

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr:                        | Received:           | Comment: | Response:  |
|-----------------|------------------|---|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2017/3304/P     | 31A,F,D,E and C  | 31 Hampstead Lane<br>Highgate<br>N6 4RT | 17/07/2017 08:15:18 | COMMNT   | <p>FAO: Obote Hope</p> <p>RE: Application 2017/3304/P (registered 27.06.17) and;<br/>Application 2017/3306/P (registered 06.07.17)</p> <p>The freeholder of number 31 Hampstead Lane, Jean Hall (31D) and the leaseholders (William Douglas, 31F; Helen Wilby, 31C; Savva Telemachou, 31A and Andrew Farquharson and Nigel Cansfield, 31E) have approved the following composite response to the above mentioned planning applications:</p> <p>Application 2017/3304/P</p> <p>History of the dwelling/ previous planning applications:</p> <p>The property is adjacent to number 31 and was originally utilised as a single storey double garage with no dividing wall/boundary. The property is, by nature of its original use, proximate to the boundary of number 31 (and also 29).</p> <p>By planning application dated 29/1/1991 permission was granted to the existing freeholder of number 31 for a single storey extension for use as a self contained annex.</p> <p>Documentation cannot be sourced in relation to this historic application although the freeholder confirms the scope was severely restricted and that part of the ground floor had to be kept as garage space. In addition, no side extension was permitted to the boundary wall with number 29 on the basis there would be loss of light into the kitchen at no29. A roof/second floor extension was also not permitted.</p> <p>Permission was later granted [to the then owner of Highwood Lodge] on 08/04/08 (application number 2008/0009/P) for the removal of "condition 4" relating to the use of the garage for car parking purposes to allow the conversion into habitable space for a dwelling house and insertion of a new sliding gate to the front.</p> <p>Finally, although a formal application was not made, the freeholder is aware that another [previous] owner of the Lodge had architect plans drawn up for extension (up and back) on the site. Given the objections raised by neighbours to the pre-planning enquiries, the plans were not submitted to the Council.</p> <p>Loss of privacy/ overlooking:</p> <p>The planned work would cause significant loss of privacy to flats 31D (the upper most flat) and 31E (the flat adjacent to the Lodge).</p> <p>The proposed additional storey and roof terrace directly overlook the windows on the side</p> |

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

elevation of no 31 and given the proximity of the buildings this would be intrusive.

The extension and roof terrace would also directly overlook the existing roof terrace of 31D and the existing private gardens to 31E and 31F

Loss of light/ overshadowing:

As outlined above, the Lodge is proximate to number 31 (and 29) and the creation of an additional storey and roof terrace would result in the loss of light to those rooms on that side elevation.

Layout and density:

Pursuant to Camden's Planning Guidance relating to "design", the main considerations for any roof alterations/extensions should be (i) the scale and visual prominence; (ii) the effect on the established townscape and architectural style and (iii) the effect on neighbouring properties.

In our collective opinion, the scale/ scope of the plans result in a significantly altered layout and increased "bulk" in a narrow space. Although the plans do not rise above the height of neighbouring projections, the scale and proportions of the building (given the limited site space) would be overwhelmed by the extensions.

If permission were granted, the extended dwelling would undoubtedly overshadow and dominate the natural space between the adjoining properties at numbers 29 and 31 and would unbalance the architectural composition.

Further, the proposed design is not within an established pattern of adjacent properties and the addition would be unsympathetic to the age and character of the surrounding properties and to the area.

In addition, there are several relevant policies contained in the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (passed by referendum in June 2017) which reinforce and expand upon Camden's Planning guidance. In particular DH3 (relating to rear extensions and the requirement these are "subordinate in scale to the original dwelling") and DH5 which states that "Roof extensions, dormers and roof lights should respect the existing roof form in terms of design, scale, materials and detail and be restricted to the rear except where they are part of the established local character and a new extension or dormer would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the area of the significant of heritage assets...."

The proposed plans are clearly in contravention of these policies.

Conservation area:

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response:  |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--|
|                 |                  |                  |           |          | <p>The dwelling is situated in a conservation area and the surrounding dwellings are Victorian mansions. The current dwelling, given that it is restricted in height, does not impact too significantly on the character and appearance of the conservation area. However, the proposed plans create a far more imposing and modern design which could be detrimental to the heritage of the area and impacts upon the character, history and nature of the adjacent dwellings and surroundings.</p> <p>Practical issue:</p> <p>Although perhaps not technically a matter for planning consideration but a practical issue and one related to property law, to erect an additional storey would require scaffolding to be erected in the passage between the Lodge and number 31. The counterpart lease will need to be reviewed to assess whether it extends to major construction work over and above any essential repairs (and it is assumed it does not).</p> <p>Application 2017/3306/P</p> <p>Although these plans are far more modest in scope and scale, the rear extension would impact the privacy of the residents of number 31. The new use of habitable, indoor living space would directly overlook the gardens of 31E and 31A whereas the current layout provides for only ad hoc use.</p> |

---

|             |             |                             |                     |     |  |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----|--|
| 2017/3304/P | D Gugenheim | 29 Hampstead Lane<br>N6 4RT | 20/07/2017 17:59:51 | OBJ | <p>Dear Mr Hope</p> <p>Having looked at the plans I would agree with the comments from The Highgate Society and object.</p> <p>This site was previously a garage stated in the HS letter.</p> <p>It is currently a 2bedroomed property with no rear land. To change to a 6bedroom house is extreme.</p> <p>Houses 27 and 25 have 4 bedrooms with a vast gardens to the rear.</p> <p>The front land is limited to having one car and one motorbike, there is no further space..</p> <p>The roof terrace will overlook other properties.</p> <p>So I partially object.</p> |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----|--|

---

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr:                           | Received:           | Comment: | Response:   |
|-----------------|------------------|--|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2017/3304/P     | D Gugenheim      | 29 Hampstead Lane<br>N6 4RT                | 20/07/2017 18:00:08 | OBJ      | <p>Dear Mr Hope</p> <p>Having looked at the plans I would agree with the comments from The Highgate Society and object.</p> <p>This site was previously a garage stated in the HS letter.</p> <p>It is currently a 2bedroomed property with no rear land. To change to a 6bedroom house is extreme.</p> <p>Houses 27 and 25 have 4 bedrooms with a vast gardens to the rear.</p> <p>The front land is limited to having one car and one motiorbike, there is no further space..</p> <p>The roof terrace will overlook other properties.</p> <p>So I partially object.</p> |
| 2017/3304/P     | Michael Pierce   | 29 A<br>Hampstead Lane<br>N6 4RT<br>London | 20/07/2017 18:10:12 | AMEND    | <p>The proposed building is far too big and will effect the light coming into my flat and will devalue my flat. It is hard to get a true idea of what the finished building will look like but I fear it will be out of keeping with the look of the road.I was refused plastic windows at the back of the house.</p>   |