

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4324/P	Elizabeth Richardson and Phil Gladstone	13A Burghley Road Garden Flat London NW5 1UG	15/09/2017 13:41:27	COMMNT	13A Burghley Road (Garden Flat) London NW5 1UG

7th September 2017

Emily Whittredge
Planning Department
Camden Town Hall
Judd Street
LONDON
WC1H 9JE

Dear Ms Whittredge

Objection to Planning Application No: 2017/4324/P - 11 Burghley Road, London NW5 1UG
Application type: Full Planning Permission

As direct neighbours to 11 Burghley Road, we wish to record our strong objection to the above planning application. As stated in our letter opposing the earlier application, Number 2017/0670/P, we have owned and lived in the adjoining property, 13A Burghley Road (the lower ground floor flat which includes a part of the garden), for the last 18 years. Some of this letter, therefore, may repeat comments made on the previous application.

Loss of privacy, unacceptable overlooking, noise pollution and electric light pollution
As will be clear to the planning department, No 9, 11 and 13 Burghley Road were designed and built in Victorian times to form a terrace, probably of three households, Nos 9, 11 and 13, although No 13 has now been sub-divided into three separate units. The design at the rear of the property with the middle house, No 11, set back, was well thought through to safeguard the privacy of all three houses. Windows were positioned in such a way as to not intrude on the private space of the other dwellings. The proposed extension, as well as ruining the attractive façade of the back of the building and substituting an out-of-character "glazed box" and two sets of "modern" almost wall-to-ceiling bi-folding glass doors to the extension to the kitchen/diner, removes the important amenity of privacy to us and to neighbouring properties. The glazed box and doors invite unacceptable overlooking. Our garden space, which we enjoy, would be totally overlooked from the glass extension to the kitchen/diner with its set of bi-folding glass doors. These doors, which open to the garden against a glass balustrade from the kitchen/diner of the applicant, are only centimetres away and just above our garden space about level with the top of, and overlooking, the garden wall. If the bi-folding kitchen/diner doors were open and people assembled inside there, they would be easily heard only centimetres away from the top of the wall between the gardens of No 11 and 13. (It should be borne in mind, that nowadays the kitchen is probably the most central assembly place for the family whether there be guests present or

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>not). Added to this, how, we ask, is it possible, even if there were such a desire, to cover the inside and ceiling of the glazed box with curtaining to prevent electric light pollution to our garden and that of other neighbours? Our garden is also overlooked by anyone standing on the terrace on top of the proposed playroom - the terrace is also level with the top of the garden wall. At present the applicant and guests assemble at ground level, a level more private to them as well as neighbours, and where the noise is stifled to some degree by the dividing garden walls. If this plan were to be approved and implemented, it seems, as mentioned above, that they would then be able to assemble on the roof terrace above the playroom making noise pollution another possible outcome. Is it fair that neighbouring properties should have these discomforts imposed upon them?</p> <p>Concern relating to impact of proposed excavations The lowering of the garden of No 11 raises concerns for our conjoined property. The plans indicate that the garden wall between our property and No 11 would be left with no foundation on the side of the proposed alteration. Would this wall be left in a stable condition? Would the excavations lead to ground instability? Has a Basement Impact Assessment been carried out to evaluate the impact on the foundations of neighbouring conjoined properties as well as No 11 itself? The excavated soil, we presume, would be properly disposed of as raising the level of the remaining garden would cause further intrusion problems to conjoined properties.</p> <p>“Pillars” required to support beam to take weight of floor of kitchen/diner and ceiling of kitchen Probably what may seem a naïve question from a layman, but would the foundations of the whole building, ie, Nos 9, 11 & 13 Burghley Road, not be detrimentally disturbed, should supports be put in place to take the weight of the beam holding the new kitchen floor and the beam holding the ceiling of the glazed box? It would seem that the necessary vertical supports would be very close to our bedroom wall between Nos 11 and 13, but that at both sides the foundations of the whole building would be disturbed. It should not be forgotten that the proposed extension has two existing houses conjoined, the foundations of which have been in place since the 1860s. These houses were all built as one unit. No 11 is not a detached house.</p> <p>The proposed extension is not in keeping with the existing 1860s Victorian terraced building and would harm the outlook and visual amenity The applicant claims that “the new rear extension is arranged to respond to the geometry of the rear façade”. The rear façade of what was a beautifully proportioned building, would, be ruined forever by the proposed out-of-scale and out-of-character extension, and a proportion of the green space of the garden area would be removed. The building was originally purposely designed with the middle, double-fronted house, No 11, set back a little at the rear and front for privacy and aesthetic design. The extension is not in keeping with the building in style, in size or in geometry. The proposed design does not even follow the building line of property No 13, the glazed box for some reason protruding 15 cm beyond the rear façade. Why? Is there a reason why the glass box in the plans juts out beyond this building line? It does not appear to be in keeping with “the geometry of the rear</p>

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

façade". At the other side, the proposed playroom projects even further, over 2 metres, from the rear façade of No 9, again hardly in keeping with the "geometry . . .".

In the Design and Access Statement No 3.0 Planning Alterations section the following wording appears "The proposal is to re-incorporate the existing basement flat back into the house to provide additional accommodation for the applicants and their family. A new glazed rear extension is proposed to provide more living space for the family and to improve the connection between the house and the garden" the implication being that the proposed extension is the only means by which this can be achieved. There can be no doubt that incorporating the existing flat back into the house would provide more accommodation given that the applicant does not, at the moment, use this basement accommodation. In line with the other adjoining properties, No 9 and No 13, it would appear that connection between the lower ground floor and the main house could easily be reinstated internally without the need for the proposed extension. (Access was blocked off by the previous owner, presumably so that the lower ground floor could be rented out). Likewise, access to the garden from the lower ground floor could easily be re-established without the proposed extension – evidence of how this is done can be viewed in No 13 and No 9 Burghley Road.

CONCLUSION

We trust that our strong objections will be given careful consideration. An attractive Victorian building, built as three terraced dwellings with features and design typical of its time should not be spoilt by an extension of ultra-modern appearance, which would perhaps fit very well on a modern detached house. Camden's Statement of Community Involvement 2016 states among other things, that ". . . planning may . . . also influence our quality of life and general well-being" and that "through planning, we can preserve the best of what already exists in our surroundings". Many of us in Camden who have small garden spaces spend more time in our garden in the back of the property than in the front. Should this right/luxury be taken from us by an invasive and dominating extension built at the back, which so greatly affects the quality of the living environment? We love our garden space – it is like an extra room to us bearing in mind that our whole flat is smaller than the basement to be re-incorporated in No 11 before adding any extension. Surely we have a right to expect privacy, freedom from light pollution, background noise, and useable private garden space, NOT to be taken from us by our Council agreeing to this extension.

Yours sincerely

Elizabeth W Richardson

Phil Gladstone