garden so as not to obstruct light to 79" appears to overlook the proposition quoted earlier in their submission that:

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>the topography increases the effect of a [development] for those on the downslope side, with the impacts of height and bulk, overlooking and overshadowing being greater than a similar proposal on level ground...Development on the downslope side can result in an excessively high wall for the downslope neighbour and so increase in height on this side is unlikely to be acceptable.</p> <p>The effect of the proposed studio if situated on the southern flank of the garden would be yet more intrusive and obstruct far more light to 75 since its base will be a metre higher than our garden whereas, situated on the northern flank, the base would be a metre lower than 79's garden. The answer, of course, is not to move the studio from one side to another but not to permit it at all. The studio is too large and out of keeping with the gardens on either side or facing.</p> <p>Our fourth concern is in relation to the eastwards extension of the former garage between No 77 and No 79. In our view the planned new front to what is currently the garage should be set back at least to the rear (the west) of the most easterly of the two ground floor windows on the north wall of No 77 in order to preserve the character of the estate which is of detached houses. The east front of this extension should match or at least be in keeping with the original three door garage fronts of the estate. It should not have a door and window as on the plan which is wholly out of keeping with the original and most recent changes to the estate.</p> <p>Finally, the proposed dormer windows also appear too large for the estate and would have a negative impact on it.</p> <p>John and Lisa Hendy 8 July 2014</p>
2014/3609/P	Mrs Pippa Rothenberg	74 Hillway London N6 6DP	02/07/2014 12:19:53 INT		<p>Living across the road from number 77 I do feel that the flat fronted look of the single storey extension to the side where the car port is will not fit in with look of the rest of the run of linked houses. I am unsure whether a precedent should be set to build a separate office room/ garden room in the smallish back garden is a good idea. This is the first time that a building of this type has been applied for in the linked houses run</p>
2014/3609/P	R.J.Morgan	2 Robin Grove Highgate N6 6NY	09/07/2014 12:52:20 INT		<p>We have no objection to the planned building change, but are apprehensive about any further tree felling in local gardens and the size of structures being erected at the foot of gardens abutting on our property.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/3609/P	G Egen	73 Hillway Highgate N66AB	07/07/2014 13:10:22	COMMNT	<p>Object to certain aspects of the plans:</p> <p>Extension of the single story extension is too pronounced, ie, facade is coming too far forward relative to adjoining property and isn't really in keeping with the HLE Conservation Guidelines. It is over-dimensioned and will also give rise to party-wall issues with #79 Hillway. My other objections relate to the size of the dormers for the attic extension. These are very large relative to the property and roof line and appear overdimensioned and not in keeping with those found on adjoining properties. Historically Camden was more attuned to this issue and restricted dormer sizes (as in our own case) but recently I've noticed that Plholders have obtained consent for very large dormers going to the very edge of the roof...not in keeping with Conservation guidelines.</p> <p>My final</p> <p>Last but not least we object to the additional studio construction. Firstly, it is a modern design and totally out of character with the neighbouring garden landscapes and shared rear garden aspects. Moreover, it is too big/over-bearing and is right up against the property line. I can't quite tell but think it also implies that they will have to chop down a tree or two? They clearly want to add to the amenity of their garden but they need to be more mindful and respectful of the conservation values of the HLE and also not create something that may be viewed as encroaching on neighbours' garden perspectives. Nor should they be allowed to sacrifice healthy trees for such a construction.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/3609/P	John Hendy QC	75 Hillway London N6 6AB	08/07/2014 21:02:11	COMMNT	Re: Application Number 2014/3609/P, 77 Hillway, London, N6 6AB Comments by Mr and Mrs Hendy at No 75 Hillway

We support all the comments of Mr Ruggi at No 79 Hillway which we will not repeat. We would like to add some points of particular concern to us.

The first is in relation to southern flank wall of the planned rear extension to the house and of the patio. The contrast between the existing and planned development can be seen by contrasting the south elevations in plans HIW-300 and HIW-x-301. It shows a new area of wall above the existing glass roofed study (formerly a garage) in our house some 1.5 metres by 1.75 metres. This will overshadow our studio, garden and outlook to some extent.

Secondly, we are concerned that it is proposed that the southern wall of the ground floor extension is to use the existing party wall between us and No 77 and extend it upwards to the first story. It is believed that the party wall is not a cavity wall but simple 9 inch brick work. It would be preferable if the party wall was not used and a new wall was built within the boundary of No 77. This is what we did when converting the garage. This had the benefit of improving sound insulation between the two buildings. If the party wall is used for the rear extension of No 77 then there will be a risk of sound intrusion, albeit not at the level of the study because of our use of a second wall.

