

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3800/P	Gilda Williams	79 Hillway Highgate N6 6AB	16/07/2017 18:08:19	OBJLETTE R	<p>Dear Camden Planning,</p> <p>RE: Objection to multiple proposed extensions, 81 Hillway, ref 2017/3800/P</p> <p>As the owners of the property adjacent to (directly south of) the massive extension scheme proposed for 81 Hillway N6 6AB, we strongly object to the proposal, on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the increased height to the south on the top floor represents excessive massing, an unneighbourly obstruction of light and an invasion of privacy to our home; - the increased height to the south on the extended ground floor also represents an unacceptable obstruction of light to our garden and home; - the proposal goes directly against many Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area guidelines. <p>1) Objection to two dormers on south side of top-floor attic: We strongly object to the two south top-floor dormers on the grounds of massive light obstruction and invasion of privacy to our property, as well as loss of characteristic chimney to the conservation area. Please also note that the proposed plan plainly shows two south-facing dormers, but the application states there is only one.</p> <p>Given the extreme slope of Hillway, any height extension to the south of a property has an immense light-blocking effect on the adjacent property to the south, which is lower. For this reason, in recent years, new top-floor dormers built on the Holly Lodge Estate have been mostly confined to the north: otherwise the lower-level neighbour to the south suffers excessive loss of light and privacy to their property. We propose that 81 Hillway install instead flat Velux windows on the south-facing roof, which would be much more appropriate and unintrusive towards our neighbouring property. Otherwise, even taking into account the use of privacy glass on these proposed dormers, we will unfairly have two sets of windows directly facing down and into our main family bathroom, top floor toilet/shower room and staircase.</p> <p>A south dormer at 81 Hillway would furthermore effect very detrimentally the natural light in our skylighted main kitchen area. The proposed building-up on both north and south sides of the roof goes directly against the HLE guidelines of avoiding "inappropriate bulk, massing and/or height". (p. 12). We urge Camden to reject any dormers built on the south side of any property on Hillway.</p> <p>Worse still, this southside dormer requires the demolition of a chimney, which is a characteristic feature of Holly Lodge architecture. The HLE guidelines specifically encourage "the retention of any architecturally interesting features and characteristic decorative elements such as ... cornices and chimney stacks."</p>

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

We would like also to point out that the proposed dormers are out of proportion, being so large as to reach up to the existing ridgeline, whereas dormers built in recent years are generally lower than the roof, in order avoid spoiling the residential roofline uniformity on Hillway. This 81 Hillway proposal goes directly against HLE guidelines (p. 17): "There are limited opportunities for roof extensions as alterations to the roofscape could adversely affect the character of the Conservation Area."

In sum we propose that southside dormers are entirely rejected, possibly replaced with flat Velux windows, on the grounds of loss of privacy and light to our property, and that the northside dormers are lowered to avoid destroying the characteristic roofline of the Conservation Area.

2) Objection to ground-floor back extension, because of both the larger footprint and the raised height:

We strongly object to the proposed

- a) raised ground-floor ceiling height that incorporates an unnecessary tall parapet wall that blocks natural light to our house and garden;
- b) back garden footprint that extends beyond all other houses nearby;
- c) loss of green space;
- d) new build across full-width back facade that spoils a uniform back garden elevation.

The extensions on nearby houses are limited to about ¼ back facade width. This excessive overbuilding plainly goes against Conservation Area guidelines.

Again, because of the strong slope on Hillway, raised ceiling heights and extensions to the south of any property has a huge impact on the lower property located to the south. Currently in the immediate area all back extensions cover a small portion of the back facade (about ¼), are low in height, and are confined to the north side of the property because of undue depletion of natural light to the neighbouring property to the south. The proposed extension will block light at out property on 79 Hillway in the main living space, part of which would be due to an unnecessarily tall parapet wall above the roof line.

Moreover, recent policy has deemed that back extensions do not extend beyond the furthest house extension in the immediate area, a policy this proposal violates. We will remind Camden that our own extension, built within the last decade, needed to follow this sensible guideline, and we limited the extension-length into the back garden and the building footprint to the existing local builds. We ask that Camden insist on following this same policy for number 79 and not allow these ever-larger extensions

The HLE guidelines state (p. 17) "Rear extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible" – and indeed extensions in the immediate area extend maximum across about ¼ of the back facade, not the full width as proposed. HLE guidelines: "Extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the group of buldings ... Rear extensions will not be acceptable where they spoil a uniform rear elevation of an unspoilt group of buildings" . This proposal is in breach the pattern for extensions in the area.

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

We would like to point out that in recent years 1st-floor extensions over the garage area are no longer acceptable, because they block views of back-garden greenery from the street and undermine the sense of semi-detached rather than terraced homes. At 81 Hillway there is a historic extension over the garage which pre-dates this later policy. We accept that the proposed new refurbishment maintains the space gained from the old over-garage extension, but please note that the footprint at 81 Hillway is already extended beyond what today would be acceptable.

