

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3800/P	Dr Gilda Williams	79 Hillway Highgate N6 6AB	31/07/2017 17:25:38	OBJ	Gilda Williams 79 Hillway, N6 6AB London

30 July 2017

Dear Camden Planning,

RE: Objection to amended proposal, specifically the unaltered ground-floor back extension with proposed overbuilding in both height and footprint
81 Hillway, 2017/3800/P

As the owners of the property adjacent to (directly south of) the extension scheme proposed for 81 Hillway N6 6AB, we are relieved that the wholly inappropriate south-facing dormers and demolition of characteristic chimney have been revoked. They should never have been proposed.

However, to our dismay, in the new proposal the ground floor extension remains unamended, with no consideration of the existing footprints and uniform back facades in the vicinity, and no consideration regarding the resulting impact on neighbouring properties in terms of the reduction of greenspace and natural light especially to the south. We must reiterate, as per our previous communication, that the increased height to the south on the extended ground floor represents an unacceptable obstruction of natural light to our garden and home and goes directly against many Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area guidelines.

We would like to remind Camden Planning that our own back extension, built within the last decade, rightfully needed to respect the limited footprint pre-existing in neighbouring properties (about ¼ of back façade, in contrast with this full back façade extension proposed at 81 Hillway). Moreover our roof line had to slope downwards towards the back -- i.e., the top interior height was considerably reduced in height towards the back of the house -- in order to avoid impinging upon the natural light and privacy towards the neighbouring property to the south.

As my neighbour John Hendy QC has expressed well in a recent objection letter to Camden Planning:

‘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.’

We hereby reiterate our objection to the ground-floor back extension, because of both the

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

unacceptable larger footprint and the excessively raised roof height.

Regarding the ground floor extension, 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.

Please take a careful look at the document titled "***Amended** Proposed Side Elevation Facing North". The outline of our roofline at 79 Hillway next to the proposed neighbouring building at 81 Hillway makes it plainly visible that the adjacent back extension -- with an entirely unnecessary tall parapet wall over that extension -- will tower over our home and skylights, severely restricting natural light to our main living area and kitchen. All recent back extensions have avoided such massing and height protrusions, particularly to the south. Once again, because of the extreme slope on Hillway, any building up on the southside has an extreme and detrimental effect of the adjacent southerly neighbour. As I reiterate, our own extension, built within the past decade, had to slope downward in height and recede in footprint to the south -- rightfully so, so as not to intrude upon the natural light on our neighbours.

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 ground-floor extension at 81 Hillway, even in amendment, will block light at our property on 79 Hillway in the main living space, part of which would be due to an unneighbourly, unnecessarily tall parapet wall well above the roof line. We respectfully ask that the ground-floor roofline be severely pushed back in footprint, particularly towards the south, and that the remaining back extension be lowered considerably in height so as not to block natural light to our property.

We respectfully ask that Camden Planning not allow these ever-larger extensions, which may well increase a single individual's floor space and property value but to the detriment of the whole community, by severely curtailing the light and greenspace for the neighbourhood.

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 buildings ... 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:
					<p>Again, as mentioned in my previous communication, at 81 Hillway there is a historic extension over the garage which pre-dates later policy. Please note that the footprint at 81 Hillway is already extended beyond what today would be acceptable.</p> <p>We accept our new neighbour"s right to update their property, but urge Camden Planning to insist that new builds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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; - avoid impinging on neighbour"s natural light by rejecting any unnecessary overbuilding and proposed raised roof height on the extended ground-floor, as well as the excessively enlarged footprint. <p>We respectfully ask Camden Planning to uphold existing norms, regulating that all building proposals respect existing norms related to height and length of back extensions, and not adversely affect adjacent properties -- as this amended proposal continues to do.</p> <p>I will repeat my plea, asking that Camden Planning please take into account the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Statement guidelines, 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". As neighbours, we hope all will join together in preserving our special London neighbourhood – its vital greenspace, shared natural light, and cohesive architecture.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Dr Gilda Williams</p>
