

**9 Burghley Road  
Kentish Town  
NW5 1UG**

**Tel:** [REDACTED]  
**Cell:** [REDACTED]  
**email:** [REDACTED]

**6<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

Planning Department  
FAO: Emily Whittredge – planning and case officer (originally Sofie Fieldsend)  
Camden Town Hall Extension  
Argyle Street  
WC1H 8EQ

Re: Planning Application – 2017/4324/P

Dear Emily Whittredge

Welcome back. You will be familiar with the previous planning application 2017/0670/P that was withdrawn. As this is a completely new application, for the record, we will be repeating some of our original comments.

My name is Ivan Sharrock and with my wife Suzanne Sharrock, we have owned & resided at No 9 Burghley Road NW5 1UG since 1986.

## **1.0 HISTORY**

- 1.0 Built between 1862 and 1871, Nos. 9, 11 & 13 Burghley Rd were designed as a terrace to form the footprint of a dumb-bell, No 11 being in the middle, double fronted and set back from the single fronted houses Nos. 9 & 13, at both the front and the rear.
- 1.2 The rear elevation faces approximately North West.
- 1.3 This clever design gave privacy to all three houses as none of the adjoining windows were in a line.
- 1.4 In 2006 our lovely neighbours, Dan and Lou Chamberlain, bought and renovated No 11. Towards the end of the renovation we had a conversation with Dan about how far out from their Upper Ground Floor (UGF) rear door a proposed, small, metal landing could extend – originally there were steps that went straight down from the UGF back door to the garden, similar to the steps that still exist in No13. We agreed that the small landing should not go beyond the rear building line of their immediate neighbours' at No 9 & 13 Burghley Rd. (In the event it did extend beyond the line). To preserve some of our privacy & amenity, we

erected a 1.7mtr high trellis above our garden wall and grew a jasmine to cover it. Dan, on his side grew bamboo to also give them privacy for his landing.

## **2.0 THE RECENT PROPOSED EXTENSION APPLICATION 2017/0670/P**

- 2.1 The above application was withdrawn in July.
- 2.2 The neighbours at Nos. 9 and 13 Burghley Rd had each and severely objected to this proposed development on the grounds that it would be detrimental to the amenity they currently enjoyed in the following areas.
- 2.3
  - a) Loss of sunlight.
  - b) Intrusive overlooking and loss of privacy.
  - c) Noise.
  - d) Light pollution.
  - e) Rear building line infringement.
  - f) Construction materials not in sympathy with the existing structure.

## **3.0 “CAMDEN’S STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT 2016”**

- 3.1 We would like to draw your attention to the above planning policy document that says:

### ***Why is planning important?***

- 1.8 *Planning directly affects our physical environment - where we work, live and spend our leisure time. In doing so it also influences our quality of life and general well-being.*
- 1.9 *Through planning, we can preserve the best of what already exists in our surroundings, make sure that new buildings are designed to a high standard and ensure that the right uses are in the right place.*

## **4.0 THE NEW PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

- 4.1 This ultra-modern, proposed rear addition to the conjoined 1860’s three-house terrace is a blight on the existing architectural details & proportions of the property, has no redeeming 1860’s features and is a gross eyesore devaluing our amenity.
- 4.2 Apart from some written concessions on the plan to existing detail for the rear door(s) and living room windows (to be converted into doors), the overwhelming use of floor-to-ceiling glass by the architects for both the Lower Ground Floor (LGF) and the Upper Ground Floor (UGF) has

turned the house inside out. No attempt has been made to give the neighbours any privacy from sight or sound.

