
From: Tim Owens [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 August 2015 16:56
To: Planning
Subject: Objections to applications 2015/4179/P, 2015/4157/P and 2015/4053/P.

Dear Camden Planning,

I am writing to object to the series of applications recently submitted for 8 Pilgrim's lane - 2015/4179/P, 2015/4157/P and 2015/4053/P.

As you are aware, the property has been the subject of numerous applications, the latest of which is under appeal. The current series of applications is a cynical attempt to circumvent the appeal process. The substance of the applications is, in aggregate, substantially similar to the application under appeal. I believe Camden should not entertain such a transparent attempt to skirt the appeal process and reject this application on the same grounds that it rejected the original.

The applicant is trying to avail of permitted development (PD) rules in national planning legislation. As a designated conservation area the application of PD rules is much stricter. Moreover, given the challenges to structure stability of neighbouring properties, the risk of flooding and the complex engineering process that is required to construct the basement, PD should not apply in this case.

In addition, the applicant seeks to take advantage of PD rights by asserting that the property is a single dwelling house. This is incorrect. The property has a separate basement entrance and the basement has been historically occupied as a separate unit. The original application was rejected by Camden's DCC. Amongst other reasons, the application was refused on the grounds of insufficient information and the failure *"to demonstrate that the proposed basement excavations would not have significant adverse impacts on the structural stability of the application site and adjacent properties"*⁴¹. This new application fails to provide any information about these issues and should not be considered until they satisfy the information criteria stipulated under Camden's basement guidance.

I wish to also contest the decision by Camden not to initiate a proper consultation process for these applications. To date I have not received a formal notice about these applications. I note that your website has a "Comments Until" date of 27th August 2015 for one of the applications and two dates before the application was received for the others! Given the substantial level of interest in the original application I believe it is Camden's duty to consult at a minimum with the individual who commented on the original application. In addition I have the following specific comments on the applications.

2015/4179/P

The proposed extension of the loft space will result in the infill of an existing window. Moreover, the proximity of this extension to our property will result in the overshadowing of the attic room and bedrooms of our property and the loss of light. The addition of three roof-lights on the western roof will result in loss of privacy as they directly overlook the upper rooms of our property and garden. The number and size of these proposed roof-lights is incompatible with the character of a conservation area.

The detail provide by the applicant on the lightwell is unclear. The glass used in the lightwell is currently opaque. The lower windows which directly look into our kitchen are currently opaque. The plan suggests that they will be transparent. It also misrepresents the height of the existing fence so as to give the appearance the property would not be overlooked.

This is an unacceptable loss of privacy and amenity and is contrary to CPG6; the "good practice" guidelines on overlooking of paragraph 7.4 in CPG6 have not been met. I also feel that the design guidance of CPG 1 regarding roof-lights has not been followed.

2015/4157/P

The proposed new patio and garden steps will result in a substantial loss of garden space. Moreover the impact on surface water will be substantial. This is contrary to CPG 1 and CPG 3.

The applicant has not made any attempt to address the impact of the work on the existing trees, one of which is the subject of a TPO. The proximity of the proposed patio and steps will put this tree at risk.

Elements of the proposed design are not in keeping with the character of the existing building. The additional stairs, the proposed removal of a doorway, the removal of the existing porch, the replacement of the terrace balcony all cumulatively result in an erosion of the distinct character of the property. This is contrary to Camden's policy CS14.

2015/4053/P

The proposed basement development gives rise to precisely the same concerns raised by the original application. The applicant is fully aware of the engineering difficulties raised by the proposed basement. Existing analysis has highlighted some of the problems: the flying freehold, the substantial groundwater flows, the existence of contaminated soil and the Burland scale analysis of the impact on neighbouring properties to name a few. These illustrate the complications with the proposed development and the potential for damage to the neighbouring properties.

Please reject these applications.

Best regards

Tim Owens
6 Pilgrim's Lane
London NW3 1SL

^[1] Refusal Reasons Page for Planning Application - 2012/5825/P from www.camden.gov.uk/planning