

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2017/6591/P | Benjamin Parnell | Tory House | 12/01/2018 19:12:08 | OBJ | <p>I object to this ungainly extension which will spoil the streetscape and takes no account of local planning guidelines.</p> <p>Additionally solar panels will spoil the special nature of the conservation area.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2017/6591/P | Frank Mort & Daniel Virgili | 32 Oakeshott Avenue | 11/01/2018 23:13:48 | OBJNOT | <p>We live adjacent to 30 Oakeshott Avenue at number 32, and will be most affected by this proposed extension along our flank wall. We are totally opposed to it for the following reasons:</p> <p>This property has already been extended and adapted in 2013, with a loft conversion and the use of the garage as kitchen and living space. This new proposal is clearly an overdevelopment of the property. The proposed changes to the roof will be large and overbearing and thereby destroy the intact roofline. Houses on the Holly Lodge Estate each have their own external character, are individually delineated and are separate entities. The garage is well set back and is currently a subservient side extension. With a width of the garage and side drive of almost 3 meters, the ground floor extension proposed will merge the front elevation of No 30 and No 32, in a manner that will create imbalance, be unattractive and will have an extremely negative impact on the original design of both houses and on the overall integrity of the streetscape.</p> <p>In making our objections we wish to remind Camden Council that such an application is:</p> <p>1. Contrary to Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy adopted 6 December 2012, in Part 1 Section 7 of which it states that: 'There have been many extensions to the properties in the conservation area, some of which detract from both the appearance of the building as well as the wider area. There is concern about front and side dormers and side extensions and extensions.</p> <p>Alterations to the roofs need to take into consideration the slope, view from front, side and rear elevations.'</p> <p>2. Contrary to the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan which was passed at Referendum on July 6, 2017 with an 88% "Yes" vote and has now been formally adopted. Core objective 5 states as follows:</p> <p>'Despite its conservation area status, Highgate has recently suffered from insensitive development that has undermined the integrity and coherence of the conservation areas, their buildings and their settings. These fall into three main categories, which include:</p> <p>II. incremental alterations and extensions that detract from the character of individual buildings, and cumulatively from the streetscape.'</p> <p>On a personal level, as the residents most directly affected by the proposal, we object to the infill between 30 & 32 on the ground floor and the dormer as follows:</p> <p>1. It will add to noise pollution in our property and thus result in a major loss of amenity, as noise from the attached rooms will be heard in our living and dining rooms. This happened in 2013 when the garage area at No 30 was converted into a kitchen, despite supposed soundproofing.</p> |

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

Comment: **Response:**

2. The plans do not show any new wall being erected along our flank wall. We are totally opposed to the use of our wall as a side wall for the proposed rooms at No. 30. The walls of the houses on the estate are single brick, not cavity walls, and we will not allow the use of our wall as part of the extension at No. 30. The wall was not designed as a party wall between the two houses; as they were constructed as detached dwellings.

3. While we believe that the extension is too large and contrary to planning guidelines and the Neighbourhood Plan, as stated above and should be rejected outright. Nevertheless, we would insist that should any extension occur, it must involve a stand-alone wall, with at least a 50mm separation between the houses. We will not agree to any building, roof or any tie-ins being attached to our flank wall.

4. There is the potential for increased fire risk for both houses, as they will now be substantially attached.

5. If undertaken, the any works will cause damage to our flank wall and to the inside of our house. This occurred in 2013 when the garage of No 30 was converted into a kitchen; with the result that major cracking appeared throughout our house. We were left to remedy this damage at our own cost.

6. We would insist on full indemnity for any damage of any nature caused if any work were to be undertaken.

7. The debris and dust that always arises from a re-development is a major health issue and the council needs to address our concerns. We would insist that shuttering around the construction site at No 30 be installed, as we would be adversely affected by the building works.

8. We also object to being overlooked by the additional dormer window. It is too large. It needs to be 500mm from the main roof ridge.

We wish to be notified of the Committee date.

Frank Mort and Daniel Virgili
32 Oakeshott Avenue, N6 6NS.

