

Tessa Craig
Planning Officer
Camden Council
Town hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 8ND

March 2nd 2017

RE proposed development Flat 1, 63-65 Haverstock Hill

Application Ref: 2017/06/05/P

Thank you for the notification regarding the proposed development of the aforementioned flat.

While not wishing to be unreasonable to the new owners, based on the plans as on your website, I am writing to object as I am very concerned at the size of this proposed 'extension' in the Eton Conservation Area.

The owners claim about the history of the flat in the Design and Access Statement appears to be inaccurate. According to the daughter of the previous owner, the flat has never been divided into two since the original conversion in 1972 – the original planning permission did allow for two flats by internal division but was never implemented. This (hypothetical) second flat already has its own separate entrance located on the upper ground floor internal to the building and was included in the original design. Since 1985 until the end of 2016 the property was used as a single family unit until its recent purchase, and it was marketed for sale as a four-bedroom family home. Thus it is inaccurate to describe the proposal as a 'reinstatement' to two, three bedroom flats.

Rear extension: Amenity and Outlook (CPG 4.9; 4.10: Bullets 5,6 & 7)

The plans submitted propose to split the bulk of the garden into two and create two self-contained flats with extensions and large terraces which will (on current intentions) concrete **over half** the existing garden. There will be a fence dividing the two patios with what is described as a 'communal' garden at the rear. On the current plans, the combination of the extensions, patios and steps will substantially reduce (half to two thirds) the garden area with a consequent loss of amenity and outlook for all the flats which overlook the garden. The new owners claim that neither of the remaining trees will be affected, but I don't see how these cannot be affected by the current proposals. To date I have not been provided with the promised detailed plans with clearly mark dimensions for the garden.

Flat 4 is directly above Flat 1. It benefits from two large picture windows out to the back. As such this 'extension' (5.5m building + 5 meter stone terrace + steps) will have a direct adverse impact on its outlook and amenity. The proposed addition will result in Flat 4 overlooking a new build structure which will destroy one of the best features of this flat, ie outlook: overlooking a beautiful garden (its original selling point for me and previous owners). Should this **development** proceed the view will consist of a 5.5m + extension with four skylights in a flat roof, past which another 5ms of land will be concreted over to create a terrace (which I believe will include electric lights). In addition the current stairs will be pushed much further back beyond the patio areas for quite a depth. Furthermore, a

fence will divide part of what will remain of the garden into two narrow strips, with only the very rear, about a third of the current space recognisable as a garden. This, the developers describe as a 'communal' area but will in effect be 'communal' to their Flat 1 only in practical terms as no one else has access.

The number and size of skylights that are proposed in the flat roof are likely to reflect light upwards which will disturb the view from my flat most of all, but also from all the flats at the rear.

In short, this development (for it is much more than an extension in my view means that the amenity and outlook of all the flats to the rear will be lost, and lost for ever, which goes against the following CPG sections:

- 4.9 "A rear extension insensitively or inappropriately designed can spoil the appearance of a property or group of properties and harm the amenity of neighbouring properties, for example in terms of outlook and access to daylight and sunlight."
- 4.10....
 - 5. ..."not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure;
 - 6. allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden; and
 - 7. retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity, including that of neighbouring properties, proportionate to that of the surrounding area."

Scale and proportion

This is not a modest or subservient addition/ extension and does not provide a suitable ratio of built to unbuilt land. It is a development. The 5.5m projection of the extension from the building's rear wall is out of proportion. It profoundly disturbs the ratio of built to unbuilt space (CPG 4.10 Bullet point 1). As far as I'm aware, no other building nearby has such a large extension. It goes against CPG 4.10 Bullet point 7).

Furthermore, this seems particularly unhelpful at a time when pollution levels in Camden are high and rising, further concreting and in all likelihood, cutting one or more of the remaining trees (part of the garden has already been denude), cannot but add to the pollution problem.

The current garden is in keeping with the pattern of surrounding properties which at the rear have large gardens. The plans suggest that the property as a whole (ie 63-65 collectively), will lose a reasonable size garden for the benefit of the property as a whole thus failing to retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and a garden proportionate to that of the surrounding area (see CPG 1 Design 4.10).

Furthermore, the proposed extension may also prevent any prospect of myself as the owner of Flat 4, of being able to even apply for permission to add a small balcony for Flat 4 in the future, possibly because of rights to privacy and light to Flat 1 below

It is also possible that the extension with its four skylights, may reflect light upwards disturbing the views from my property at night, and possibly affecting some of the other flats on this side of the building.

Front extension: Design & Amenity

The building, particularly the section which covers Flat 1(2) is situated in the Eton conservation area. I am concerned that the visual effect of the front extension onto the

exiting terrace/ path may detract from the design which at one time was considered award winning by the firm of architect Ted Levy. With the proposed changes, the architectural integrity of the front will be compromised, in particular the articulation of the front elevation. It will also adversely alter the aspect of the front garden, which is a common part for all 11 flats. Such an extension will change the aspect and affect everyone entering the building on a daily basis, adversely in my opinion, and the area as a whole thus going against the Camden's planning guidelines CPG1 Design 3.11 ...

"the character of a conservation area depends on the presence of specific original details and where these are lost the historic interest and attractive character of the area deteriorates."

And also pertains to CPG 4.10: Bullet point 2 & 3.

2: "respect and preserve the original design & proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style"

3: "respect and preserve existing architectural features such as projecting bays (etc)..."

Front & Rear extensions: Security

While the applicant has tried to reassure me on the question of security, I remain anxious. The suggestion from the applicant was for a kind of light beam that would send a message to their phone (or any other phone) to alert for intruders, but unless they or one happen to be *in situ* and capable of an effective response, I remain concerned. This applies to the extensions both at the front where my flat in particular is at risk of easy access and the back where the applicant has already removed some fencing at the rear.

In summary, I object by virtue of the scale of the extension, the ratio of built to unbuilt space, loss of amenity re outlook, light pollution/spillage, the allowance for the retention of a reasonable sized garden, the retention of existing landscaping and garden amenity. The new owners clearly want to increase the value of their own property however, it looks like this would be at the expense of all the other leaseholders as outlined above. Surely something less invasive to the other occupants could be achieved here.

Thank you in advance for your consideration

Owner Flat 4

Relevant CPG guidelines:

Rear extensions

4.9 A rear extension insensitively or inappropriately designed can spoil the appearance of a property or group of properties and harm the amenity of neighbouring properties, for example in terms of outlook and access to daylight and sunlight.

General principles

4.10 Rear extensions should be designed to:

1. be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, **form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing**;
2. respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;
3. respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies or chimney stacks;
4. respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including **the ratio of built to unbuilt space**;

5. not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, **outlook**, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure;
6. **allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden; and**
7. **retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity, including that of neighbouring properties, proportionate to that of the surrounding area**