

11.11.15

To: Obote Hope, Planning Officer, Camden Council
From: Cynthia Rand Kukielski, 2 Langland Gardens
re: planning applications 2015/0315/P & 2015/3036/P
Consultation letter and objection

These are the following points which support my objection to the plans as submitted:

1. The proposal is **effectively a 3 storey rear extension** (lower ground, ground, and first floor ½ width) with basement excavation below the original footprint and under the requested extended footprint to the rear. No first floor extensions exist on the neighbouring properties.
2. The proposed first floor extension with terrace and privacy screening will lead to diminished light entering the ground floor flat windows of no 6 Langland Gardens which face the proposed rear extension. The reduction of light entering the existing ground floor facing window will likely be significant *especially* in the darker months where the sunlight hours are shorter. The window presently receives unobstructed light even with the low angle of the sun in darker months. The height of the proposed ½ with first floor, and terrace screening will block the sunlight as it passes from east to west in the sky. No 4 is westward of no 6. It is doubtful that even frosted glass screening for the terrace would improve the loss of direct light into no 6. The impact of loss is considered significant by the owner of the flat at no 6 and should be strongly considered as an objection to the proposed first floor extension and terrace. The first floor extension should not be permitted.
3. The notifications on the street and the ad in the Ham & High do not reference associated application 0315; whereas the consultation letter refers to 'associated reference 0315'. The public notices and the consultation letters are inconsistent.
4. The description of works to be done is misleading. The structure *exists* as 6x1 bed units; 2 on each of 3 floors. The description refers to excavating the basement so the 'existing 2x2 beds at ground floor can expand to 2x3 bed units'.
5. There is no basement habitation existing, nor was basement development previously requested, nor approved. The submitted existing floor plans show the 6 x 1 beds; given this, where are the 'existing 2x2 bed units at ground floor' as in the application description?
6. With regard to proposed planning application 0315, architect drawing 112 'existing long section' was included in the submitted drawings and is quoted in the decision notice. This architectural drawing showed a basement under the entire footprint of the building; however when application 3036 was submitted several months later, it showed the 'existing long section' 112/D showing a cellar only at the front of the building. The proposal 0315 was consulted on & decision based on misinformation; therefore, there has been heretofore, no permitted habitation development at lower ground level. No work has commenced at the site as there is now applying to develop at lower ground level, therefore, the two 'existing' 2x2 bed flats which are proposed to increase to 2x3 bed flats is

inaccurate as no basement development permission has been granted with 0315.

7. 0315 proposed works were restricted to above ground changes ONLY, and were granted with misinformation. This among other reasons should void that decision. There was no tree report and no design access statement submitted with 0315 to support above ground extension into the garden.
8. CPG 1 suggests design width and height of extension which impact negatively on neighbours should not be allowed. The flat roof of the ground floor extension would lead to a loss of privacy as it can be accessed by the flat's windows.
9. The outlook amenity from the first floor bedroom windows will be negatively impacted. The adjacent first floor windows which now have a view of gardens would overlook the flat roof of the rear extension.
10. The description says "2 storey rear extension" but plans show ½ width at side closest to boundary with no 6 Langland Gardens. Inconsistencies such as this can lead to insufficient consultation feedback.
11. There is an existing cellar at the front of the building of uninhabitable depth; the rest of the house sits on top of what can be described as 'crawl space'.
12. The proposed works in 3036 to excavate the basement would require an extreme amount of earth removal to accommodate lower ground floor flats, two light wells at the front and one large light well at the rear. Along the run of semi detached houses, there is only one basement developed which was previously uninhabitable, but of low head height and significantly more extensive than what exists at no 4, so the amount of earth removal was significantly less than that is required for no 4.
13. The subject property is in a conservation area and should warrant a biodiversity assessment since a significant amount of existing lawn, mature shrubbery and some trees will be lost in the rear garden with this plan.
14. The rear extensions: full width and first floor with terrace, are out of character with the neighbouring properties. The proposed full width ground floor extension should not be permitted as it will disturb the symmetry of existing ground floor rear extensions which exist along the neighbouring houses. The neighbouring semi-detached houses are either single homes, or are divided by floors into apartments. The subject house proposes splitting the semi-detached building vertically at ground and lower ground floors. The neighbouring houses which do have a rear extension are ground level & half width and all of them maintain the open garden space adjoining at the party wall/fence boundary. For these reasons the full width rear extension should not be permitted.
15. The Design and Access statement for the arboricultural report submitted for 3036 incorrectly refer to a permitted basement development. This is incorrect as none was previously applied for, nor previously permitted in previous applications.
16. The Soiltechnics report assumes no subsidence at neighbouring buildings, but there is known subsidence at no 6 and this should be assessed before any works are started.
17. Soiltechnics Q13 response should be supported by an evaluation of neighbouring properties structures foundations in order to strengthen the supposition.

