

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/5683/P	Ned Williams & Olivia Breese	2 Leverton Place NW5 2PL	16/11/2015 22:02:16	OBJ	<p>We are writing to submit an objection to the above application on the grounds that the proposed works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) would cause significant loss of light to our house; (ii) would cause an unacceptable intrusion on our family's privacy and directly overlook large parts of our accommodation; and (iii) are not consistent with the intent of the original development of these terraced houses or the surrounding conservation area. <p>No daylight or sunlight report has been submitted to support this application and the application dismisses the impact of the development on neighbouring properties. The three terraced houses at 1-3 Leverton Place were simultaneously converted from shops into family houses by the same developer. The houses are very similar and the harmonious design was carefully balanced to maximise space, light and privacy for all three houses. The proposed works materially distort this balance to the unacceptable detriment of our privacy and access to light. We request Camden Planning to consider this local context when determining this application, in accordance with CS 14.</p> <p>Furthermore, the information and drawings provided in support of the application provide almost no contextual information, particularly with regards to our house and window openings and our neighbouring roof terrace and rooflights, all of which are central to the amenity of our house. As such, the assertion within the design and access statement that no detrimental impact will be felt by neighbouring properties is simply not true.</p> <p>Specifically with regards to the impact on our property, this can be broken down into four areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the rear top floor bedroom; (ii) the rear first floor bedroom; (iii) the roof terrace; and (iv) the ground floor living and dining space. <p>To address then each of our concerns in the specific areas highlighted above –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Rear Top Floor Bedroom <p>This room is situated to the rear of our top floor, immediately adjacent to the top floor bedroom within the existing plans for 1 Leverton Place. This bedroom contains one window, facing north which can be seen in the elevations provided directly to the east of the current and proposed bedroom at 1 Leverton Place.</p> <p>As the window is currently flush with the existing rear wall, it benefits from approximately 120 degrees of daylight light and outlook from due west to NNE. The eastern outlook is blocked by the rear bathroom to our house which has been in place since the original development.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

The proposed extension would restrict this outlook to the west side as well, resulting in only c. 45 degrees of outlook from NNW to NNE with the associated loss of light. In effect the single window in the bedroom will be at the end of a narrow passage 2100mm long between the existing bathroom to the rear of our house and the proposed extension to 1 Leverton Place. Given this is the only window, the impact on light to this bedroom is unacceptable.

Material loss of privacy would also result from the proposed roof terrace, the eastern end of which would be visible from this window and so provide direct sight in to this bedroom.

(ii) Rear First Floor Bedroom

This room is situated to the rear of our first floor, immediately adjacent to the kitchen within the existing plans for 1 Leverton Place and is a nursery for our young daughter. This bedroom contains one window, facing north (which is not shown in the elevations provided) and also has a rooflight in the ceiling (which is also not shown in the plans provided) to provide additional natural light because the existing kitchen at 1 Leverton Place extends beyond the rear wall of our house at this level and so this window offers limited light. The rooflight enjoys full light to the west (ie where the proposed extension to the top floor is) and the loss of direct light which would result from the proposed extension would be unacceptable.

With regards to loss of privacy, the proposed roof terrace would look directly down in to the rooflight and so to the nursery below removing any privacy from the room at all.

(iii) Existing Roof Terrace

Both 1 Leverton Place and our house benefit from a North facing roof terrace at first floor level. These are immediately adjacent to one another.

Direct sunlight to our roof terrace is already restricted, particularly during the autumn and winter months, when direct sun only reaches approximately 1 metre from the back fence of our roof terrace. The proposed extension would further reduce our access to direct sunlight, substantially reducing the benefit of our roof terrace.

The proposed roof terrace is at second floor level, one storey above the existing first floor roof terraces and so would overlook our entire terrace, which is the only outside space available to our house, removing any privacy or quiet enjoyment from our use of this area. In addition, because the proposed roof terrace is elevated, there would also be an unacceptable sense of intrusion. 1 Leverton Place already has a roof terrace at first floor level and the marginal increase in amenity to the house is outweighed by the undeniable impact on our privacy.

(iv) Ground floor living and dining space

The entire ground floor of our family house is made up of a single large room running the full length of

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

the house: kitchen, dining room, living room and play room in one. This room has one window at the front of the house overlooking the street (with shutters protecting privacy but unavoidably compromising the natural light) and two large rooflights at the back of the house, set into our roof terrace. As we are in the middle of the terraced street, there are no other windows or sources of light or fresh air. As the roof terrace is north facing, the natural light in this room requires careful protection.

The proposed extension would cast a shadow over the majority of one of our rooflights (immediately adjacent to the “music studio” in the proposed plans), materially compromising the light available at the back of the house. It would also impact the direct sunlight available to the rooflight set parallel to our back wall which is already restricted in the autumn and winter months. This would require us to be dependent on artificial light in virtually all of our living space. This is not consistent with Camden planning guideline 6.1 which recognises that access to daylight and sunlight is important for general amenity, health and well-being.

In addition, the proposed roof terrace would be immediately above the rooflight and would give a direct view into our kitchen / dining / living area. This intrusion into our family life and total loss of privacy would be entirely unacceptable.

Further, the proposed extension would be visible from the further forward of our two rooflights and what is currently an unencumbered view up to the sky would be intruded upon to a depth of 2100mm with substantial overbearing effect.

We have considered whether the use of solid fencing on the eastern edge of the proposed roof terrace would address our privacy concerns specifically in respect of the overlooking impact on the kitchen and nursery, but in fact this would have an even greater negative impact on the natural light available.

Finally, we note the proposed music studio at ground floor. It is not clear to us if this is specifically a matter for planning permission or consent as to how the space is used and would certainly not expect any change from residential to commercial or similar use. If works are to proceed, due consideration must be given to the necessary soundproofing. The original conversion of the terraced shops into houses took place with minimal (if any) sound proofing and so we would further suggest that soundproofing measures are undertaken at all levels where works are taking place.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we request that the proposals are rejected in accordance with Camden Planning Policy DP 26 which requires the Council to protect the quality of life of neighbours by only granting permission for development which does not cause loss of amenity. We consider that we have demonstrated the deleterious impact on our access to light, privacy and general amenity that would result from the granting of this application.

We would be happy to provide further information in support of this objection if this would be of benefit to Camden’s planning team.