

**9 Burghley Road  
Kentish Town  
NW5 1UG**

**Tel:  
Cell:  
email:**

**15<sup>th</sup> May 2017**

Planning Department  
FAO: Emily Whittredge  
Camden Town Hall Extension  
Argyle Street  
WC1H 8EQ

Re: Planning Application – 2017/0670/P

My name is Ivan Sharrock and with my wife Suzanne Sharrock, we have owned & resided at No 9 Burghley Road NW5 1UG since 1986.

## **1.0 HISTORY**

- 1.0 Built between 1862 and 1871, Nos. 9, 11 & 13 Burghley Rd were designed as a terrace to form the footprint of a dumb-bell, No 11 being in the middle, double fronted and set back from the single fronted houses Nos. 9 & 13, at both the front and the rear.
- 1.2 The rear elevation faces approximately North West.
- 1.3 This clever design gave privacy to all three houses as none of the adjoining windows were in a line.
- 1.4 In 2006 our lovely neighbours, Dan and Lou Chamberlain, bought and renovated No 11. Towards the end of the renovation we had a conversation with Dan about how far out from their Upper Ground Floor (UGF) rear door a proposed, small, metal landing could extend – originally there were steps that went straight down from the UGF back door to the garden, similar to the steps that still exist in No13. We agreed that the small landing should not go beyond the rear building line of their immediate neighbours' at No 9 & 13 Burghley Rd. (In the event it did extend beyond the line). To preserve some of our privacy & amenity, we erected a 1.7mtr high trellis above our garden wall and grew a jasmine to cover it. Dan, on his side grew bamboo to also give them privacy for his landing.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

- 1.0 This large, ultra-modern, proposed addition to the conjoined 1860's three-house terrace is a blight on the existing architectural details & proportions of the property, has no redeeming 1860's features and is a gross eyesore devaluing our amenity.
- 1.1 Apart from some written concessions on the plan to existing detail for the rear door(s) and living room windows (to be converted into doors), the overwhelming use of metal-framed plate glass by the architects for both the Lower Ground Floor (LGF) and the Upper Ground Floor (UGF) has turned the house inside out. No attempt has been made to give the neighbours any privacy from sight or sound.

## **3.0 FOOTPRINT & VOLUME**

- 1.0 The proposed extension would extend beyond the present building line by approximately 2Mtrs (the architects cleverly reduced this by 5cm to 1950mm to make it appear smaller, the so-called "99p petrol station ploy").
- 1.1 The whole extension will cover a floor area of some 28% extra to the existing house.
- 1.2 The extension creates approx. 15% more volume than the combined LGF flat and upper three floors of the main house.

## **4.0 THE LOWER GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION**

- 1.0 Incorporating the LGF self-contained flat into the main dwelling will increase the main dwelling floor area by approximately 33%.
- 1.1 Combining the flat with the LGF extension and UGF glass box, the floor area of the existing main dwelling will be increased by a massive 55% approximately.
- 1.2 The garden will also lose approx. 20% of its natural habitat.

## **5.0 THE GLASS BOX**

- 1.0 The 3mtr x 3.6mtr x 3.0 to 3.75mtr (sloping roof) glass box has a 3mtr x 3.6mtr sliding SW facing glass wall that overlooks our garden. When open, and the wall of glass disappears inside the main building, the feeling will be that we at No 9 are also connected to the inside of our neighbours house. When all the windows are closed and people are inside it will be like looking at a goldfish bowl.
- 1.1 The NW facing vertical sliding glass window, when open to balustrade-level, will have the affect of bringing the present interior kitchen/dining room 3.6mtrs forward with the probability of people standing at the open window in full view of our garden.
- 1.2 At night this box will be a large lit area that will stand out as an intrusive, eye-catching object that will ruin our amenity.

