

13A Burghley Road

(Garden Flat)

London

NW5 1UG

13 May 2017

Emily Whittredge  
Planning Department  
Camden Town Hall  
Judd Street  
LONDON  
WC1H 9JE

Dear Ms Whittredge

### **Objection to Planning Application No 2017/0670/P – 11 Burghley Road, London NW5**

We wish to record our strong objections to the above planning application. As you will see from our address at the head of this letter, we are direct neighbours, having owned and lived in the adjoining property, 13A Burghley Road (the lower ground floor flat which includes a part of the garden), for the last 18 years.

Thank you for visiting the site on Thursday, 11<sup>th</sup> May 2017. As we hope was evident during your visit, the points made by the architect on behalf of the applicant in the *Design and Access Statement* are totally misleading as far as the impact on neighbouring properties is concerned. This is an extension, which should be totally rejected by the Council. We will address the impact on our property and neighbouring properties below and will refer to some of the misleading assertions made by the architect.

#### **Light pollution and loss of daylight and sunlight**

The claim by the architect that “*the proposed alterations will have minimal impact on the daylight and sunlight to 13 Burghley Road*”, is, frankly, outrageous, as would be clearly seen by you during your site visit; sunlight for 13 Burghley Road as well as, we suspect, for other neighbours, would be seriously affected. The part of the proposed extension on the upper ground floor which projects 3.6 metres from their existing rear wall and 3 – 3.25 metres in

height above our garden wall would unacceptably overshadow our garden and our lower ground floor flat accommodation. We had a wooden frame of the proposed extension constructed along our garden wall (exactly the height and width outwards from our rear wall) in order to judge the impact, and were appalled and depressed to realise that all the sun from around midday to midafternoon which falls over our French windows into our bedroom and our window on our back door into our kitchen, would be totally overshadowed by the proposed construction. (*Please see enclosed Jpeg images*). The sun would only appear beyond the extension around 3.00 pm and only for a short time. This would affect us greatly and we would be forced to have artificial lights burning in the bedroom and kitchen constantly. The French windows of our bedroom were designed to open on to steps leading up into the garden and I often sit there to paint in the natural light in the summer months. These rooms will also lose the natural heat from the sun and will require more frequent use of our central heating. In short, the rear area of our flat would be in constant shadow all year round and the whole pleasure of our garden space lost forever. Not only would there be a diminution of sunlight and natural heat, but in the winter months in particular, the electric light pollution at night when the applicants were resident in the “*glazed box*” part of the extension, would totally pollute the outlook from our property and that of neighbours.

### **Loss of privacy, unacceptable overlooking and noise pollution**

As mentioned, the extension on the upper ground floor level consists partly of a huge glazed box, 3 - 3.25 metres in height above our garden wall. This is unacceptable as it would overlook our property and lead to a loss of privacy. Not only this, but the plans display a large terrace well above garden-wall height which would, again, overlook other properties including ours and, we would suggest, cause noise pollution when in use by the applicant and guests. At present the applicant and guests assemble at ground level – a level more private to them as well as neighbours and where the noise is stifled to some degree by the dividing garden walls. No 11 is, right now, set back slightly and its garden is a little lower thus providing for privacy between us.

### **The scale of the proposed extension is excessively large in the context of the site, is over-dominant, and would harm the outlook and visual amenity**

The applicant claims that “*the proposed rear extension is arranged to respond to the geometry of the rear façade and to retain the elegantly proportioned ground floor sitting room . . .*”. The rear façade of what was a beautifully proportioned building, would, be ruined forever by the proposed huge out-of-scale and out-of-character extension, and green space of the garden area would be removed. The extension is not in keeping with the building in **style** or in **size** (geometry) – any extension would ruin the building and should not be permitted. The open aspect would be lost as would be the view from my home. In fact, the loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of myself, and neighbouring owners.

### **Concern relating to impact of proposed basement**

The lowering of the garden of No 11 raises concerns for our adjacent property. This has the potential to be a damp trap and is contiguous to our bedroom and garden wall. A trough might also be created which could become a detritus trap.

Finally, in the *Design and Access Statement* there are repeated claims that “*additional accommodation for the applicants and their family*” are required with the implication that the proposed extension is the solution. Also, that there is a desire to “*re-incorporate the existing basement flat back into the house . . .*” and the need to “*create better access from the garden to the basement*”. There can be no doubt that incorporating the existing flat back into the house would provide more accommodation given that the applicant does not, at the moment, use this basement accommodation. In line with the other adjoining properties of similar style, it would appear that connection between the lower ground floor and the main house could easily be **reinstated internally** without the need for the proposed extension. (Access was blocked off by the previous owner, presumably so that the lower ground floor could be rented out). Likewise, access to the garden from the lower ground floor could easily be re-established without the proposed extension – evidence of how this is done can be viewed in No 13 and No 9 Burghley Road.

As I indicated by email, although living in the attached property, we received no “*Neighbours’ Notification*” to alert us of this planning application until very late. This has now been rectified after we contacted you.

We trust our strong objections will be given careful consideration. The invasive and dominating proposed extension should not be permitted when it so greatly affects the quality of the living environment of which, I hope you would agree, sunlight, daylight, privacy, freedom from background noise, and useable private garden space, are valued elements.

Yours sincerely

Enc: Jpeg images

Unfortunately the day you made your site visit it was mainly overcast so we have taken these images to indicate the shadows that will be formed and the light that will be lost to this area of our garden.



Structure indicating shadow across 13B which then goes down and across our bedroom french windows and kitchen window on our lower level.



Photo taken from outside our kitchen door. Structure showing how the sun will be obstructed by the proposed extension.





Picture taken from our bedroom which leads into our garden. This is the sunlight that we will lose along with the light that it provides for our bedroom, as indicated by the structure in the previous image.



Picture taken from our kitchen which leads into our garden. This is the sunlight that we will lose along with the light that it provides outside and inside our kitchen.