We accept our new neighbour's right and desire to update their property, however any planning proposal must respect the immediate neighbours as well as the entire community's aims, which this proposal does not. We urge Camden Planning to:

- refuse massive overbuilding and raising of entire top floor attic particularly as regards the unacceptable south dormers, in order to maintain characteristic Holly Lodge residential scale;
 - avoid impingement on neighbour's natural light and privacy;
 - preserve characteristic architectural features, and reject the proposed demolition of the distinctive Holly Lodge chimney. Acceptable dormers to the north must be beneath existing roof line, as is customary on Holly Lodge;
 - maintain the vital green space and park-like nature of Estate by not permitting excessively sized back extensions larger than about ¼ of the back facade, in line with the neighbouring houses;
 - prevent the impingement on neighbour's natural light and privacy to the south by rejecting the two proposed dormers to the south;
- prevent the impingement on neighbour's natural light by rejecting the proposed raised roof height on ground-floor extension, requiring that any proposal respect existing norms related to height and length of back extension, and not adversely affect adjacent properties as this proposal does.

The Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Statement guidelines were written a few years ago in light of the rise of unsuitable alterations to properties, in a community-minded effort to preserve "what makes Holly Lodge Estate special". This special character is why we – and presumably our new neighbours – have chosen to live in Holly Lodge in the first place, and must be upheld. The proposed extensions to 81 Hillway – especially the massive bulking, and excessive extending and heightening to the south and back of the property, as well as the demolition of the chimney – represent a relapse to the careless building practices of the past, as insensitive to one's immediate neighbours as to the community, and must be rejected.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Gilda Williams

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3800/P	J Hendy and L Quinn	75 Hillway London N6 6AB	21/07/2017 10:58:55	COMMNT	<p>We have had sight of the letter of objection of Dr Williams of 79 Hillway dated 17 July 2017. We agree with all she writes and have little to add. Our house is naturally less directly affected but the massive scale of the proposal to develop No.81 is deeply troubling to us and, we assume, to anyone who lives on the estate. Whilst the extensions upwards and outwards may increase the value of the applicants' property we have no doubt that it will decrease the amenity enjoyed by all other residents on the estate who enjoy the distinctive feel and scale of Holly Lodge.</p> <p>We respectfully urge Camden Planning to refuse permission for the raising of entire top floor attic above the existing roof line and the installation of south facing dormers. These proposals are out of scale and destructive of the uniformity of the estate. In particular the removal of the characteristic architectural features of the distinctive Holly Lodge chimneys is objectionable. The excessive rear extension is an incursion into the green space at the rear of the properties. Whilst residents primarily enjoy their own gardens, they also enjoy the gardens of their neighbours, their trees and shrubs, the maintenance of natural light and the lack of domination by neighbouring structures. This communal enjoyment is one of the features of the estate and should be preserved. The lines established for other rear extensions in height and depth should not be permitted to be exceeded by this property.</p> <p>Like most residents, we fully support the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Statement to preserve "what makes Holly Lodge Estate special". This special character has been damaged in the past before planning controls were robust enough to preserve the uniformity of estates like ours. It is essential that Camden's planning team respects the Conservation Area Statement and prevents developments such as this which will set a precedent for other property developers and will, by degrees, destroy our preserved communal amenity to the detriment of all, including new occupants.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3800/P	J Hendy and L Quinn	75 Hillway London N6 6AB	21/07/2017 10:59:15	COMMNT	<p>We have had sight of the letter of objection of Dr Williams of 79 Hillway dated 17 July 2017. We agree with all she writes and have little to add. Our house is naturally less directly affected but the massive scale of the proposal to develop No.81 is deeply troubling to us and, we assume, to anyone who lives on the estate. Whilst the extensions upwards and outwards may increase the value of the applicants' property we have no doubt that it will decrease the amenity enjoyed by all other residents on the estate who enjoy the distinctive feel and scale of Holly Lodge.</p> <p>We respectfully urge Camden Planning to refuse permission for the raising of entire top floor attic above the existing roof line and the installation of south facing dormers. These proposals are out of scale and destructive of the uniformity of the estate. In particular the removal of the characteristic architectural features of the distinctive Holly Lodge chimneys is objectionable. The excessive rear extension is an incursion into the green space at the rear of the properties. Whilst residents primarily enjoy their own gardens, they also enjoy the gardens of their neighbours, their trees and shrubs, the maintenance of natural light and the lack of domination by neighbouring structures. This communal enjoyment is one of the features of the estate and should be preserved. The lines established for other rear extensions in height and depth should not be permitted to be exceeded by this property.</p> <p>Like most residents, we fully support the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Statement to preserve "what makes Holly Lodge Estate special". This special character has been damaged in the past before planning controls were robust enough to preserve the uniformity of estates like ours. It is essential that Camden's planning team respects the Conservation Area Statement and prevents developments such as this which will set a precedent for other property developers and will, by degrees, destroy our preserved communal amenity to the detriment of all, including new occupants.</p>
