

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1559/P	Ms Dzidra Stipnieks	24 Romney Court 139 Haverstock Hill Belsize Park London NW3 4RX	09/05/2016 12:17:14	OBJEMPER	24 Romney Court 139-141 Haverstock Hill Belsize Park London NW3 4RX

Carlos Martin  
Planning Solutions Team  
Planning Department  
Development Management  
Camden Council  
Camden Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London WC1H 9JE.

8th May 2016

Dear Mr Martin,

Planning Application 2016/1559/P  
135 Haverstock Hill, London, NW3 4RJ - Erection of 5h and 6th floor extensions

I write as the owner and resident of Flat 24 Romney Court to object to the above planning application for the reasons set out below.

I have studied the application documents on the Council's website and, because of the 135 Haverstock Hill's location in a designated conservation area, the Council's Belsize Conservation Area Statement.

My reasons for objecting are:

#### 1 LOSS OF AMENITY TO NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTS - OVERLOOKING

The applicant proposes to construct a sixth floor roof extension which will extend from front to back along the north west elevation of 135 Haverstock Hill. The edge of this structure will be located directly above the existing exterior wall of the building and will not be set-back from its edge. It will also be within a few feet of the windows of the habitable rooms on the adjoining building at 139-141 Haverstock Hill.

The proposed elevations, and especially drawing HYA 15042 (P) 107 "Proposed North West Elevation", show that the sidewall of the proposed sixth floor extension facing 139-141 Haverstock Hill will be solely constructed of floor to ceiling glass windows.

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

This is in complete contrast with the solid brick frontage of the ground to fifth floors of 135 Haverstock Hill on this frontage – which totally excludes windows from that part of 135 Haverstock Hill which faces the building at 139-141 Haverstock Hill. The only windows on this frontage of 135 Haverstock Hill are forward of the building line of 139-141 Haverstock Hill and therefore only overlook its front car park.

The forward location of the proposed sixth floor windows at the building's edge means that the occupants of these rooms will be able to approach the inside of the windows and look into the habitable rooms at 139-141 Haverstock Hill.

There is no mention in the application that all, or indeed any, of the proposed glazing on this frontage will be permanently obscured in order to prevent the occupants of 135 Haverstock Hill from looking into the habitable rooms of 139-141 Haverstock Hill.

I would draw your attention to the error in drawings HYA 15042 (P) 003 & 103 "Sixth Floor Plans" which fail to show the windows of the fifth floor bedroom at 139-141 Haverstock Hill which faces south east and looks out directly across the existing front roof terrace of 135 Haverstock Hill. The proposed glazed sixth floor structure will be directly in front of, and overlook, this bedroom window at 139-141 Haverstock Hill. As the Applicant's Design & Access Statement contains a number of rooftop photographs, I am surprised that they have overlooked the existence of this bedroom window.

A further clarification which needs to be considered is that of the windows at 139-141 Haverstock Hill which are labelled as Kitchen Windows on elevation drawings HTA 15042 (P) 009 & 109 "Sections". The "L" shaped configuration of the kitchen and livingroom areas of these flats means that they function as an integrated habitable space. In these circumstances any overlooking from an extension to 135 Haverstock Hill should be resisted.

It should be noted that 135 Haverstock Hill was constructed some twenty years after 139-141 Haverstock Hill and was carefully designed to avoid any overlooking into any of the windows of 139-141 Haverstock Hill which face 135 Haverstock Hill.

A further overlooking concern is the proposal to construct a South East facing sixth floor terrace overlooking 131 Haverstock Hill. This is shown on drawing HYA 15042 (P) 103 "Sixth Floor Plan", in a location where no terrace currently exists.

## 2 LOSS OF AMENITY TO NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTS – LOSS OF DAYLIGHT & SHADOWING

The location of 135 Haverstock Hill building, when compared to the location of 139-141 Haverstock Hill means that any increase in the height of 135 Haverstock Hill along its North West elevation will block morning sunlight and daylight from the rooms with South East facing windows at 139-141

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

Haverstock Hill. There would also be an increase in shadowing.

