We have lived at No. 11 St Mark's Crescent for over 33 years.

Our neighbours at No. 12 have submitted a planning application proposing to reconstruct their existing single story rear extension extending further into the garden The planning application also proposes significant alterations to the existing glazing over the front basement area.

We wish to register our strong objection to both of these proposals for the following reasons -

**Loss of daylight and privacy arising from the reconstruction of the rear extension extending at a greater depth into the garden**

The existing single story extension (which was built with no planning permission) is admittedly unattractive and out of character with the original design of these Victorian buildings. The existing extension already reduces our source of light and sense of privacy. Persons standing on the balcony of the extension can look backwards into our ground floor rear study room, which is used daily as an office by my husband.

The current extension extends approximately 2.3 m from the main wall of the building into the garden. The railings to the terrace above extend a similar 2.3 m from the rear of the building.

The proposal is to demolish the existing extension and to reconstruct a single story extension (extending a further approximately 1.3 m into the rear garden area than the original 2.3 m of the existing extension.

The railings to the terrace above will extend a further 300 mm approximately than the existing position of the railings.

We have been in communication with the owners of No. 12 and appreciate that the height of the extension (as previously proposed) has now been lowered (by reducing the internal floor level) so that the vertical height of the extension is approximately the same as the existing. This is appreciated. Similarly it is appreciated that the increased depth of the proposed extension (approximately 1.3 m) has been ‘set back’ from the party garden wall line by approximately 600 mm .

Partly as a consequence of this setback the flank terrace railings are now proposed to be located approximately 600 mm back from the garden party wall line. The existing configuration had these railings approximately on the party wall line.

It is appreciated that these revisions (resulting from our dialogue with the owners of No. 12) have been developed in an effort to go someway to meet our objections.

Regrettably however, the current proposals nevertheless still involve the building mass increasing into the garden area of approximately 1.3 m thus further reducing daylight and views (from the south-west) from our rear study window and increasing the already unpleasant sense of enclosure in our garden area and views from the rear study.

Also regrettably, although the current proposal sets the railings back approximately from the garden party wall line they nevertheless extend into the garden area depth approximately a further 300 mm Consequently, despite this setback, the increasing depth of railings facilitates even greater backward overlooking from this corner of the terrace into our study window.

Any proposal to increase an already unfortunate overlooking configuration is wholly indefensible and any proposal of a screen in this situation is not acceptable, as this would further reduce natural light and sunlight to the rear of our premises. This can be appreciated by studying the submitted drawings.

We also feel that the proposed ‘setback’ of the railings where these abut the flank of the projecting bay window to No. 12 is visually ungainly and detracts from the clarity of the projecting bay window element Similarly the proposed incongruous angular setback at the abutment with the party wall is ‘strange’ and ungainly and harms the remaining clarity that the existing rectilinear extension exhibits .

These two elements worsen an already regrettable extension and diminish the surviving character of the rear elevations of both Nos. 11 and 12 ,as originally built as an identical pair .

We do not accept therefore that these revisions meet our objections (to a significant loss of our privacy/overlooking and loss of daylight) in any meaningful fashion. The harm that this existing extension (built without planning permission) has caused should not as proposed be made more harmful to us.

**Loss of garden space  further incursion into the garden area generally arising from the increased depth of this proposed extension**

The existing extension was constructed without planning application and is brutal and out of character with the existing buildings. We appreciate that many of the houses in this terrace have single-storey extensions, a few similarly, unfortunately in an uncomfortable rectilinear configuration. However, more recently other extensions have inclined or grass/living roofs ,all in an effort to mitigate the visual mass of these additions. The majorities are in style sympathetic to the character of the buildings and have generally retained balcony railings in their original positions and not repositioned them at the end of the extensions .

The proposed extension makes no effort in this regard and indeed the existing rectilinear mass is proposed to be increased in depth by approximately 1.3 m .

We strongly object to the proposal to further extend an already unfortunate building mass into the rear garden areas .

Granting approval, in the circumstances, to an extension on an extension, further reducing the garden areas would create a most unfortunate precedent for the remainder of St Mark's Crescent .

Due to the curve of the Crescent garden depths of Nos 10 and No. 11 are already less than the depth of gardens to the remainder of the crescent extending to the east. We feel it is important that proportionality in the ratio of garden space to the footprint of the houses (and any later extensions) is adhered to. Any granting of larger extensions diminishing the gardens and planted areas would erode and be seriously harmful to the mature and extensive green views enjoyed from the public canal towpath and which contribute significantly to the character of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area .

These are not at all ‘ordinary’ back garden rear elevations in any sense. The rear elevations of St Mark's Crescent are viewed across the canal and play an exceptionally significant role in defining an important part of the character of this Conservation Area

**Inappropriate glazing infill to the front basement light well**

We appreciate that our neighbour’s basement light well is already partially enclosed

However we understand that proposals to enclose these areas is generally thought to be inappropriate and to be resisted as has been stated in various documents produced by the Primrose Hill conservation area advisory committee .

Therefore a reconstruction of an existing inappropriate glazing system by more modern double glazed construction using modern glazing bars and at a greater height would be an increased visual intrusion to the pictorial elements of the front elevation. We appreciate that the existing glazing cannot be removed but would register our objections to increasing and making worse this already inappropriate visual intrusion .

The present proposal is harmful to the character and appearance of the intimate nature of this terrace and fails to preserve or enhance the character of these buildings in a Conservation Area .

We are not aware of any glazing enclosures to front basement light wells (other than the partial one existing to No. 12 in St Mark's Crescent.) An existing glazed construction which is already contrary to the views of the PHCAAC should not be regularised or given planning approval for any modification or increase in mullion size, gutters, flashings or height etc .

Such a glazed construction as proposed would be highly visually intrusive and unharmonious to the small and intimate character of the Street. Any increase of glazing or enclosure would create a most unfortunate precedent the remainder of the street. The requirements and advice of the PHCAAC should be respected.

On these grounds we would request this proposal be refused. Any approval of this application would make a bad situation even worse.

We wish to be notified of the date of committee meeting.

Sarah and Sandy Lieberson

11 St Marks Crescent London  NW1