

2 Leverton Place
London
NW5 2PL

23 March 2015

Dear Sirs

Re: 300 Kentish Town Road, NW5 2TG. Planning Application Ref. 2015/0818/P

I am writing to submit an objection to the above application for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed extension, by virtue of its proximity and design would give rise to an unreasonable loss of light to the detriment of the amenities of the adjoining occupiers**
I own and live at No. 2 Leverton Place and the proposed extension will have an unacceptable impact on the levels of light in our house at both ground floor and first floor level. The only window on the entire ground floor of the house is located at the front of the house and, using the 25 degree line test recommended by Camden Planning Guidance, this window would lose a material part of its direct sunlight. This would require us to use artificial light at virtually all times constituting a material loss of amenity.
- 2. The proposed extension, by virtue of its proximity and design would give rise to an unreasonable loss of privacy to the detriment of the amenities of the adjoining occupiers**
The extension proposal will substantially reduce our privacy and increase overlooking. Our bedroom faces the (illegal) roof terrace of the existing property at 300 Kentish Town Road and we already have substantial privacy issues as a result of this. The proposed extension will result in an entire residential frontage, including double French glass doors approximately 8.4m from our bedroom window. This is less than half of the current guidelines for facing window distance between residential properties is 18m and would constitute an intolerable breach of privacy.

In addition, the proposal indicates that the existing roof terrace will be formalised, albeit decreased in size. The existing roof terrace is illegal and entirely inappropriate for its position and is already the source of noise, nuisance and intrusion on our peaceful enjoyment of our property.

3. Design within a conservation area

The proposed extension, by virtue of its bulk and materials would dominate the rear elevation of the building and would appear incongruous and visually jarring in the streetscene. To this end it is considered that the proposal would cause harm to the appearance of the building, would fail to preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Kentish Town Conservation Area and would further erode the setting of the rear of listed buildings at 1 and 3 Leverton Street, contrary to policies B1, B3, B6 and B7 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and advice contained within Camden Planning Guidance 2006.

The existing building on the first floor of 300 Kentish Town Road is well set back from the edge of the property and is almost completely hidden from the street. The new development will be clearly visible at street level, interrupting the flow of the buildings and creating an unreasonable sense of

enclosure, reducing light levels and altering the nature of the lane. The development neither “conserves” nor “enhances” the context or character of Leverton Place and as such contravenes Camden Planning Guidance. Further, the proposed design does not harmonise with the architecture of the conservation area.

4. Disruption to Leverton Place caused by construction work

Leverton Place is a narrow 2-way street, down which two cars cannot pass each other. This already results in a great deal of horn usage and shouting when two cars meet in the middle which is disruptive for inhabitants. In addition, the restaurant located in the same building as 300 Kentish Town Road has regular deliveries from vans which wait in Leverton Road, blocking the street to other road users and resulting in further disruption. The addition of construction traffic to this narrow and congested road would result in an unacceptable level of traffic, , noise and other disruption. The refurbishment of the other flats in this building has already resulted in construction rubbish being dumped on the street for several days at a time, blocking the pavement and causing a nuisance; material construction work would exacerbate this issue.

In conclusion, therefore, I note that: (a) the existing flat for which the extension was sought was granted planning permission as an office, not a residential property, and I am not aware of change of use permission having been granted; and (b) planning permission was never requested to establish the existing roof terrace which has only been permitted through the passage of time. The extension proposal would therefore be a ratification of two flagrant breaches of Camden’s planning regulations and would exacerbate a situation in which there are already privacy, light and nuisance concerns to further negatively impact both Leverton Place and Leverton Street. I therefore request that the proposals as they stand are rejected.

If officers recommend approval of this application, we are asking for it to go before the Development Committee. Please acknowledge receipt of this email and inform me of the date of the hearing, if there is to be one.

If you wish to discuss my concerns further or to visit the property to assess the impact on privacy and light, please feel free to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Olivia Breese