


**Penny Davis
29 Briardale Gardens
London NW3 7PN**



3 January 2016

Ms E Whittredge
Planner
London Borough of Camden
Camden Town Hall

Dear Ms Whittredge

2014/3668/P 31 Briardale Gardens

Further to the revised plans submitted for number 31 Briardale Gardens London NW3. I wish to restate my continued objection to the proposed extension. In addition I wish to object to the proposed changes to the facade of the property.

It is disappointing that this further set of revised plans do not take into account my own objections or that of other neighbours or Conservation groups who I know will be equally disappointed. The basement element has been removed as a result of the restrictive covenants that burden number 31.

Loss of Amenity

I refer to Jeremy Peters letter of 11th July 2014 on the loss of amenity that I and other neighbours will suffer as a result of this proposal. The proposed turreted glass roof will give the feeling of being overlooked in my home and garden, as well as causing light spillage and glare. Many of the sensible suggestions included in CPG6 to reduce the impact of loss of amenity on neighbours have been ignored including the location of rooms and more extensive use of obscure glazing and screening.

The proposed roof will be mainly glass, and as this will cover the kitchen area which is likely to be the most used room in the house, it will be heavily lit for long periods of time. This combined with the television glare will negatively impact my bedroom and balcony. There is no indication that the developers will etch the glass turreted roof which is most likely a major source of excessive light. The roof light on the side of Number 33 is not shown on the plans to be etched.

Plan number 364-P-03D2 indicates how intrusive the glass turret will be to my balcony which will suffer from the full glare of artificial light. The height of the glass turret at 4.25m (excluding finial) will dominate the view from my garden and spoil the outlook and enjoyment of privacy.

There is no mention of double glazing the roof turret or roof lights so I will also be subjected to the noise from the proposed kitchen area.

Character of the Conservation Area

In addition to neighbours comments, two local conservation groups have also objected to this proposal as failing to meet the standards required in a conservation area. Heath and Hampstead Society commented:

We are also now able to comment on the fact that the house is locally listed, and probably designed by Quennell. The architectural design of these extensions is not up to the quality appropriate to such a distinguished building.

In their letter of 15th January 2015, RedFrog state:

Conservation Area Statement is, "gables and sweeping clay tiled roofs that in some places drop to eaves at ground floor level." Clearly, a glass turreted roof is completely out of character. This would be detrimental to the bats and birds which utilise this green corridor linking to Hampstead Cemetery

There is also concern about the reduction in green space and the negative impact of increased hard surfaces (additional patio area) in the already small back garden.

Number 31 is one of the smallest houses in the street, this is clearly shown on the Ordnance Survey map on the Planning Portal, the proposed extension is out of proportion to the host building, as well as being proportionally larger than those agreed for neighbouring properties. It will dominate the original house.

Number 31 are planning to change the character of their porch and front door by adding glass above the door. This would spoil the look of the property and is discordant with my own as the two form a handed pair. It is not in-keeping with the essence of a Quennell design.

DP25 states that Camden will "take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management plans when assessing applications within conservation areas, and will only permit development that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area"

I would therefore assume that the comments made by both Conservation societies will carry some weight with the Planning Officers and Development Committee and they will refuse the request to have an extension which will dominate the host building and features a central glass turret with finials.

Chimney Stack

It is not clear from the plans whether the developers are intending to remove the chimney stack at the front of the property. The photo cover of the Design and Access Statement shows the chimney stack as it currently exists in the proposed plans elevations 364P OSD

the stack has been removed. The Chimney is part of the overall design of the property, is clearly visible from the street and adds to the character of Briardale. Several other objectors have also raised this issue. I assume that this will be subject to an additional planning request. **Please confirm.**

Sustainability and the Environment

The revised plans make no substantial contribution towards sustainability and the environment which will counter balance the increased carbon emissions from constructing and living in the extension.

There is no indication that the glass roof will be insulated. There is no attempt to reuse existing materials instead some of the historic features of the house are being replaced. There is no indication that walls will be insulated.

In addition as bats have recently been spotted flying over the area at dusk, the increased artificial light will have a detrimental impact on their flight path. These bat flights have been recorded by neighbours and Camden should be fully aware of Bat roosts in Kidderpore Avenue at both the Barrett site and the proposed Kings College development. There is obviously the cumulative impact of development on bat habitats.