18. Soiltechnics Summary 12.1 conclusion refers to a 'single storey extension at ground level', this is not what is proposed in the planning application. This should be pointed out to the consultant as it may impact calculations.
19. Trees, grass, and mature shrubs will be removed, and there will be an impact on the neighbouring mature plants of no 2. According to the arboricultural report trees that have 10+ years of life left will be felled in a conservation area.
20. National Planning Portal defines 'original' footprint as what existed when first built or as existed 1947. Conservation area guidelines say that basement development should be within the original footprint, therefore the basement development should be restricted to the original footprint, which does not include the above ground rear extension at ground level in 0315; especially since it was granted with misinformation, and should be voided.
21. It is difficult to see how the rear lightwells have been reduced in length; and the proximity of the front light wells to the road given the drawings of the lower ground and ground floor plans on one page.
22. The front left light wells show no railing treatments and would be out of character with the conservation area if glass is used. It is uncharacteristic of the streetscape and these treatments should be submitted as part of the original proposal so the consultants can comment, rather than piecemeal applications to do so.
23. Planning Practice Guide says that good design should add to the overall quality of the area. The rear extension at first floor with terrace, full width at ground floor would not be characterised as good design as they detract from the quality of the area rather than add to it, and therefore should be refused.
24. Design policies should *concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, and layout of application plans*, as per the Planning Practice Guidance 59. This is particularly important given the site location, impact neighbouring structures, symmetry of neighbouring buildings, and location in a conservation area.
25. Unfortunately, the applicant did not initiate an attempted to work with the neighbours to discuss the proposed design plans. The neighbours had contacted the developer to request securing the site, along with other site issues. However, since spring time, when we suggested delaying party wall matters until plans are granted by the council, there has been no further communication from the developer. The consultation through the council as an opportunity to give feedback and help evolve the proposed design is the route neighbours have.
26. The shared green canopy to the rear of the properties is a conservation area feature. The removal of trees and shrubs at the sides and rear will take away from the noise buffer they serve as now. The green space at the rear is very tranquil in the evenings and that tranquility should not be disturbed by a proposed terrace.
27. The proposed first floor terrace will introduce noise at the first floor rear as well as light spill as it is open. The introduction of these is unfavourable and not of good design. Of further concern is the height of the balustrade which does not prevent users of the first floor terrace from peering around the screens looking

towards first floor bedrooms at nos. 2 & 6 Langland Gardens. Though this may not happen often, it is an intrusion to the private sleeping spaces of the direct neighbours and is unacceptable. The first floor terrace should not be permitted for these reasons.

