

My concerns and objections to the proposal 2017/5272/P are:

1/. Light pollution from 4 skylights and one very large skylight below 2 bedrooms.

The plans show 4 skylights which will lie horizontally in front of the bedroom of the first floor flat. The proximity of the skylights would constitute a sense of encroachment into the bedroom and loss of privacy. Artificial uprising light from 4 skylights in the evening would of course be a nuisance and disturbance for a bedroom.

The very large skylight at the side of the house would also most likely allow an immense amount of artificial light to be visible and affect the 2nd bedroom of the first floor flat that currently looks over the side path and garden.

2/. The unusual roof design with skylights and ski slope style roof rising significantly in height toward the garden would be far far above the median line between the ground and first floor flat and much higher than necessary. This large ski slope style roof would have a dominant impact on the bedroom facing it and of course alter the green outlook from the first floor flat to an urban one. It would likely also create a sense of being boxed in. Such a design is not in keeping with the established character of this property.

I note Camden says it wants to help maintain the character of conservation properties and it seems a shame to substantially alter the character of this property which has managed to retain a cohesive design.

3/. The size of the extension and over development of the green spaces (garden grabbing), in this section of Savernake Road.

The next door property number 90 has recently replaced the 40 year old garden shed with a much taller building which has had a very dominating effect on adjacent properties. This has also involved decking much of the former garden so the area is now nearly all of modern 'urban' look. The cumulative effect of approving more extensive ground level building that takes away green spaces and substitutes them with new building will create a much more urbanized environment and sense of building density and mass than the area has thus far enjoyed. Increased density and building mass is not conducive to the open green character of this section of Savernake Road. Further development in this section of Savernake road which such a large ground floor extension would mean, and the cumulative loss of natural habitat for wildlife and green outlook which have been a feature of this part of Savernake Road, would be an irreversible loss. Once these green spaces are lost, they are lost for good.

The application makes reference to other sites with extensions. I imagine each application is looked at on an individual basis and that relevant factors are considered such as the amount of building surrounding properties, and that also who is affected by changes to the footprint of buildings is considered. Some properties with different flats may be owned one person, or be garden maisonettes or houses, and the residents may not object to loss of outlook or light pollution.

I imagine over development of space in a conservation area is also considered.

I note that Camden's policy states it wishes to preserve and enhance the character of conservation areas, and to support the original design and proportions of building. This extension would not do this, but have the opposite effect.

Camden also notes the softening effect of green views and the importance of upholding the benefit of gardens for future generations, and to respect the ratio of built to unbuilt space.

4/ Design and Access statement

The proposal includes photo's of the next door property 86 and further away at 84. The extension shown next door at 86 includes a discreet balcony above the extended downstairs area and looks in keeping with the character of the property and which adjoins 88. The extension at 84 which is further away was built before the introduction of many regulations including those safeguarding noise transference etc and not relevant to this application.

Materials to be used.

Camden policy states that materials chosen should be sympathetic to the existing building. The use of strips of wood as indicated in the plans would not be in keeping with the existing building.

The use of pebbles on top of the proposed side extension would have a dominating effect on the flat above. Sedum and planting has a much more softening effect on flat roofs and Camden states it encourages green roofs.

Access

In terms of ambulant disability access, the smart original style front door to 88a has been for 20 years or so at the side of the property although there is no photograph included with the plans of this.

The proposal states the purpose of re opening the access door from the

communal hallway and making it the front door is to enhance ambulant disabled access. However as there is a large step up into the building itself I know this has been an issue for ambulant disabled access to the property. The communal hallway is made even narrower by the cupboard containing the electricity meters.

However, facilitating better ambulant disability access to the ground floor flat could be more practically achieved through the current front door to this property which is at the side of the house, whether in the same position or relocated.

Therefore it does make sense to keep the front door at the side of the property if ambulant disabled access is the key reason for this change.

The plans describe a new 'side access door'.

However, my concern is that the purpose of reopening the door from the communal hallway would be to create a self contained unit for rental purposes at the front of the flat, (I note a new window to the 'dressing room' is also applied for), and with new separate front door from the communal hallway.

This is not indicated in these plans, nor approved by the Freehold Company. I would be grateful for clarification from the planning department as to intended use.

I hope you will give considered attention to my comments and objections and notify me of your decision regarding this application.