- 4.3 The latest plans do not take into account that there exists a building line at the rear of the conjoined houses. Having reduced the original projection of the glass box to avoid the loss of sunlight to flats A & B at No. 13 Burghley Rd, the architects have still (cynically in our opinion) decided to build out an extra 15cm (6inches) beyond the rear facades of the adjoining properties. With the kitchen/diner bi-fold doors open this would enable people standing at the glass balustrade to directly overlook the rear gardens of No. 13.
- 4.4 We note that on the 28<sup>th</sup> August the plans were revised giving some greater detail to the proposed garden steps and “playroom” roof-lights (on two levels).
- 4.5 Of greater concern is the RSJ that will be needed to support the rear brick façade of No.11 at LGF ceiling height. It appears as if it will go from the party wall adjoining No 9 to the party wall adjoining No 13. Another RSJ will be required to support the rear façade in the UGF at ceiling level in the dining/kitchen area. These steel beams will have to be supported on pillars requiring substantial foundations and disturbing the conjoined brickwork footings on which these houses are built. As all three houses are built as one unit, over the years there has been various movement due to settlement. Drastically disturbing this harmonious structure is likely to disturb this settlement and that is likely to have a detrimental impact on the adjoining houses and the ability to enjoy our amenity.
- 4.6 The architects have deemed it necessary to draw in the foliage/planting along the adjoining garden wall and party-wall of No 11 & No 9. This has obscured a new rear façade window that appears to have been introduced to give daylight to the new LGF bathroom. A new drawing is necessary to show clearly a) the window and b) the ground level outside. Is a well to be constructed?
- 4.7 Is there a glass balustrade along the south-west side of the glass roof-lights?
- 4.8 If any part of this development is allowed, the garden level must remain the same or lower to keep the neighbours privacy and to prevent further overlooking intrusion. All spoil will have to be removed from the site.
- 4.9 The shrubs and trees shown on the plans are not part of a permanent solution to overlooking or privacy.
- 4.10 Has a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) been produced as set out in Camden Planning Guidance 4? If so, when can we expect sight of this report? Will it be published on the website?
- 4.11 Solar Dazzle. When the afternoon sun hits the proposed UGF glass box there is certain to be some light reflection, refraction and unwanted glare

and dazzle. Has the BRE been asked to produce a report on the likely affects that this will have on the amenity enjoyed by No 9?

- 4.12 There appears to be a floor-to-ceiling plate glass window in the proposed playroom. Is this fixed or opening? If opening it will have a considerable impact on noise for No 13 Burghley

## **5.0 THE LOWER GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION**

- 5.1 The proposed plans show a playroom that extends some 2015mm beyond the rear building line. Whilst the roof of this structure is just below our garden wall, the terrace, glass roofed walkway and garden access steps would mean that anybody standing/walking on the structure will intrusively overlook our garden and spoil our amenity. The position of the steps from the terrace to the garden in the new plans has increased the extent to which we are overlooked.

## **6.0 THE GLASS BOX**

- 6.1 The 3mtr x 2mtr x 3mtr glass box has a 2mtr x 3mtr sliding SW facing glass wall that overlooks our garden. When open, and the wall of glass disappears inside the main building, the feeling will be that we at No 9 are also connected to the inside of our neighbours house. When all the windows are closed and people are inside it will be like looking at a goldfish bowl.
- 6.2 The NW facing bi-fold floor-to-ceiling glass windows, when open, will have the affect of bringing the present interior kitchen/dining room 2mtrs forward with the probability of people standing at the open window in full view of our garden. It will be as if a street restaurant has opened in our neighbour's garden.
- 6.3 At night this box will be a large lit area that will stand out as an intrusive, eye-catching object that will ruin our amenity. Recently, at night, when most of the rooms at the rear of 11 Burghley Rd were lit, we took a photograph to show how the interior lights impacted on the environment. Most of the light is contained within the rooms. This will NOT be so when the kitchen/diner ALL GLASS BOX is lit up.

## **7.0 THE TERRACE**

- 7.1 The new terrace is 1.3mtrs above ground level and large enough to entertain at least 15 guests, hold parties and barbecues etc, all this taking

place just 2mtrs away from our garden wall and at a totally unacceptable height. (CPG 6 – Amenity – Overlooking).

- 7.2 It has been designed as an outdoor “room” that, with the simple addition of a roller blind attached to the main house rear wall, the area could easily be made into an all-weather entertainment terrace. We note that the glass roof-lights, ostensibly to be used as an access path to the garden are at two slightly lower levels to the main terrace. Why? If it is an attempt to mitigate any “overlooking” it fails miserably.
- 7.3 Once this LGF “playroom” is built out beyond the building line and constructed as designed with a glass balustrade terrace 2mtrs from our garden wall, it would only take a days work to remove the south-west glass balustrade and extend the terrace across the glass roof making a much larger entertainment area that would come within 1mtr of our garden wall. We are not suggesting that this would happen immediately but once planning permission is given for this development it is the sort of “ad hoc” development that could take place.
- 7.4 We are faced with the possibility, to preserve our privacy by sight (not noise), of erecting a 2mtr high trellis along the top of the whole of our garden wall. This is probably illegal and something I do not wish to contemplate. We like the open nature of the gardens.

