

Flat 4  
64 Lawford Road  
London  
NW5 2LN

12<sup>th</sup> March 2017

Dear Sir / Madam,

We are writing to object to the planning application 2017/0839/P for Upper Flat, 75 Bartholomew Road London NW5 2AH.

Our objection is based on a number of factors, with the most predominant being the intrusion on our privacy that this proposed design would introduce.

### **Privacy and Overlooking**

Both the proposed roof extension and terrace will overlook the main habitable area of our property (our living room and kitchen) leading to a significant intrusion on our privacy.

This is contrary to the advice given in the Camden Planning Guidance documentation and, we believe, is contrary to policy DP26.3.

- *Camden Planning Guidance | **Design** | Roofs, terraces and balconies, Section 5.25*  
“A terrace will only normally be acceptable on the rear of properties.” and  
“[A terrace] should not result in overlooking of habitable rooms of adjacent properties.”

*Camden Planning Guidance | **Housing** | Residential development standards, Section 4.25*

*“New development, extensions, alterations and conversions should not subject neighbours to unacceptable noise disturbance, overlooking or loss of security.”*

*Camden Planning Guidance 6 | **Amenity** | Overlooking and privacy*

*“Development are to be designed to protect the privacy of existing dwellings”*

Our top floor flat in the former Duke of Cambridge pub has two large 140cm x 220cm sash windows that face across to 75 Bartholomew Road. We are currently afforded some privacy in that we have installed half height shutters on the windows to avoid being overlooked by (and to avoid overlooking) the properties on the other side of the road.

The proposed roof extension and terrace would have direct line of sight into our living room and kitchen area, even if our half height shutters were fully closed.

The images on the following pages show the extent to which the proposed roof extension and terrace would overlook our living room and kitchen area. They show both the existing

situation and where the proposed designs show the roof extension would lie (indicated in red). Please note that the red areas have been drawn on visually from looking at the proposed designs and will not be as accurate as the scale drawings.

We would also like to point out that the red areas indicated in these drawings show the extent of just the roof extension, which is set back from the front of the property. The overlook from the terrace, in front of the roof extension, would be *even more* significant.

***(Pictures are shown on the following pages)***

**Overlook into Window 1 - Existing**



**Overlook into Window 1 - Proposed**



**Overlook into Window 2 - Existing**



**Overlook into Window 2 - Proposed**



With this information in mind, we strongly disagree with the application's Design and Access statement where it suggests that "No neighbouring properties will be affected in terms of overlooking or daylight issues."

## **Outlook**

Whilst noting that protecting a specific view is not a material planning consideration, we are concerned that the visual amenity enjoyed by us has not been considered in the proposed design - and that consideration of this is specifically mentioned in Camden Planning Guidance.

Since the introduction of the Bartholomew Estate Conservation area, the top floor of the Duke of Cambridge pub has enjoyed a largely uninterrupted outlook to the east, including the historic tower of the Camden School for Girls. The proposed development would significantly reduce this visual amenity by reducing the amount of open sky and obscuring the historic tower with a more overbearing modern metal, glass and brick structure. (This is illustrated in the previous picture of Window 2).

## **Feedback on other planning considerations**

The proposal's Design and Access statement makes reference to the previously granted planning permission for roof extensions to the neighbouring properties and argues that this forms a precedent to allow the proposed design.

We would argue that the planning permission granted for the build roof extensions at numbers 77 and 79 was actually granted *prior to current planning policies and guidance* and that, therefore, this should not be taken as a consideration.

In addition to the changes to more general Camden planning policy and guidance since the previous planning permission was granted, we note that the Bartholomew Estate conservation area statement, issued many years after the planning approval for roof extensions at numbers 77 and 79, contains the following key points and statements.

- 75 Bartholomew Road is included in a list of "important local buildings" that "make a contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area".
- "Although recent external alterations have been quite minor and isolated, collectively they are beginning to erode the character of the Conservation Area."
- BE1 – "New development should be seen as an opportunity to enhance the Conservation Area. All development should respect existing features such as building lines, rooflines, elevation design, and where appropriate, architectural characteristics, detailing, profile, and materials of adjoining buildings."
- BE16 – "Mansard additions and other forms of roof extension which fundamentally change the roof form are uncharacteristic of the Conservation Area. The introduction of a roof addition of this nature is unlikely to be acceptable due to the adverse effect on the skyline and surrounding streetscene."

- BE31 – “Planning permission may be required for the formation of roof terraces. It is advisable to consult the Planning Service if this is the case. Roof terraces are not part of the established character of the Conservation area. The creation of high level balconies where they will be visually intrusive or result in partial removal of the roof will be resisted.”

Finally, we do not believe there is a strong argument for the need for a terrace if the proposed rood extension is to be used as a bedroom.

### **Suggestions**

If, for example, the terrace were to be located at the rear of the property (as per Camden Planning Guidance’s own recommendations) then it would not overlook residential properties. Furthermore, if the design of the roof extension were to be lowered then it would have less impact on our privacy and outlook.

### **Summary**

We object to the currently proposed design in terms of its adverse effect on our privacy and outlook. We believe that it is contrary to current Camden planning policy and design guidelines, as well as guidelines for the Bartholomew Estate Conservations Area, and we ask that planning permission is not granted for the design in its current form.

Yours sincerely,

Douglas Anderson  
Michelle Anderson