

---

**From:** Kathy O'Shaughnessy [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 09 October 2015 09:49  
**To:** Craig, Tessa  
**Subject:** Re: 19 Rona Road

Dear Tessa  
we spoke earlier - I am writing from 21 Rona Road, next door to no. 19.

#### **Objection to Proposals at 19 Rona Road**

Please consider these comments to be an objection to the proposals to convert and extend the existing single family dwelling into a pair of maisonettes.

We are very concerned regarding the detrimental impact of the substantially enlarged rear extension on the residential amenity we currently enjoy at 21 Rona Road and upon the character and appearance of this part of the Mansfield Road Conservation Area.

The rear extension as proposed would:

- extend significantly beyond the (currently unbroken) rear building line formed by two storey original rear projections which is an important and intact characteristic of the conservation area
- extend the width of built footprint as well as extend the height of the rear wing by one and a third storeys to create a building form of bulk, scale and materiality uncharacteristic of, and alien to, this part of the conservation area

The effect of the significantly bulkier rear extension, and the disposition of windows within it, would be to:

- lead to the loss of light and sunlight currently enjoyed by windows at 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor on our rear main elevation and to kitchen windows
- result in the significantly and uncomfortably increased sense of enclosure as perceived from these rear windows as well as those in the glazed roof of our kitchen
- lead to direct and immediate overlooking of our existing bedroom and kitchen windows from new windows in the flank of the proposed extension (where no such overlooking currently exists).

The detailed design of the roof dormers are odd with poorly proportioned fenestration. It is not clear how the front basement bedroom will be ventilated and we are concerned that this underground room may require mechanical ventilation to be placed in the front garden which would be unsightly and potentially noisy.

In summary the proposals are not at all neighbourly and would lead to a substantial and unreasonable loss of residential amenity as currently enjoyed. Further they do not properly take into account the qualities of historic context which are worthy of preserving and enhancing.

As such the proposals should be seen to be contrary to CS5 which requires the Council to protect the amenity of Camden's residents and to ensure that the impact of developments on neighbours is fully considered; and to CS14 which requires development to be of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character. The proposals are also contrary to Camden Development Policies DP24 by not properly considering the character, setting, context, and form and scale of neighbouring buildings; DP25 as the proposals fail to preserve and enhance the historic character and appearance of the area; DP26 as the proposals would fail to protect the quality of life of neighbours because of the harm arising to a) visual privacy and overlooking, b) overshadowing and outlook, c) sunlight and daylight levels.

Finally it is not clear from the proposals how the front glazed lightwell will work. In the absence of sufficient detail we wish to reserve our position on how policy DP27 (basements and lightwells) might be applied to add a further objection to the scheme as such a design device is alien to the character of the conservation area and may compromise the architectural character of the building and of this part of the conservation area.

We would be most grateful if you could take the time to visit our house in order to assess these matters and concerns for yourself.

Please confirm that you have received this objection.

Thankyou very much.

Kathy O'Shaughnessy and William Fitzgerald