The gardens at Briardale are a site for birds nesting in the Spring, there is a nest in the Cherry Tree in my own garden next to the Magnolia tree as well as a Black Birds' nest, if these are in use care needs to be taken during the construction phase. All nesting birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

Inaccurate Information

The Design and Access Statement contains a number of inaccurate statements as follows:

- The developers repeatedly attempt to use the extensions at Number 29 and Number 33 as precedents. My own extension was approved by Camden in the 1940s under different planning regulations. It is 2.7m in depth less than the 4.2m proposed by the applicants and does not have central glass turret. I would be delighted if the applicants would scale back their proposal to reflect my own. The extension to Number 33 had full planning permission and differs from the one proposal as it involved the conversion of existing buildings. Furthermore in the case of Number 33 the roof is flat and not predominately glass and the actual extension to the building was moderate. Neither extension provides the developers with a precedent that would justify the current plans, Glass roofed extension are not a feature of the area.
- The developers continue to confuse buildings outside Camden and outside RedFrog Conservation area in both their written statement and the photographic examples provided, photograph 13 is not in Briardale or Camden. Houses in Pattison Road are part of a different borough and are not relevant in the current context. In addition the balcony shown in photograph 12 predates my own residency (over 20 years) it is not the result of recent planning. Photograph 11 is a fantastic example of modern architecture, which replaced an old garage - the design is an innovative example of sustainability, again I would welcome the developers adopting some of the initiatives that have been incorporated - including recycling rainwater and heating.

- Measurements - the measurements provided by the developer are **internal** rather than external and these have been used as comparators with neighbours external measurements. The full height of the extension will be over 4.25m (at its highest) and the depth over 3.5m plus .7m, for the bay window (a depth of 4.2m) extending 1.3m beyond my own extension.
- The assertion that the extension will not damage neighbours is entirely conjecture as Mr Blake is neither a qualified architect nor a structural engineer therefore, is not technically qualified to comment on the impact that foundations of differing levels will have on the stability of my home.
- The arboricultural assessment assumes the existence of a cellar under the rear of the property - this is inaccurate and not shown on the plans.

Arboricultural assessment

The magnolia tree in the garden of 31 Briardale is a material constraint on the development of the proposed extension.

The revised arboricultural assessment has been amended to reflect that a basement is no longer being built under number 31, the assessment fails to address any of the points raised by Adam Hollis of Landmark Trees in his report dated 9th February 2015.

These include:

- Inadequate trial pit information (the initial trial pits were dug some distance from the tree)
- Mitigation for the secondary impacts on the tree posed by the size and height of the extension
- Omission of details regarding the off site tree T6, from which it is proposed to remove two branches
- Absence of information and mitigation required to address the secondary impacts of leaf litter on the glass roof which will be used as an excuse to fell or over prune the tree in the future.
- The omission of clear identified RPA on the root protection plan
- Absence of information on on-site storage
- The impact on the tree of digging beneath the party wall with the RPA
- Minimal construction information
- The impact of the foundations noted for the proposed extension, which highlighted as within 1 m of the Magnolia
- The omission of any mitigation for the proposed terracing within the RPA of the magnolia.

The ATS assessment assume the existence of a basement, there is none, there is a small cellar at the front of the house which is shown in previous plans now removed from the website.

For the future health of the Magnolia, these issues need to be addressed, and given the Developers stated fondness for the tree, I am sure they will be keen to do so. Indeed it is Adam Hollis' recommendation;

...that the size and height of the extension pose potential primary and secondary impacts to the magnolia. For permitted (no-harm) development, it would be appropriate to scale down its proportions, given the size and height of the extension have prompted several objections including two from local Conservation societies

Construction Management Plan

The developers are building an extension on a former brickyard with known hydrological and geological complexities I am therefore surprised by the lack of a construction management plan. As already mentioned the health and survival of the Magnolia tree is at risk and understanding the proposed foundations is crucial to ensuring its well being. The developers will be working in a confined space and there is no entry to the back garden except down a narrow back passage or through the house. As the lack of space has previously been used by the Developers as a reason for not undertaking further testing, I am not sure how they will get the necessary machinery into the garden or how its storage will be managed to mitigate damage to the tree and neighbouring gardens.

In view of the above, I restate my objections to the extension as follows and further object to the proposed changes to the facade

- To all changes to the facade of the property including removal of chimney stack and added glass above the front door
- To the overbearing size and scale of the extension which will intrude on my privacy and outlook and is out of proportion to the host building.
- The detrimental impact the glass roof will have on bat flight paths and habitat
- To the predominately glass roof with turret and finials - which is discordant with a Quennell house and will cause light trespass and glare.
- The height and scale of the extension is a threat to the survival of the beautiful magnolia tree - this needs to be properly protected.
- The lack of a fully detailed tree survey and adequate tree protection measures
- The lack of construction management plan

It is hoped that these objections are taken into account and will result in a development more sympathetic to the house and one which will make a positive contribution to the conservation area without harming the privacy and amenity of neighbours or damaging the Magnolia tree.

I request that this planning application is considered by the Development Committee.

Yours sincerely

Penny Davis