## 6.0 THE TERRACE

- 1.0 The new terrace is 1.3mtrs above ground level and large enough to entertain at least 20 guests, hold parties and barbecues etc, all this taking place just 1.2mtrs away from our garden wall and at a totally unacceptable height. (CPG 6 – Amenity – Overlooking).
- 1.1 It has been designed as an outdoor “room” that, with the simple addition of a roller blind attached to the main house rear wall, the area could easily be made into an all-weather entertainment terrace.
- 1.2 We are faced with the possibility, to preserve our privacy by sight (not noise), of erecting a 2mtr high trellis along the top of the whole of our garden wall. This is probably illegal and something I do not wish to contemplate. We like the open nature of the gardens.

## 7.0 COMMENTS ON ‘THE DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT’ BY GUARD TILLMAN POLLOCK ARCHITECTS

- 1.0 “It is that which has not been stated that is often important to note.” This is the case throughout this submission.
- 1.1 *This application seeks to re-incorporate the existing basement flat back into the house to provide additional accommodation for the applicants and their family*  
What it does not say is that a self-contained residence, currently let, is lost from the Camden Borough.
- 1.2 *The proposed new rear extension is arranged to respond to the geometry of the rear façade and to retain the elegantly proportioned ground floor sitting room windows and the existing door opening from the entrance hallway.*  
What it does not say is that the “elegantly proportioned UGF kitchen windows” will be destroyed and replaced with a massive, inelegant sheet-glass box.
- 1.3 *The proposed alterations will have a minimal impact on the daylight and sunlight to 13 Burghley Rd and no impact on 9 Burghley Rd.*  
Apart from a gross miss-statement as to the sunlight and daylight impact of a 2750mm x 1950mm brick-wall on the amenity enjoyed by the LGF & UGF flats at No 13, what it does not go on to say is the impact on sight, sound and electric light at night. The box is an ugly rectangular goldfish bowl; the height and size of the terrace will inevitably impact on the uninterrupted enjoyment of our garden and the noise will no longer be contained by our garden wall. At night, the lit up glass box will cast a glow adding to the light pollution in our gardens.

## 8.0 OBJECTION

- 1.0 It is difficult to make suggestions to accommodate our neighbour's plans as the scale of the proposals seem to be far greater than the reasonable request for "*much needed additional space*". The latter could be met by re-opening the stairwell to the LGF and re-instating the LGF door to the rear garden giving them a third more floor space than they enjoy at present.
- 1.1 It should be noted that from past census, up to seven adults have lived in this space.
- 1.2 We strongly object to this overlooking, intrusive extension to a house that was built as one part of a harmonious design. Any extension will ruin the amenity of the other two conjoined houses.

## 9.0 CONCLUSION

- 1.0 We have reluctantly come to the conclusion that this extension could be a harmful precedent to extend a beautifully proportioned building that could be applied to the rest of the street to the detriment of the amenity currently enjoyed by the residents.
- 1.1 This proposed extension from the "School of Minimalist Modernism" might be suited for a detached house with no adjoined neighbours.
- 1.2 As stated above, we have lived here for over thirty years in harmony with our close residents and would like to continue to do so. We thought we had the right to the enjoyment of our garden without being subject to an intrusive, overlooking development. Sadly, that will not be the case if any part of this extension is allowed.

## 10.0 PLANNING for the FUTURE

- 1.0 Where urban houses have front and rear gardens, rarely do owners use their front gardens for family recreation or entertaining because of the lack of privacy.
- 1.1 Rarely are alterations/extensions allowed to the front elevation of houses facing the road as they would spoil the amenity enjoyed by the residents.
- 1.2 It seems odd, then, that at the rear where most families spend their leisure time because of privacy, extensions and alterations are proposed that can destroy the very essence of the neighbours' harmonious lifestyle.
- 1.3 The permitted parking in this area is also over-subscribed so it would be appropriate to make this application a car-free development.
- 1.4 Planning regulations change over time so that what might be allowed today may not be allowed in ten years time. (e.g. the summer-house in the rear garden of No 13 Burghley Rd). Unfortunately, once planning permission has been given the go ahead, it cannot be taken away if all the criteria have been met. In this case, if planning permission were granted, 150 years of harmonious, neighbourly living would come to an end.