

Kate Phillips, Planning Officer
Camden Regeneration and Planning Development Management

20th July 2015

Dear Ms Phillips,

Planning Application: 82C Savernake Road, NW3 2JR (Ref: 2015/3582/P)

I would like to object to the above planning application for development of an additional third (and fourth) floor at the back 82C Savernake Road back development. As such, I am the long standing occupier of 82B/1st floor Savernake Road, one of the four properties that would be most adversely affected if this application is granted.

The grounds for objecting are:-

1. This will seriously overshadow and block out light to this property (light that has already been blocked off by the earlier extension of 82C and neighbouring properties), including directly/explicitly breaching the easement of and right to light. Indeed, it would put one of the bedrooms and the bathroom entirely in shadow, without any direct sunlight at all (at the far end and near bottom of long overshadowed gully going up three stories. It would also reduce the light to the other bedroom and the garden by circa 30- 35%% (again after the existing extension by 82C, no.80 and no.84 have already heavily restricted the light).
2. It is entirely inconsistent with the build height and lines of all the adjoining houses and the entire street (up to the Heath entrance and down as far as Gospel Oak School). The prevailing height and breadth of back extensions along the street is currently (at maximum) to the first floor, which this house and most neighbours have already reached, and the extension now proposed will then go higher and further than any other extension. Furthermore, this would then set a precedent (which your department would then find hard to resist) for other such extensions in the rest of the street, effectively tearing up the shared limitations to all our properties extending yet further out (in turn obliterating what remains of the gardens, light and lines of the entire street).
3. The build-out (i.e. its volume/lines/depth) would be entirely out of keeping with the lines, style, integrity and architectural form and aesthetic of the property and vicinity despite this being a Conservation Area.
4. The application amounts to over-development and/or overcrowding. No. 82 has already been pushed to the limit of building out for properties in the area/vicinity (including raising questions as to how far density can reasonably be pushed). This creates a five room (four bedroom) and three bathroom development out of what was originally just a two room top floor. Here, 82C has already been extended into the roof with a whole additional floor (not just single room as with most others in the street) and added an existing roof terrace over the back extension. As to the rest of the house it already one of the deepest ground/1st floor extensions in the street; as well having a cabin build across the back garden (taking up 30% of the already reduced garden). Enough is surely enough.
5. The proposed (over) development is potentially flawed in terms of structural integrity and building regulations. It entails building a further additional floor and terrace on to what was originally a single story/single brick course back extension on which a further story and roof terrace have already been added. At the same time, the main house, which would take up some lateral load, is already bearing the additional load of an extra floor. Yet the applicant has not in any way addressed any structural issues. Equally, with then four double bedrooms at the top of the house and at the top of long steep narrow staircase, it will create a fire/access risk from overcrowding.

In addition development to this extent will overload utilities/services infrastructure in the house, even allowing for additional waste pipes and supply being attached to the exterior of the building for the bathroom in the new extension. Here, it is also worth noting the applicant has not obtained the necessary consents and/or met the requirements of either the freehold or the leaseholder agreement between the three flat owners – which while incidental to planning per se, still speaks to the nature and quality of the application.

Taken together this is an application without any merit; indeed is simply over-development at the expense of the adjoining properties and integrity of the area.

Yours faithfully, **Chris Parry-Davies**