

87 Hillway, Highgate, London N6 6AB

London 11th December 2017

Mr Obote Hope
Planning Officer
Development Management
Camden Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

Planning Application – 2017/6650/P – 89 Hillway, N6 6AB

Dear Mr Hope,

I refer to the above planning application and wish to register my **objections** to some of the plans as regards to the effect on my property and concerning the general appearance of the Holly Lodge Estate and of Hillway. I am also seeking clarification and/or amended details of an earlier application/approval at the same address submitted under different applicants' names (2017/0558/P).

Objections:

1. The applicant is seeking to build a first floor side extension over the garage, thereby linking up nos. 89 and 91 Hillway to create a terracing effect.
The Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (adopted 6 December 2012) states on page 48 that '... the in-filling of gaps between buildings will be resisted.....Extensions over existing garages or side extensions will be resisted'.
I support the CAAC's view and object to this first floor side extension.
2. The applicant seeks to construct a full width rear extension. To the extent that such a construction would exacerbate a terracing effect at the rear of the houses on Hillway, creating a rather solid view, I object on the same grounds as above, i.e. that it would fill a characteristic gap.

I also and in particular object to the length of the full width extension. From the architect's drawings it appears that the proposed construction will protrude some 2 – 3 metres beyond my own extension. Viewed from my terrace, this would leave me facing a wall to the height of some 4 metres and a length of some 2 – 3 metres with the concomitant loss of light.


On top of this wall there is a proposed 'privacy screen', running the length of my balcony, i.e. some 3.5 metres, to a height of some 2.5 metres. In view of this new application and its new circumstances, I would kindly ask you to review the granting of such a screen, to which I still object on the grounds of the much diminished attractiveness of our views from our first floor into the Holly Lodge greenery and the considerable loss of light from our first floor windows. No other property on the Holly Lodge Estate is blighted with such a structure.

Clarification/amended details:

Referring again to the previous application (2017/0558/P), when you directed the applicants to install obscured glazing to their south facing roof windows, I would like this new applicant also to be directed that the windows be built shut and obscured glazing to be permanently retained. I notice that you applied this stipulation to planning application 2017/3800/P (81 Hillway) under paragraph 4 of your decision notice dated 29.11.17: 'The side dormer window shall be obscured glazing and built shut. The obscured glazing ... shall be permanently retained thereafter. Reason: In order to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring premises in accordance with the requirements.....'.

Lastly, I would draw your attention to the applicant's intention to construct a balcony on the first floor. A recent application for a balcony by the owner of no. 91 Hillway was vehemently opposed by the owners of no. 89, who also sought to remove my balcony, labelling it 'illegal' even though it was built with planning consent in 1967. Personally, I would like all properties to enjoy a balcony facing the lovely greenery and have no objection to anybody being granted the right to do so, but can't help reflecting on the hypocrisy inherent in this application.

May I again extend an invitation to you or any of your colleagues to visit me and my wife at our property so that you could form a view from this side of the fence.



Peter Twachtmann