

Objection to planning application 2017/4770/P relating to 91 Hillway

Variation of condition 3 (approved plans) of planning permission 2015/0245/P dated 19/08/2015 for: Erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension, following removal of existing extension, installation of a new door and balcony at rear first floor level; installation of one rear and one side dormer window; installation of two roof lights within side roof slope and one roof light on existing first floor side extension; enlargement of first floor window on the front elevation; and enlargement of the single storey ground floor side extension on the front elevation to facilitate the reinstatement of the original garage in connection with use as a dwelling (Class C3), namely, installation of glass balustrade with privacy screens associated with a terrace to the rear at first floor level.

Prepared by

BRIAN O'REILLY ARCHITECTS

The Studio
31 Oval Road
London NW1 7EA
T +44 (0)20 7267 1184
E mail@brianoreillyarchitects.com
www.brianoreillyarchitects.com

Dear Planning

I write in objection to application number 2015/4770/P relating to number 91 Hillway.

The objection is on behalf of my client at number 89 Hillway, directly adjacent and south of number 91. They have moved to The Holly Lodge estate because they believed that it would give them quietness and privacy within secluded and introverted garden landscape of the Estate.

The Proposed Terrace application at 91 Hillway further erodes the special character of the estate and diminishes greatly the privacy and enjoyment of the neighbouring gardens.

The application is for a terrace on a first floor flat roof extension.

The extension has only recently been granted and is in construction at the moment.

We believe that the proposed terrace is contrary to the following planning policies: Camden Planning Guidance, Camden Development policies, DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours, Core Strategy Policy, CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development and CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

We object to the application for the following reasons:

1) The presence of a new terrace at a higher level presents a viewpoint for overlooking into the garden of number 89. This overlooking is contrary to Camden Planning Guidance (*CPG/Rear Extensions/4.10 ...not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure;...*)

2) Because of the natural incline on Hillway and Number 91 being uphill. The proposed balcony provides a viewing platform and a vantage point over the garden of number 89. For this reason it would appear overwhelming to have a terrace at this level when viewed from the garden of number 89..

3) Number 87 Hillway (the other adjacent neighbour) already has a balcony on its rear extension for which planning was never requested. Having overlooking balconies on both sides would take away from the peaceful and private enjoyment of the garden and should not be expected in an environment such as the Holly Lodge Estate which was not designed in a way that enabled overlooking.

4) The gardens at Hillway are large and there is already more than enough amenity for one house. There is no need to provide additional amenity at the expense of neighbours.

5) The design of the balcony presents a problem of bulk because of its solid sides which while being large and visible do not provide enough protection from overlooking.

6) The frameless glass balustrading to the front and returns of the proposed balcony are not in keeping with the arts and crafts detailing of the Holly Lodge estate and will provide an unsympathetic reflective surface as viewed from the surrounding gardens

7) The use of a high level balcony has the potential to present a noise nuisance because of the elevated nature of the terrace and the hard sound reflective surfaces forming the terrace. Noise from a low level and planted garden is less audible and more natural.

8) The Proposed Terrace presents a further unnecessary development on an already overdeveloped site.

We would hope and expect that you take on board the above objections and that you will refuse the application.

The attached drawings describe in diagram some of the points raised above.

Sincerely yours,
Brian O'Reilly

These plans are project and site specific and shall only be used for their intended purpose unless otherwise permitted by written consent of Brian O'Reilly Architects.

All dimensions shown are indicative and must be double checked on site by the contractor. Any inconsistencies found must be reported to Brian O'Reilly Architects.

DO NOT SCALE FROM THE DRAWINGS.



91 HILLWAY

89 HILLWAY

87 HILLWAY



project
89 HILLWAY LONDON N6 6AB
BRIAN O'REILLY ARCHITECTS
31 Oval Road, London, NW1 7EA +44 (0)20 7267 1184
www.brianoreillyarchitects.com mail@brianoreillyarchitects.com

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| status / number | scale |
| PROPOSED / 430-202-P/C | 1:100 @ A3 |
| drawing | date |
| PROPOSED REAR | 06.04.2017 |
| ELEVATION / REVISION C | |

