

2237/J01/ST



Planning Department  
London Borough of Camden  
5 Pancras Road  
London N1C 4 AG

20 July 2017

**For the attention of Obote Hope**

Dear Sirs

**HIGHWOOD LODGE, 31 HAMPSTEAD LANE, LONDON N6  
APPLICATION REF: 2017/3304/P**

We write on behalf of Hanley Limited, the owners of the neighboring property, Beechwood, adjoining the application site, to object to the above application.

It is only through the kind intervention of other neighbours that the owners of Beechwood became aware of these proposals, with no prior discussion or correspondence having occurred between our client and the owner of Highwood Lodge or their representatives.

We note that with the exception of the Site Location Plan (Scale 1:1250), none of the drawings show the proposed site *'in context with adjoining properties'* and none *'include details and measurements which show the relationship with adjoining sites, such as the location and height of any boundary walls and the total height of adjoining roofs and eaves'*. The sole exception is a dotted line on the 'as existing' and 'as proposed' ground floor plan (both labeled 'First Floor'), which by deduction is assumed to be the outline of No. 31A Hampstead Lane.

No sections have been provided that would better help understand these relationships.

As a consequence it is difficult to gauge both the scale of the proposed developments and the impact on adjoining properties (Nos. 29 + 31A Hampstead Lane and Beechwood itself).

A Planning Statement is referred to on the application form, but is absent from the submitted documentation. With the property located in a Conservation Area, no attempt seems to have been made to provide an appropriate planning and heritage assessment of the proposals that would demonstrate an understanding of the impact in terms of design, amenity and heritage.

**Cont/d...**

**Cont.d**

What is clear is that the rear wall of the application site (South-east elevation) is in fact the boundary wall shared with Beechwood (see attached site plan for Beechwood) and was so even before the current property was built replacing the garages in this location.

Aside from the absence of sufficient information to adequately understand the application, we object on the following grounds:

1. **Loss of Privacy/Overlooking:** Currently there is one high-level window in the Master Bedroom positioned in the boundary wall. Being high level, no overlooking is likely. Both of the new schemes vastly increase the fenestration not only at ground floor (extra window for both ensuite bathroom and the Master Bedroom), but have full height windows on the boundary at first and second floor, with Juliet balconies that actually project over the boundary into Beechwood. The use of these principal living spaces at first floor (formerly set back from the boundary) dramatically increases the loss of privacy from overlooking. The concept of a roof terrace dramatically affects the privacy of the adjoining properties on all sides with direct overlooking.
2. The use of this roof terrace (and window/doors to a lesser extent) is likely to cause a significant increase in noise and disturbance arising from its use.
3. There would appear to be loss of light issues caused by the proposed rear extension and addition of a second floor to windows in the side of 31A Hampstead Lane and to a lesser extent No. 29 Hampstead Lane. We see no evidence that this aspect has been assessed and it would appear that the proposals would result in a significant loss of amenity to adjoining properties.
4. Formerly a conversion of a garage block between the run of Victorian properties along Hampstead Lane, this 'infill' site is now subject to proposals that are no longer 'subordinate' to the original buildings and do not respect the pattern of development in this part of the Highgate Conservation Area.

Having invested much into the whole estate at Beechwood to allow the house and grounds to be enjoyed, the proposed works at Highwood Lodge submitted are likely to result in this part of the grounds (currently used by the gardeners) being unusable for any longer term future use. In the shorter term, the implementation of such proposals are surely in need of a detailed Construction Management Plan considering the restricted site, busy road and close proximity of neighboring homes.

For the reasons stated above, we confirm on behalf of Hanley Limited their objections to this set of un-convincing proposals and trust that Camden will reject the proposals as they currently stand.

Yours faithfully



**Stephen Twine**  
Scott & Twine LLP

cc. Dave Collins – Hanley Limited