

Alex & Orla Ryland
94 Highgate West Hill
Highgate
London
N6 6NR

30th October 2015

Camden Planning Office
Camden
London

Objection to planning application number 2015/5061/P - 93 Highgate West Hill

Dear Sir / Madam,

As owners of 94 Highgate West Hill we are strongly objecting to the above planning application due to the severe negative impact it will have on our property and our lives. It will affect our quality of life due to losing our privacy, increase noise levels and change the character of our house and the area.

- Loss of privacy due to overlooking

Converting the roof of the new extension into a terrace will mean we lose our privacy. The new balcony will overlook the first floor childrens' bedrooms, kitchen and garden, specifically the area nearest the house and allow full view into these areas.

To date our rear bedroom, kitchen and playroom/living area and garden are not overlooked. For comparison please see the following photos:

- photo A - bedroom one prior to the extension with a former balcony in place
- photo B - bedroom one after the extension
- Photo C - bedroom two prior to the extension when the former balcony in place
- photo D - bedroom two after the extension
- photo E – Kitchen and garden area prior to the extension when the former balcony was in place
- photo F - Kitchen and garden area after the extension.

The photos clearly shows that a balcony on the new extension would fully overlook the back bedrooms, garden area outside the house and the kitchen/living area. The bedrooms are used for children and being overlooked removes our privacy, but also raises concerns as to who could be looking into the children's bedrooms.

Due to the close distance between the two properties and the differences between ground floor levels (due to the buildings being erected on a slope), the privacy issues are increased substantially.

- Noise

The proximity of the propose balcony and our bedrooms will have a negative impact on noise levels in our house. The proposed size of the balcony makes it suitable for entertaining or

everyday activities, which create noise. There is not an adequate distance between the building to absorb this noise and we will also not be able to control the noise level.

The former balcony could not be used for entertaining due to its size. It was also set further back from the side of our house, the current proposal has railing flush to the house.

- Outlook

The balcony will be overbearing and have a dominating effect over our property due to its size and height which is magnified due to the differences in ground floor levels (due to the property being built on a slope)

- Incorrect information & previous applications

The proposed first floor plan drawings submitted are incorrect. The floor space detailed for the old balcony is incorrect, you can clearly see from the photos provided by us and the applicant that the floor space is a rectangular area but on the new plan they have detailed an additional square area which was not there. This is distorting the application and makes it look as if the new proposal is only marginally bigger than the old one, when in reality is about twice the size. The drawings also do not show the level of our house in relation to the applicant's, which is a lot lower and has an impact on this application due to how it overlooks our house.

The original extension application (2010/4781/P) included the proposed roof terrace, but was withdrawn following discussions with the planning case officer. Prior to this application being withdrawn, Carlos Martin from the Planning office visited our property (94 Highgate West Hill) and observed that a terrace on the extension would impact all rooms at the rear of our property. There was also a subsequent application (2014/4097/P) that was withdrawn due to the same reasons. Then there was another application in 2014 (2014/7459/) which was refused. The Design and Access Statement provided with this application was incorrect, the applicant states that Martin Carlos the planning officer had advised the applicants that there had been no objections to the proposal of a roof terrace, this statement was incorrect. At every stage of all the planning application, four in total now, we and other parties had made our views clear to the planning officer, which has been documented. This Application is identical to the application in 2014 and all our objections remain as before.

Yours faithfully,

Alex & Orla Ryland

Photo A - Bedroom one prior to the extension when the former balcony was in place



Photo B – View from bedroom one after the extension



Photo C – Bedroom two prior to the extension when the former balcony was in place



Photo D – View from bedroom two after the extension



Photo E – Kitchen and garden area prior to the extension when the former balcony in place



Photo F – Kitchen and garden area after the extension

