

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 2017/4680/P | Stephen Grosz | 52 Downshire Hill | 04/11/2017 06:16:21 | COMMNT | I live in Downshire Hill and I am opposed to this extension. It is clear from the drawings that this development will be disproportionate, in terms of both height and scale. More there will be a loss of privacy to the homes in Pilgrim's Lane—their bedroom windows and garden will be overlooked. There will be an increase in noise to surrounding buildings from the proposed balconies. More these balconies are not in keeping with the surrounding buildings or this conservation area. Where will the existing extractor fans and vents on the flat roofing be moved? In short, there is simply no precedent for a development on this scale. |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2017/4680/P | Edward & Mari Holden | 2B Pilgrims Lane London NW3 1SL | 03/11/2017 16:38:56 | OBJ | <p>1. We object to the proposed development at 34a Rosslyn Hill. It would result in a substantial loss of privacy. The proposal is inconsistent with current guidelines in terms of height and scale. And it is misleading in various respects.</p> <p>2. Paragraph 27 of the application claims that the development “would have no material impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the two houses on either side”. However, it fails to comment on the material impact it would have on other nearby properties, including 2B Pilgrim’s Lane (our home) and 2A.</p> <p>3. Paragraph 15 claims that as there are “a number of existing windows in the rear facades of the terrace already ... the proposal would be of no greater detriment to the level of privacy enjoyed by the occupiers of the surrounding properties”. In Paragraph 19, the application claims to comply with Camden Planning Guidance that “rear extensions should be designed to not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to ... privacy/overlooking” Neither claim is true.</p> <p>4. The proposed extensions would move the rear façade about 10 meters closer to 2B Pilgrim’s Lane. Much larger glass doors would replace the small traditional windows now at the rear elevation. Expanding and resituating these windows closer to 2B would provide the occupants a direct view into 2B’s ground floor living and dining area (through three large plate glass windows at rear) and into 2B’s master bedroom and garden area below.</p> <p>5. The Design and Access Statement fails to include a photograph looking out from the rear of 34a Rosslyn Hill. If it did so, it would reveal a clear line of sight between the proposed extension and the windows at rear of 2B Pilgrim’s Lane.</p> <p>6. The application proposes construction of balconies at the rear elevation of the 1st and 2nd floors. The positioning of these balconies would only worsen the loss of privacy referenced above. They would mean more noise. The balconies might become a source of pollution as occupants might find the balconies a convenient place to smoke. The balconies would be out of keeping with the existing buildings, and it is not obvious why offices would need such terraces.</p> <p>7. Paragraph 23 says there is no plan for “... relocation of existing plant”. This point cannot be confirmed as the drawings do not detail the existing exhaust fans on the rear elevation. The paragraph further claims that there “will be no additional noise generated”. To the contrary, if the fans remain in the current position, the proposed extension would be up against them and deflect more exhaust fan noise to the rear and toward 2B.</p> <p>8. The proposed development would also overlook our neighbours at 2A and their garden – as well as look out generally on Pilgrim’s Lane – resulting in a loss of light and privacy for 2A and the occupants of the homes on the opposite side of Pilgrim’s Lane.</p> <p>9. The London Borough of Camden designated 2B Pilgrim’s Lane as one of three commended projects at the 2006 Camden Design Awards. The architects of 2B took great</p> |

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

care in its construction not to impinge on the privacy of other properties. This application does not display an equal degree of consideration for the privacy of 2B and our neighbours.

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2017/4680/P | Stephen King | 2A Pilgrim's Lane | 03/11/2017 12:47:55 | OBJ | <p>1. We object to the proposed development at 34a Rosslyn Hill: it is inconsistent with current guidelines both in terms of height and scale and encroaches excessively on near neighbours. The planning application, meanwhile, is highly misleading.</p> <p>2. The photograph below paragraph 3 on page 1 of the Design and Access Statement shows not only a view of the rear of 28-36 Rosslyn Hill but also the side elevation of 2A Pilgrim's Lane. It is clear that the two windows at the top of that side elevation would offer a direct view of the proposed extension. Yet the application only takes into account the effect of the development on numbers 32 and 36 Rosslyn Hill.</p> <p>3. The claims in paragraph 9 of the document are misleading. Although the height of the proposed extension to 34a Rosslyn Hill is similar to 32 Rosslyn Hill, the surface area involved is far greater. Specifically, whereas the 32 Rosslyn Hill proposal envisioned an increase in floor space of 26m² (see http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/5390424/file/document?inline), the 34a proposal amounts to 80m². It is inappropriate, therefore, to suggest that there is any precedent for the 34a plan.</p> <p>4. The Site Location Plan also suggests that the proposed development will overlook the garden of 2A Pilgrim's Lane and the rear windows of 2B Pilgrim's Lane, encroaching on what is already a limited supply of natural light.</p> <p>5. Paragraph 12 usefully summarises the current guidance but paragraph 13 then makes a claim that simply cannot be substantiated [12. It is noted that Policies DP24 and CPG1 (design) advocate a general presumption towards resisting extensions that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions. 13. The proposal however, represents an opportunity to improve the appearance of part of the rear façade of the "terrace" which would have a beneficial effect on this part of the Hampstead CA]. Because the planning proposal makes reference only to the impact of the extension on 32 and 36 Rosslyn Hill, it ignores the impact on other neighbours, including those at 2A and 2B Pilgrim's Lane.</p> <p>6. We disagree, therefore, with the statements made in paragraph 14 [It is considered the proposal would not materially harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of a loss of sunlight/daylight or outlook than the existing arrangements]. The proposals make no mention of the impact on 2A and 2B Pilgrim's Lane.</p> <p>7. Paragraph 17 is factually incorrect [our proposal would be of a similar scale, design and facing materials to [the 32 Rosslyn Hill] approved addition]: the scale of development at 34 Rosslyn Hill would be considerably greater than at 32 given the larger surface area of the ground floor building (see point 2 above).</p> <p>8. The proposed balconies at the rear of both the first floor and second floor extensions suggest that noise could be a problem for surrounding neighbours. These balconies are out of keeping with the existing buildings and it is not obvious why offices would need such balconies. The balconies would overlook 2B Pilgrim's Lane (see Sight Location Plan).</p> <p>9. No allowance has been made for the various air conditioning and extractor fans which currently serve the restaurant on the ground floor of 34 Rosslyn Hill. A comparison between the existing and proposed AA and rear elevation drawings suggests that these have somehow 'disappeared'.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------|---|
| 2017/4680/P | Nicola Grosz | 52 Downshire Hill London NW3 1PA | 03/11/2017 14:29:06 | OBJ | I am writing to object to this planning application, which would cause loss of privacy and light to 38 Rossllyn Hill. The planned two storey extension would overlook no 38 (bedroom window) and block light. |