28. The style of the proposed windows of the ground and lower ground floor are uncharacteristic to the original building and are a significant increase in glazing, outweighing the glazed surfaces of the original building.
29. There has been no assessment of surface water run off and how increasing hard surfaces will affect that of the host property and the neighbours downhill.
30. Though the host property has been assessed for flood impact, but there has been no assessment of flooding potential to the down hill and nearby properties.
31. There has been no structural assessment of neighbouring properties, especially given the fact that there is subsidence at no 6.
32. The rear garden will be made level to accommodate stone patios; how will this impact surface water of subject and neighbouring properties?
33. There is an increase in number of bathrooms from 6 to 11 which is significant and impact water usage and waste disposal to the public sewage.
34. The NPPF says councils should find ways to enhance AND improve the places where we live. The plans, as submitted, simply do not accomplish this and need to evolve in order to do so.
35. The development should be car free to encourage a reduction in emissions. The host building is close by to several bus routes and within a short walking distance of overground and underground stations. If the host building had been further up in Hampstead, it would not be appropriate to make it car free as public transportation is not easily accessed.
36. The change from 6 to 11 bedrooms is very dense and should be reassessed; whether there is a reduction of flats, or a revision of interior space to be more in line with a less dense configuration and less massing at the rear. As is, this is inappropriate development and should be scaled back as suggested in the planning guidance, particularly as it is out of line with the neighbouring properties which each have a half width rear extension at ground at the outer half, leaving the interior boundary walls and fences original.
37. The proposal shows *mixed sizes of flats (1, 2 & 3 beds)* which will likely all be sold at market value, and not meet the socioeconomic mix planning policy looks for in development policies.
38. The proposed INTERIOR floor space is almost doubled; increasing from 301 to 542 square metres. This living space square footage does not include the development of the front light wells and a very large light well created at the rear. It is excessive development given the size of the original building and neighbouring buildings and should be scaled back.
39. Where is the buried tank which attenuates groundwater flow to the sewer? This will require even more excavation and there is already an excessive amount proposed and accounted for in the drawings with this application.
40. Demolition of the original rear 'bump out' will significantly inconvenience no 2, as will the excavation adjacent to the rear patio, living room and sleeping quarters.

There will be a loss of privacy to all rooms at the rear first and ground floor rooms during construction, and a loss of garden use throughout the entire length of the project. I will effectively have to have my drapes and shades closed throughout the entire day Monday through Saturday. This is unacceptable and extremely inconvenient leading to a loss of sunlight during the duration of the project.

41. The full width ground floor extension will result in a sense of enclosure to the outdoor patio area of no 2 as the boundary bends in on no 2. The extension of the party wall into the garden will result in a loss of amenity of an openness and view of brick wall towering over the original boundary fencing.
42. The basement is larger than the proposed ground floor footprint. This is unacceptable and should follow the proposed ground floor.
43. The first floor extension and screening will block light into the windows of no 6. The 45 degree angle should be drawn from the timber framing to illustrate this as it should be stipulated not to be of material that will not lead to light spill into the existing first floor flats of the neighbours.

It is without doubt or debate that no 4 needs refurbishment. However, the proposals so far should not gain approval from the council as submitted. The scale of the proposal is too large for the original building. The amount of earth movement is significant with this proposal. The full width ground floor extension is uncharacteristic and unsympathetic with the neighbouring properties, as is the first floor extension and a first floor terrace. These will significantly change the amenity of the immediate neighbours who will be most negatively impacted.

The demolition and construction period for the proposed plans will be overly inconvenient to no 2 as there will be loss of use of outdoor patio & garden use; impact on stability of patio and existing plants and garden adjacent to the subject site; windows will have to remain closed to keep out dust and dirt, and shades will have to be drawn at first and ground floor rooms all day to maintain privacy, and loss of mature plants in my garden.

There can be a balance between creating quality homes within the guidelines and policies that will create a wonderful outcome for all rather than what is proposed which is overambitious. I object to the plans as submitted for 0315 & 3036, and especially the culmination of the two.

I hope the council will request a revision of the plans to be more in line with the neighbouring properties and consistent with conservation area guidelines while supporting renovation of the building. The council should also encourage the developer to work with the neighbours to reach a successful outcome for the developer, the neighbours, and the council. A cooperative approach will result in an acceptable and appropriate result.