#### **8.0 COMMENTS ON ‘THE DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT’ BY GUARD TILLMAN POLLOCK ARCHITECTS**

- 8.1 *The proposal to re-incorporate the existing basement flat back into the house to provide additional accommodation for the applicants and their family.*  
Excellent! Incorporating the LGF self-contained flat into the main dwelling will increase the main dwelling floor area by approximately 33%.
- 8.2 *The proposed new rear extension is arranged to respond to the geometry of the rear façade.*  
Strange ideas of geometry – a LGF playroom that sticks out in the middle of the rear façade and an all-glass box that takes up nearly half of the rear façade and projects vertically to the floor above!
- 8.4 *The proposed alterations will have no impact on the daylight and sunlight to 13 Burghley Rd and no impact on 9 Burghley Rd.*  
What it does not go on to say is the impact on sight, sound and electric light at night. The box is an ugly rectangular goldfish bowl; the height and size of the terrace will inevitably impact on the uninterrupted enjoyment of our garden and the noise will no longer be contained by our garden wall. At night, the lit up glass box will cast a glow adding to the light pollution in our gardens.

- 8.5 *As the rear façade of No 11 Burghley Rd is set back behind the adjoining houses the new extension will have no significant impact on these properties.*  
The architects have just put their feet in their mouths. At present the existing façade IS set back and there IS NO significant impact on the adjoining properties.  
However, the very significant impact will come from the proposed extension that is to be built OUT from the existing set back rear façade. Duh!
- 8.6 *The extension will provide much needed additional space for the applicants and their family and provide a better connection between the house and the garden.*  
The latter could be met by re-opening the stairwell to the LGF and re-instating the LGF door to the rear garden (bricked up when the applicants renovated the building in 2006) giving them a third more floor space than they enjoy at present and better access to the garden.

## 9.0 OBJECTION

- 9.1 It is difficult to make suggestions to accommodate our neighbour's plans as the scale of the proposals seem to be far greater than the reasonable request for "*much needed additional space*".
- 9.2 It should be noted that from past census, up to seven adults have lived in this space.
- 9.3 We strongly object to this overlooking, intrusive extension to a house that was built as one part of a harmonious design. Any extension will ruin the amenity of the other two conjoined houses.
- 9.4 This new application has only addressed one of the six points in our original objection and that was loss of sunlight to 13 Burghley Road.  
See paragraph 2.3 above.

## 10.0 CONCLUSION

- 10.1 We have reluctantly come to the conclusion that this extension could be a harmful precedent to extend a beautifully proportioned building that could be applied to the rest of the street to the detriment of the amenity currently enjoyed by the residents.
- 10.2 This proposed extension from the "School of Minimalist Modernism" might be suited for a detached house with no adjoined neighbours.
- 10.3 As stated above, we have lived here for over thirty years in harmony with our close residents and would like to continue to do so. We thought we had the right to the enjoyment of our garden without being subject to an intrusive, overlooking development. Sadly, that will not be the case if any part of this extension is allowed.

## **11.0 PLANNING for the FUTURE**

- 11.1 Where urban houses have front and rear gardens, rarely do owners use their front gardens for family recreation or entertaining because of the lack of privacy.
- 11.2 Rarely are alterations/extensions allowed to the front elevation of houses facing the road as they would spoil the amenity enjoyed by the residents.
- 11.3 It seems odd, then, that at the rear where most families spend their leisure time because of privacy, extensions and alterations are proposed that can destroy the very essence of the neighbours' harmonious lifestyle. See paragraph 3.0 above.
- 11.4 The permitted parking in this area is also over-subscribed so it would be appropriate to make this application a car-free development.
- 11.5 Planning regulations change over time so that what might be allowed today may not be allowed in ten years time. (e.g. the summer-house in the rear garden of No 13 Burghley Rd). Unfortunately, once planning permission has been given the go ahead, it cannot be taken away if all the criteria have been met. In this case, if planning permission were granted, 150 years of harmonious, neighbourly living would come to an end.