

3 Leverton Street
London
NW5 2PH

FAO: John Diver
Camden Planning Department
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square c/o Town Hall
Judd Street London
WC1H 9JE

18 May 2016

Dear Mr Diver

**Re: 300 Kentish Town Road, NW5 2TG. Planning Application Ref.
2016/1745/P**

I wish to object to the above planning application and my objection is based on the following grounds:

- Loss of privacy
- Inconsistent with Camden planning policy
- Incomplete or misleading information

Loss of Privacy

- 1) The plans indicate an extension of the east facing exterior wall of a bathroom by 1.2 meters further to the east, and the installation of floor to ceiling French windows in this wall. The plans indicate that this space will be used as a study/lounge (though see below). The current window in this wall is a small frosted pane of the type typical of a bathroom.

These changes represent a significant change to the level of intrusion into the privacy of the rear bedrooms at numbers 1 and 3 Leverton Street.

I.e. a room in the property at 300 Kentish Road that previously had no direct line of sight into the rear bedrooms of numbers 1 & 3 Leverton Street will now provide a clear, unrestricted and intimate view of the interior of these bedrooms via the proposed French windows.

The distance between the windows of the two properties will now be approximately 12 meters as opposed to the recommended guidelines of 18-21 meters.

The rear bedrooms of numbers 1&3 Leverton Street are in constant use and the occupants of the study/lounge at 300 Kentish Town Road would be able to observe the activity therein as if they were watching television.

- 2) The plans indicate the installation of floor to ceiling French Windows along the north facing façade of the property.

The existing windows are of much more modest proportions and limit the line of sight into the first and second floor rooms of the properties at numbers 1,2 & 3 Leverton Place.

Again, the proposed changes will provide a panoramic view into the private living space of the Leverton Place properties.

The distance between the north facing façade of 300 Kentish Town Road and the properties of Leverton Place, 10 meters, is already significantly less than the recommended guidelines of 18-21 meters.

Although no outward extension of the exterior wall is proposed, the introduction of French windows will again increase the sense of intrusion and lack of privacy in Leverton place.

- 3) The existing roof terrace was never granted planning permission, nor for that matter was permission granted to convert the property from office space to residential living space.

The distance between the boundary of the eastern edge of the roof terrace and the rear bedrooms of numbers 1&3 Leverton Street is approximately 6 meters.

This already facilitates clear and overly intrusive sight into the rear bedrooms of numbers 1 & 3 Leverton Street.

As a result of this proximity, informal social contact with previous residents of 300 Kentish Town Road has given rise to the following observations from said residents looking into our rear bedroom:

“I really enjoyed watching you practice your violin the other day”

“You have a lot of books in your bedroom”

“What did you win the trophies on your shelf for?”

“Where did you get that brown sofa bed I can see?”

Increasing the residential capacity of the property at 300 Kentish Town Road will only increase such instances of intrusive observation.

Inconsistent with Camden planning policy

300 Kentish Town road is in a conservation area and is surrounded by a number of listed buildings, for example the properties on Leverton Street and the Assembly House Pub.

With specific reference to the proposed installation of French windows, the proposals are entirely inconsistent with Camden Council's policy for development within a conservation area. Not only are they out of character, they fail to further the stated aim of the policy to preserve and enhance the character of the conservation area.

Incomplete, inconsistent and misleading information.

The history of planning applications for this property demonstrate that according to the last application, ref. 2015/0818/P, this property is a one bedroom flat.

The current application represents the property as a three bedroom flat, thus there is already a notable inconsistency between the so called "existing" plans submitted as part of the application in 2016 and the application submitted in 2015.

The question therefore is how did a one bedroom flat as per the planning application in 2015, become a 3 bedroom flat per the existing use plans in 2016?

The answer must be that the current owner has already made interior changes to the structure of the property.

It is worth noting, that no mention of these interior changes is mentioned in the current application.

Furthermore, the current plans for the "existing" diagrams reveal four exterior windows on the south facing façade, whereas in the planning application of 2015 there are only two such windows.

During March 2016 scaffolding was erected over the rear extension of the property indicating that building work took place. Subsequent physical observation of the south facing façade revealed that there are now four windows on the south façade whereas previously there were only two. This is consistent with converting this side of the property from a one bedroom property to a three bedroom property.

It is my understanding that the installation of two additional external windows should be subject to planning consent.

I can find no evidence on Camden Council's planning website of an application for, and approval of, permission to install two new exterior windows.

As noted previously in this letter, the planning application of 2015 indicates that this flat is a one bedroom flat.

In practice I believe this flat has always been marketed and occupied as a two bedroom flat on the rental market with the communal living space presented as the second bedroom. In the last ten years, it has never been occupied by one person, or a co-habiting couple who might need only one bedroom. It is my opinion that the absentee landlord has consistently over represented the capacity of the accommodation and will continue to do so in future, such that that the proposed Study/Lounge will in fact be used as a bedroom.


I note also that the plans make no reference to additional storage space for bicycles, prams and the increased amount of refuse consistent with the new dimensions of the property

To summarise, if approved this application will:

- Have an adverse effect on the Privacy of neighbours
- Be inconsistent with Camden's planning aims
- Merely serve to satisfy the economic aims of an absentee landlord with no connection to Camden and the quality of life of its residents.

I therefore urge you to reject these plans entirely and that the Landlord be instructed to remove the two windows constructed without planning consent.

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Darryl Davies.

Darryl Davies