

111D Goldhurst Terrace
London
NW6 3HA

14th Nov 2015

Dear Mr O'Donnell,

My wife and I wish to formally object to the revised proposals to alter and extend Unit 1, 109 Goldhurst Terrace under planning application 2015/4386/P.

Firstly, as highlighted previously, the materials to be used to cover the flat section of roof have not been described in either the original or the revised documents. Is a felt, rubber or even fibreglass surface being proposed? We feel this is important as: i) the property falls within the South Hampstead Conservation Area and the chosen materials will likely detract from its character; ii) the flat section of roof will be visible from a number of the surrounding properties, including ours. Similarly, the composition of the skylight and any flashing materials to be used have not been referenced.

We wish to object to the revised plans on the following grounds:

1. Loss of privacy

The proposed dormer window to the west-facing aspect of Unit 1, 109 Goldhurst Terrace is still included within the revised plans. As previously stated, this dormer window would directly overlook the rear of 111 Goldhurst Terrace and diminish the existing levels of privacy afforded both to us and to our neighbours. As there are currently no windows or skylights to that aspect we will continue to object to any proposal that introduces such modifications.

The proposed dormer window will overlook the garden belonging to 111 Goldhurst Terrace Ltd, which we share with Flats A, B and C below us. With regards to our flat specifically, the proposed dormer window is directly adjacent to our kitchen window, an upper floor bedroom window and a lower floor bedroom window. With reference to Section 7 of CPG6, all of these areas are deemed sensitive. This section of CPG6 also states that "*there should normally be a minimum distance of 18m between the windows of habitable rooms of different units that directly face each other*" which will not be the case.

2. Loss of light

As shown on a number of the architectural drawings, in relation to 111 Goldhurst Terrace the sun rises from behind Unit 1, 109 Goldhurst Terrace. A significant increase in the bulk of the roof (owing to a 20cm increase in height, the introduction of a large flat section and the inclusion of multiple dormer windows) will therefore reduce the existing levels of daylight and sunlight afforded to all residents of 111 Goldhurst Terrace.

Section 6 of CPG6 states that "*daylight and sunlight reports will be required where there is potential to reduce existing levels of daylight and sunlight*". We are unclear why a daylight and sunlight report has not been submitted in this case. The development work is also taking place above the 25 degree line referenced in Section 6 of CPG6.

3. The visual prominence, scale and bulk of the proposed roof extension is overwhelming

Although the application has been scaled back, the revised plans still include a 20cm increase in the height of the roof, the introduction of a large flat section and the inclusion of multiple dormer windows. These alterations will significantly increase the visual bulk of the existing property so as to risk overwhelming the many surrounding properties, including ours.

We continue to object to any proposal that increases the height of the roof and/or deviates from the current hipped roof construct. Given the proximity of the two buildings, we fear a considerably larger roof structure will dominate views from our flat's rear windows, specifically from our kitchen, an upper floor bedroom, a lower floor bedroom and our hallway.

As previously stated, Unit 1, 109 Goldhurst Terrace also falls within the South Hampstead Conservation Area. Section 7.16 of the respective Character Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAMS) document states that *"alterations should not result in increased visual bulk to the roof, nor should they draw more attention"*. The proposed alterations do result in increased visual bulk and do draw more attention and should therefore be deemed unacceptable.

4. The design is not sympathetic and is out of character

Section 7.15 of the South Hampstead CAMS document states that roofs *"play a very important role in maintaining the character of the conservation area"*. We feel that any deviation from the existing hipped roof construct would detract from this character.

Section 7.16 of the CAMS document also states that any design that *"does not take into account the careful design of the original building – its front elevation and traditional roof form – and the pattern of neighbouring buildings as a whole"* can be *"damaging to the character of the area"*. The proposed flat roof design does not take the original hipped roof design into account, nor does it conform to the pattern of neighbouring buildings, and is therefore damaging to the character of our conservation area.

5. The design goes against general planning guidance

Finally, we feel that the proposed roof modifications continue to go against a number of general design principles set out in CPG1, most notably:

- **Section 5.8** – This section states that roof alterations are likely to be unacceptable *"where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed"*. We feel that the proposed alterations to the roof would overwhelm the scale and proportions of the existing building.
- **Section 5.8** – This section also states that roof alterations are likely to be unacceptable where *"buildings whose roof construction or form are unsuitable for roof additions such as shallow pitched roofs with eaves"*. The existing roof was of a shallow hipped construction with eaves and should therefore not be considered suitable for alteration.
- **Section 5.11 (a)** – This section states that the pitch of the existing roof should be *"sufficient to allow adequate habitable space without ... raising the roof ridge"*. The

proposal requires the height of the existing roof to be increased by 20cm and should therefore be deemed unacceptable.

- **Section 5.11 (b)** – This section states that “*dormers, on both the front and rear of the property, will be discouraged to minimise the prominence of these structures*”. The revised application continues to propose dormers on all four sides of the property and should therefore be deemed unacceptable.

Sincerely,

Simon Whittaker