

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0670/P	Fraser Richardson	13c Burghley Road Kentish Town London NW5 1UG	10/05/2017 09:43:23	COMNOT	<p>{Please notify of committee date}</p> <p>We are writing from 13C Burghley Road in connection to planning application 2017/0670/P</p> <p>While we have no objection to the right of people to improve their properties, after studying the submitted proposals we have a few questions for clarification, and requests for further information.</p> <p>As we understand it, these works would combine 2 properties into a single residential unit, the currently separate basement apartment of 11A Burghley Rd and the main house at 11 Burghley Rd. This new residence would then have its basement extended into the garden area.</p> <p>It's difficult to see from the drawings submitted the context of the works in relationship to the neighbouring properties, (ie, they do not show levels and survey information and they don't show number 13 and number 9, the adjoining properties.) It would be easier to understand whether there is a problem (or how to minimise the impact on the shared amenities) if we could see detailed drawings that show the context. We would request that more drawings are added, or the current ones expanded to show the design in context and augmented with 3D views.</p> <p>The design and access statement says: "The proposed alterations will have a minimal impact on the daylight and sunlight to 13 Burghley Road." Due to the orientation of the property, the afternoon sun hits the back of 9-13 Burghley Rd. So the kitchen extension looks as it will block afternoon sunlight and the sunset from reaching the windows of 13a and 13b. These properties are small and these are their only windows facing the back. So a daylight and sunlight impact does seem likely. Can it be quantified with a BRE Sunlight and Daylight study to see if the extension complies with planning law?</p> <p>The drawings submitted indicate significant excavation of the basement, yet we note that a basement impact assessment does not form part of the submission. Would it be possible to get a Basement Impact Assessment to make sure that the works are designed to minimise the harm to the neighbouring properties and are in accordance with Camden Planning guidance?</p> <p>There are a lot of neighbours sharing the amenity of the rear spaces of these properties – many of the properties in the immediate area are tenanted, and two of the three flats at number 13 are currently going through sales. We can see from the online planning file that one of our neighbours only just found out about the planning application. Given the number of neighbours and the current circumstance of sales going through and tenancies being renewed, can you assure us that all the affected neighbours have been notified and given a chance to respond?</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

With the number of questions arising – could the deadline for responses be extended beyond 16th May

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/0670/P	E Richardson	13A Burghley Road Garden Flat London NW5 1UG	15/05/2017 01:19:19	OBJ	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

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

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, 11th 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 late morning sun 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.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

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

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

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

Elizabeth W Richardson

Phil Gladstone

PS

Jpeg images are enclosed in email to Emily Whittredge.
