

RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATION 2016/2507/P

A. Objection on grounds that it does not protect the quality of life of neighbours (DP26).

There is a shared entrance pathway between 4 families: Crown Cottage, 150a Haverstock Hill and Flats 152a, 152b and 152c Haverstock Hill. This is 1.2 metres wide and is a pleasant amenity with York stone paving, white walls which reflect sunlight and plenty of plants which are also attractive to anyone passing the gateway on Haverstock Hill. Any first floor extension would overshadow this shared amenity and would block ALL light to this pathway making it a damp, dark alley with no possible light for plants.



Photo Shared Entrance Pathway at 150a/152 Haverstock Hill NW3 2AY

B. Objection that Daylight model shown in attachment to Application is incorrect because its measurements are incorrect. It models 2 windows belonging to Flat 152a as higher than the roof of new build. In fact the top of planned extension is stated in Application to be 5.3 metres being the minimum in order to comply with building regs for room height. Once a green roof is applied, the actual height is likely to be more. The 2 windows affected are 5.16m & 5.28m max height from the ground. This would mean complete loss of sunlight with a view of a brick wall just 1.2 m from windows, and current views blocked both of rear of the property and of Haverstock Hill. The windows presently enjoy sunlight for a large part of the day, winter and summer.



Photo view of Haverstock Hill from bedroom window 152a Haverstock Hill NW32AY



Photo view of rear from bedroom window 152a Haverstock Hill NW3 2AY

C. Objection on the grounds of a new build too close to a mid 19th century house and two, originally, 18th century houses one Grade 2, the other is making an application for protection and is probably older as King Charles II visited, hence its name Crown Cottage. The

application states, incorrectly, that 152 planning application in 1985 to create flats altered the windows. This is incorrect, the windows retain their original brick lintels. One blocked off window was opened up again. The works were internal to create flats to pass planning and building regulations.

D. Objection on the grounds that the plans for the new build show a bathroom with toilet on first floor. There are no extra soundproofing materials mentioned and no means of disposing of foul waste is shown and as this is an internal bathroom, together with a cloakroom immediately underneath on the floor below, it is assumed there will need to be air vents opening 1.2 metres from our bedroom window and macerating toilets in order to remove waste to the sewer 25 feet away. This bathroom will be 1.2 metres from our bedroom which will mean the noise of running water together with machinery will disturb our sleep and we shall be unable to open our window because of noise and air pollution.

E. Objection on the grounds that the new extension will remove and obscure the 19th century frontage of the building, will create a dank, dark alley to the side of it and by virtue of this not only devalue the surrounding properties but thus also devalue the block.

by P. Wise and A.Margolis of Flat A,152 Haverstock Hill NW3 2AY