In these circumstances, I am disappointed that the applicant has chosen not to submit a Daylight and Shadowing Statement in support of their application.

**3 FAILURE TO RESPECT NEIGHBOURING LISTED BUILDINGS AT 129 – 131 HAVERSTOCK HILL**

I am disappointed by the failure of the Design & Access Statement to refer to the listed status of the neighbouring buildings at 129 – 131 Haverstock Hill.

At present the increase in the building height from 131 to 135 Haverstock Hill is moderated by the progressive stepping back of the upper storeys of the street frontage and South East elevation of 135 Haverstock Hill.

The proposed roof extension would result in the elimination of virtually all this moderation and result in a near six story vertical frontage alongside the listed buildings.

The proposed roof extensions are therefore unacceptable because of their detrimental effect on the neighbouring listed buildings.

**4 FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH CONSERVATION AREA POLICY – FAILURE TO ENHANCE BUILDING & CONSERVATION AREA**

Policy BE19 of the Council’s Belsize Conservation Area Statement states that:

“New development should be seen as an opportunity to enhance the Conservation Area.”

It is therefore a matter of concern that the proposed roof extension fails to take advantage of this opportunity and indeed, as discussed below, detracts from the Conservation Area due to its massing and height.

**5 FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH CONSERVATION AREA POLICY – DETRIMENTAL TO FORM & CHARACTER OF EXISTING BUILDING**

Policy BE26 of the Council’s Belsize Conservation Area Statement states that:

“Roof extensions and alterations, which change the shape and form of the roof, can have a harmful

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Consultees Addr:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

impact on the Conservation Area and are unlikely to be acceptable where:

- It would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building
- The property forms part of a group or terrace which remains largely, but not completely unimpaired
- The property forms part of a symmetrical composition, the balance of which would be upset
- The roof is prominent, particularly in long views.”

In the case of the application the following aspects are detrimental to the carefully considered form and character of the existing building, and are therefore reasons for refusing the application.

- Removing, by the construction of the proposed fifth floor extension, of the existing phased stepping back at the South East corner of 135 Haverstock Hill.
- Construction of a box-like sixth floor roof extension across the front and North East elevation of the 135 Haverstock Hill.
- Proposing to construct the fifth and sixth floor extensions at the building’s edge, rather than stepping them in by a “quarantine zone” of some two or three metres from the building’s edge. Which is the approach which has been followed with the construction of an additional floor at 2 Antrim Grove.
- Construction of a sixth floor roof extension which will be seen for a considerable distance when the nearby deciduous trees are not in leaf. It should be noted that a key nearby deciduous tree at 135 Haverstock Hill is extremely mature and must be approaching the end of its natural life. In these circumstances its screening value must be questioned. It is therefore a matter of regret that the Applicant hasn’t submitted an Arboricultural Statement which evidences the future life of this and other key screening trees in support of their application.

I do not believe that the proposed fifth and sixth floor extensions are architecturally sympathetic to the character of 135 Haverstock Hill, nor do they retain the overall integrity of the roof form. I do not believe that the current proposals, with their construction vertically above the external walls of 135 Haverstock Hill, are subordinate to this host building.

#### 6 FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH CONSERVATION AREA POLICY – FAILURE TO RESPECT HEIGHT & SCALE OF EXISTING BUILDING

Policy BE20 of the Council’s Belsize Conservation Area Statement requires modern development to respect the layout, height and scale of the existing development.

The proposed development will result in excessive massing above the existing building which, as a consequence, will become the tallest building along this low-rise Conservation Area’s frontage on Haverstock Hill. The application should therefore be rejected.

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

7 USE OF PROPOSED ROOF EXTENSION

It is disappointing to note in the Design & Access Statement that the proposed fifth and sixth floor roof extensions will be used to provide additional “living space”.

While roof extensions are sometimes justified on the grounds that they will provide additional housing units, and thereby make a modest contribution to London’s housing need, no such justification exists in this case.

Given the above concerns, I object to this planning application and ask that it is refused.

Yours sincerely,

Ms. D. J. K. Stipnieks

---