

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7720/P	Mrs Gillian King	37 Elliott Square London NW3 3SU	04/02/2015 16:54:40	OBJ	<p>I have read and can appreciate some of the comments made in support of this application – provision of more living space etc. however, these are generalities and as a house owner and resident of over 31 years whose quality of life would be directly affected if permission is granted, I am objecting on grounds of fact. Those supporting the application probably think they are supporting 7 extensions being built on a whole terrace of 7 houses whereas in fact only 4 of the house owners have any intention of building rooftop extensions. The owners of nos. 16, 18 and 20 Lower Merton Rise have all objected to the application relating to nos. 16 – 28 Lower Merton Rise thus making this a misleading application. A pre-application request to Camden was made on behalf of 26-28 LMR as noted in the applicant’s covering letter and the response from Camden was that it had to be for the whole block, hence the application for 7 instead of two houses with no 26 being the leading applicant on both occasions.</p> <p>There is inconsistency throughout the documentation as to the houses affected by this application e.g. 18-26 quoted in heading of Kasia Whitfield’s long letter of 16.12.14 with 16-28 then quoted below. Similarly in Delva Patman Redler LLP’s Daylight and Sunlight Analysis (page 2 under Daylight and page 4 under Conclusion) it talks about 18-26 ‘being developed out together’ rather than the whole terrace of 16 – 28.</p> <p>This leads me to the ‘Proposal’ section of the same report, which brings in a subsidiary proposal for a possible staged development of 2+2+3. In effect this is trying to establish 26 & 28 as one block and 22 & 24 as a second block as in matched pairs these are the same height as each other but are built next to each other on a downward gradient, with nos 16 - 20 (who have objected to this application) the ‘3’ in this scenario, being at a lower level. This is omitted from Kasia Whitfield’s long letter of 16.12.14 which on the 3rd page (not numbered) she quotes under Planning Justification (1) ‘Are for a “complete group” of buildings’. Kasia Whitfield’s assertion that it is ‘for a whole block’ therefore gives a false impression when taken with DPR’s report.</p> <p>Unless planning permission is granted on the basis that the whole block has to be developed at the same time (which is my understanding of how it should operate) we could end up with the situation of having only 4 extensions being built (22 – 28) leaving the remaining houses at a lower level and this would set a precedent for creating a ‘higgledy piggedly’ development aspect to the neighbourhood, surely not what Camden Planning Directorate, CEL or CAF are trying to achieve. Elliott Square is currently symmetrical as originally planned as ‘The Quadrangles’ and the building of random rooftop extensions would ruin its visual appearance.</p> <p>There is no provision in CAF (Chalcot Architect’s Forum) or CEL (Chalcots Estate Limited) building guidelines for staged building to take place the consensus being for ‘a minimum of a whole block, to be undertaken simultaneously, or not at all’. Similarly, Camden’s Planning Guidance (Design – section 5) para.5.8 goes as far as to state as unacceptable ‘Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a co-ordinated design’ and ‘Buildings already higher than neighbouring properties where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

composition'. Both of these guidelines give rise for concern with the proposed development.

Another possible technicality I have noticed is that the proposed setbacks will be 900mm (in DPR's report) whereas the CAF Guideline document for roof extensions (CAF_05_B) states 1200 mm.

The same DPR Daylight and Sunlight Analysis twice mentions 18-26 (not 16-28 which the application covers) being developed out together as 'the worst case scenario' in terms of being the largest definable obstruction to the neighbours. It can be the only scenario if the whole terrace guidelines are adhered to and the staged alternative which has been suggested is denied.

What is also not clear from the plans submitted (Proposed Rear Elevations LMR 28 – 16/GA3) is that three of the four houses named in Kasia Whitfield's short letter dated 16.12.14, already have rear extensions one (22) taking up most of the back garden. Not only do these give those of us living immediately behind a feeling of being encroached but the addition of a further storey on top of houses already higher than ours will compound this feeling.

I have submitted photographs and videos to illustrate the loss of skyline and sunshine which would apply and to show how we are already overlooked by these houses which are higher than those of us inside Elliott Square (nos 33-39) and also that the ground slopes upwards immediately behind us and again towards the north of the Square. This cannot easily be seen from the plans. I trust these will all be viewed and my commentaries taken into account.

Again, those of us living inside the Square (33 – 39) mainly live in the back of our houses where the kitchen/diners are situated and open on to our gardens. This is where the bulk of our light and all of our sunshine comes from as the fronts of the houses mostly comprise entrance halls/garages etc. On a personal note I am self-employed and work from home and spend 80% of my time in my kitchen area. In the summer I like to make the most of the sunshine – all the figures on the DPR report show my sunshine levels will be reduced. Based on the 20 year rule, the 'Right of Light' should apply to all of the houses behind the proposed development and this has not been addressed in the DPR report (I am aware it cannot be taken into account at the planning decision stage).

We already lose sunshine when the sun hits the top of the houses behind and this will happen earlier if extensions are allowed to interfere with the skyline. BRE guidelines can only be that – guidelines – they are not mandatory as stated in the Policy/Guidelines paragraph of the Analysis neither do they reflect the reality of loss of light and sunshine (both of which are beneficial to health) or the negative energy impact and cost of providing additional lighting to compensate. I am not a technical person and have tried to understand the readings for my property which were computer generated rather than based on any factual study on site. I would also like an explanation of what N/A means in so many of the columns in the sunshine readings?

Camden's Planning Guidance 6 (Amenity) para. 6.16 states 'The design of your development should aim to maximise the amount of sunlight into rooms without overheating the space and to minimise overshadowing.' Our sunshine levels would be reduced by this development.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>One of the videos I submitted demonstrates the noise arising whilst building one of the earlier mentioned back extensions. This was a mere 'soundbite' of what it was like from early morning until evening over a prolonged period, making it impossible to concentrate and detrimental on my work. The prospect of living through the noise again whilst a whole terrace of extensions (or part thereof) is being constructed does not bear thinking about.</p> <p>Contrary to some comments within the consultation about 'improving community' this issue has caused much bad feeling. Those of us who have lived here peacefully for many years are looking to Camden to follow its own guidelines and to deny planning permission on this occasion.</p>
2014/7720/P	Mrs Gillian King	37 Elliott Square London NW3 3SU	04/02/2015 23:09:20	COMMNT	Two further comments on Kasia Whitfield's long letter dated 16.12.14 which I omitted to put in my earlier objection. I strongly dispute the two statements she has made in points 4 and 5 under Planning Justification for the current proposals i.e. under point 4 I do not accept that it is 'fully acceptable' in terms of its effect on nearby properties even though it might meet BRE guidelines and under point 5 I do not agree that 'there would be no adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours'. This is a generalisation as the amenity of some neighbours would be adversely impacted if this application succeeds.
2014/7720/P	Joel Hopkins	18 Elliot Square London NW3 3SU	04/02/2015 17:24:51	SUPNOT	As a neighbour who lives in the square that backs on to the proposed roof top extensions - I am in full support of the scheme. I think the scale will suit the area as we are dwarfed by nearby tower blocks and have a lot of communal space in front and behind our properties - so there is little danger of feeling hemmed in. Here's a real opportunity to maximise space in a way that will enhance the character and architecture of our square.