

**From:** Elizabeth Middleton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 February 2015 14:51  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Application Reference 2014/7956/P 54 Regents Park Road

I am writing with relation to **Application Reference 2014/7956/P** 54 Regents Park Road (also described by associated Ref **2014/7252/PRE**)

I object to the application for planning permission on the following grounds:-

**1. Noise:** The proposed new terrace at first floor level is of major concern. A present amenity of the houses on this part of Regents Park Road is the quiet and open back gardens which are very long for the area and therefore deliver an unusually quiet and special environment for a built up area. At present from the garden terrace at Flat A, no 52 any noise from no 50, whilst increased because of the extension to that house, is at least offset by the fact that the owner excavated the basement on his development so that the ground level is several feet lower than that at 52. The garden wall therefore acts as a sound barrier and privacy screen. To date there has been very little noise from 54 as there is not currently a opening 'glass wall' (the effect of which is always to bring domestic inside noise outside). The current plans propose not only a fully retractable glass wall at basement level (to which I don't object in principle) but also a full size terrace on top. This terrace will provide, effectively, a large outside room, big enough for gatherings, tables and chairs etc and which will sit just above the gardens of 52 and 56 without any sound barrier whatsoever. Noise from people talking, parties, or carried from inside the house from the enlarged windows will be considerably increased and could represent a serious nuisance as well as loss of amenity.

**2. Privacy:** The new ground floor extension will project out beyond the height of the brick boundary wall dividing 52 and 54 and so will be very visible. People standing on this terrace will have a direct line of vision into the interior of 52. Furthermore the proposed new staircase will also give a similar view at its upper levels and its positioning at the 52 side of the terrace will encourage the user to look into the terrace and into the interior of no 52 through the extension windows. At the moment with the exception of one small projecting side window – the occupants of 54 cannot see into 52 and this will be a considerable invasion of privacy inside my home. A much smaller set back terrace, in line with that at 50 and 52 might remove this problem and accessed from the house only and not by staircase which rises above the top of the boundary wall.

The additional terraces proposed and balconies at various levels will also create additional privacy issues for all of the residents in no 52 especially, in respect of the top floor terrace, particularly the residents of the top floor flat who will be immediately overlooked.

**3. Visual Amenity & Conservation Area :** The new terrace will project above the boundary wall of 52/54 and will represent a significant change to the visual amenity of the old wall and open space and light currently enjoyed at 52. The applicant has expressed a willingness to discuss materials which is helpful however I would prefer either a smaller extension or if

the visual impact be minimised by the adoption of a similar half brick, half glass slightly sloped structure to that at no 50. This was I understand from the planning documents available for no 50, specifically designed to reduce visual impact and is effective in doing so.

Whilst basement level development in a modern style is permitted and I have no objection to the style, I query whether glass balustrades on the proposed new balcony and the proposed new terrace which will be visible from the front façade are in keeping with the principles set out in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement. In particular PH 24 refers to terraces having metal railings and generally PH26 and other principles require extensions to be unobtrusive and in keeping with the surrounding buildings. The opaque high glass wall proposed at the end of the ground floor terrace to screen no 56 seems to be particularly out of character with conservation area principles and will be an eyesore and set a precedent for the use of unsympathetic materials. Outdoor lighting placed on this terrace will also impact on the neighbouring properties.

Generally this proposal represents a considerable increase in apparent scale of a garden extension and balcony than anything else that can be seen from the garden of 52. 54 is already a substantial family house when compared to the multiple flats in the two adjoining houses and one has to query the extent to which an added amenity to one household can be set against the considerable reduction in amenity ( noise , privacy etc) which will be suffered by the neighbouring properties as a consequence.

The proposal seems inconsistent with consents given for previous smaller extensions or far less obtrusive extensions which have been agreed in recent years which were respectful of neighbours amenities (please note that the work in 2013 to Flat A,52 is for some reason not included in the applicant's Design and Access Statement but involved a much smaller extension with a set back balcony provided for the ground floor flat) and in my view, if allowed will represent a further precedent in allowing extension and terraces which compromise neighbours' privacy.

Elizabeth Middleton  
Basement Flat ( Flat A)  
52 Regents Park Rd