The proposed patio is to extend well beyond the existing patio. It is hard to judge from the plans (HIW-X-001 compared to HIW-002) but the planned patio at its southern edge seems to extend some 6.5 metres from the existing west wall of No 77 (some 5 metres from the west wall of the planned extension). The patio is about 1 metre higher than the patio of No 75 and about 1.5 metres above our garden. It is clear that we will lose much privacy unless the fence is made considerably higher for at least the length of the planned patio. This will be visually intrusive if it is effective. But it will need to be effective. Given that the patio extends furthest westwards at its southern side it seems likely that it is the southern end of the patio which will be most in use thus affecting not merely privacy but also noise intrusion (which will equally be an intrusion from our side too). An effective barrier such as a solid wall up to 1.5 metres (to screen conversation at sitting level) topped with a fence (to screen privacy whilst standing) seems necessary. If forced to choose we would prefer the visual intrusion (which could at least be masked by climbing plants on our side) and the unavoidable loss of light to a situation where we are overlooked and overheard.

Our third concern is that the garden studio appears to be of a design, size and height foreign to the estate. It extends well above the level of the existing fences. It will be very visible because of its dimensions and scale and presents a loss of visual amenity for those on the west side of Hillway who currently can see (in summer) nothing but greenery. The windows appear high enough to permit those in the studio to intrude on the privacy of people in the garden of No 75 (and vice versa). The impact on 79 is obvious. However, the suggestion of the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Advisory Committee that the studio, if approved, "may be better located along the southern side of the garden so as not to obstruct light to 79" appears to overlook the proposition quoted earlier in their submission that:

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

the topography increases the effect of a [development] for those on the downslope side, with the impacts of height and bulk, overlooking and overshadowing being greater than a similar proposal on level ground...Development on the downslope side can result in an excessively high wall for the downslope neighbour and so increase in height on this side is unlikely to be acceptable.

The effect of the proposed studio if situated on the southern flank of the garden would be yet more intrusive and obstruct far more light to 75 since its base will be a metre higher than our garden whereas, situated on the northern flank, the base would be a metre lower than 79's garden. The answer, of course, is not to move the studio from one side to another but not to permit it at all. The studio is too large and out of keeping with the gardens on either side or facing.

Our fourth concern is in relation to the eastwards extension of the former garage between No 77 and No 79. In our view the planned new front to what is currently the garage should be set back at least to the rear (the west) of the most easterly of the two ground floor windows on the north wall of No 77 in order to preserve the character of the estate which is of detached houses. The east front of this extension should match or at least be in keeping with the original three door garage fronts of the estate. It should not have a door and window as on the plan which is wholly out of keeping with the original and most recent changes to the estate.

Finally, the proposed dormer windows also appear too large for the estate and would have a negative impact on it.

John and Lisa Hendy
8 July 2014

2014/3609/P	John Hendy QC	75 Hillway London N6 6AB	08/07/2014 21:02:23	COMMNT
-------------	---------------	--------------------------------	---------------------	--------

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/3609/P	G Egen	73 Hillway Highgate N66AB	07/07/2014 13:10:01	COMMNT	<p>Object to certain aspects of the plans:</p> <p>Extension of the single story extension is too pronounced, ie, facade is coming too far forward relative to adjoining property and isn't really in keeping with the HLE Conservation Guidelines. It is over-dimensioned and will also give rise to party-wall issues with #79 Hillway. My other objections relate to the size of the dormers for the attic extension. These are very large relative to the property and roof line and appear overdimensioned and not in keeping with those found on adjoining properties. Historically Camden was more attuned to this issue and restricted dormer sizes (as in our own case) but recently I've noticed that Plholders have obtained consent for very large dormers going to the very edge of the roof...not in keeping with Conservation guidelines.</p> <p>My final</p> <p>Last but not least we object to the additional studio construction. Firstly, it is a modern design and totally out of character with the neighbouring garden landscapes and shared rear garden aspects. Moreover, it is too big/over-bearing and is right up against the property line. I can't quite tell but think it also implies that they will have to chop down a tree or two? They clearly want to add to the amenity of their garden but they need to be more mindful and respectful of the conservation values of the HLE and also not create something that may be viewed as encroaching on neighbours' garden perspectives. Nor should they be allowed to sacrifice healthy trees for such a construction.</p>
