

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2786/P	Celia Hoyles	52 Regents Park Road	14/06/2015 13:52:40	OBJLETTE R	<p>We object to the application for planning permission on the following overall grounds: its size (length and depth) of new extensions, which are completely out of keeping with any other extension in the road. It will also have a impact on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noise</li> <li>2. Overlooking/loss of privacy</li> <li>3. Effect on listed building and conservation area</li> <li>4. Loss of trees</li> <li>5. Potential problems with water table</li> </ol> <p>Our objection is to the extent of the extension of terrace at rear upper ground floor level: we do not object to the principle of an extension. Number 50 have a rear extension, as do we, at 52, both at ground level only. Ours at 52 was constructed after theirs at 50. We were required by Camden planning NOT to extend beyond the limit set at 50. This was to ensure that a) there was no undue level of overlooking the exterior ground floor level of adjoining properties thus breaching their privacy, and b) the extensions were architecturally coherent and consistent with the more stringent emphasis on conservation in more recent planning policy in Camden. We fail to see why this should not apply in the case of the extension proposed by number 54. We therefore request the extension is restricted in depth to that at 52 and 50. We object to the present plans. In summary we object to the large terrace --- much larger than anything in the road as far as we know with serious implications for privacy on either side. In more detail we object under the headings below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noise: A present amenity of the houses on this part of Regents Park Road is the quiet back gardens, which are very long for the area and therefore deliver an unusually quiet and special environment for a built up area. We raise two objections about noise, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The current plans propose a full-size terrace on top of the proposed extension. This terrace will provide, effectively, a large outside room, big enough for gatherings, tables and chairs etc, which will sit just above the gardens of 52 and 56. The impact of potential noise of parties, gatherings etc. on neighbouring properties – both gardens and indoors – is potentially substantial.</li> <li>b) We note that the proposal is now to lower the ground floor level. This has implications for the water table. We know that some tests have been undertaken but – as you may not know- a similar lowering of the ground floor level was undertaken in number 50 which resulted in several unfortunate flooding of the basement. As far as we understand it the only way this could be remedied was to install two pumps. These have created a nagging nuisance of nearly constant pump noise and we would assume that the same would be true in the case of 54</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Privacy: The extension is proposed to be above the party wall height, and the proposed staircase is above the party-wall height thus providing views of 52 flats at basement and ground level. The extension could easily be set back as we were required to do in 52, and at 50 and as specified by Camden authorities in the construction of the extension at 52 as mentioned above.</li> </ol> <p>The new ground floor extension will project out beyond the height of the brick boundary wall dividing 52 and 54 (the party wall). People standing on this terrace will have a direct line of vision into the interior of 52. Furthermore the proposed new staircase will give a similar view at its upper levels. At</p>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

the moment with the exception of one small projecting side window – the occupants of 54 cannot see into 52. The proposed extension would be a considerable invasion of privacy inside the basement of 52. A much smaller set back terrace, in line with that at 50 and 52 would be reasonable, surely, and in line with the nature of the area.

We have a small paved area in our garden one-third of the way down the garden which we use for eating in summer. At the moment it is completely secluded by trees in 52 and 54. The proposed extension and loss of the relevant trees will allow untrammelled sight of this area.

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, the open space and light currently enjoyed. As we say above, we will not object to a smaller extension.

Generally this proposal represents a considerable increase in apparent scale of a brick ground floor extension and balcony than anything else that can be seen from the garden of 52. The proposal seems inconsistent with consents given for previous smaller extensions or less obtrusive extensions which were respectful of neighbours amenities (please note that the work in 2013 to Flat A 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).

In addition, the plans proposed for terraces and balconies at other levels at various levels are not in keeping with the visual amenity and reasonable requirements of a conservation area. They will also create additional privacy issues for all of the residents in no 52. In particular the top floor terrace will overlook directly the residents of the top floor flat.

4. Trees. There are at least 2 lime trees running along the party wall in the garden which, as far as we can see, are not noted and would have to be destroyed. This will impact on the paved area noted in 2 above.

5. Water table As noted earlier the proposal is now to lower the ground floor level. This has implications for the water table, potential flooding and noise. We know that some tests have been undertaken but – as you may not know- a similar lowering of the ground floor level was undertaken in number 50 which resulted in several unfortunate incidents of flooding of the basement. As far as we understand it the only way this could be remedied was to install two pumps. These have created a nagging nuisance of nearly constant pump noise --- likely to be similar for number. 54

---