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2017/6591/P | Mr Amanda Checkley | 27 Oakeshott Avenue London N66NT | 07/01/2018 11:30:05 | OBJ | <p>I am writing to object to this planning application, which will result in a major alteration to the streetscape, both in relation to the roof line and the front elevation. This property has already been extended and adapted, with a) a loft conversion and b) the use of the garage as living space. This is clearly therefore an overdevelopment of the property. The proposed changes to the roof line will be large and overbearing. Houses on the Holly Lodge Estate each have their own external character, are individually delineated and are separate entities. The garage is well set back and is currently a subservient side extension. The ground floor extension proposed will merge the front elevation in a manner that will create imbalance, be unattractive and out of keeping with the original design of the house. We live directly opposite the property and our current attractive outlook will become unsightly. In making our objections we wish to remind you that such an application is:</p> <p>1. Contrary to Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy adopted 6 December 2012, in Part 1 Section 7 of which it states that: 'There have been many extensions to the properties in the conservation area, some of which detract from both the appearance of the building as well as the wider area. There is concern about front and side dormers and side extensions and extensions.</p> <p>Alterations to the roofs need to take into consideration the slope, view from front, side and rear elevations.'</p> <p>2. Contrary to The Highgate Neighbourhood Plan which was passed at Referendum on July 6, 2017 with an 88% "Yes" vote and has now been formally adopted. Core objective 5 states as follows:</p> <p>'Despite its conservation area status, Highgate has recently suffered from insensitive development that has undermined the integrity and coherence of the conservation areas, their buildings and their settings. These fall into three main categories, which include:</p> <p>II. incremental alterations and extensions that detract from the character of individual buildings, and cumulatively from the streetscape.'</p> <p>I urge you to reject this application on the basis that it is an over development of the property and that the proposed changes will create an unsightly and overbearing side and front elevation which are not in keeping with the house and will have a serious negative impact on the streetscape.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|----------------------|--|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2017/6591/P | Mr Jonathan Checkley | 27 Oakeshott Avenue London N66NT | 07/01/2018 11:26:46 | OBJ | <p>We are writing to object to this planning application, which will result in a major alteration to the streetscape, both in relation to the roof line and the front elevation. This property has already been extended and adapted, with a) a loft conversion and b) the use of the garage as living space. This is clearly therefore an overdevelopment of the property. The proposed changes to the roof line will be large and overbearing. Houses on the Holly Lodge Estate each have their own external character, are individually delineated and are separate entities. The garage is well set back and is currently a subservient side extension. The ground floor extension proposed will merge the front elevation in a manner that will create imbalance, be unattractive and out of keeping with the original design of the house. We live directly opposite the property and our current attractive outlook will become unsightly. In making our objections we wish to remind you that such an application is:</p> <p>1. Contrary to Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy adopted 6 December 2012, in Part 1 Section 7 of which it states that: 'There have been many extensions to the properties in the conservation area, some of which detract from both the appearance of the building as well as the wider area. There is concern about front and side dormers and side extensions and extensions.</p> <p>Alterations to the roofs need to take into consideration the slope, view from front, side and rear elevations.'</p> <p>2. Contrary to The Highgate Neighbourhood Plan which was passed at Referendum on July 6, 2017 with an 88% "Yes" vote and has now been formally adopted. Core objective 5 states as follows:</p> <p>'Despite its conservation area status, Highgate has recently suffered from insensitive development that has undermined the integrity and coherence of the conservation areas, their buildings and their settings. These fall into three main categories, which include:</p> <p>II. incremental alterations and extensions that detract from the character of individual buildings, and cumulatively from the streetscape.'</p> <p>We urge you to reject this application on the basis that it is an over development of the property and that the proposed changes will create an unsightly and overbearing side and front elevation which are not in keeping with the house and will have a serious negative impact on the streetscape.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|---|--|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2017/6591/P | Patricia Hodgson & George Donaldson | 21 Oakeshott Avenue Highgate London N6 6NT | 11/01/2018 17:26:46 | COMMNT | <p>We live across the road and object to the visual impact of proposed changes to the roof line and front elevation of 30 Oakeshott which will alter the character of the run of houses opposite us, contrary to the principles set out i) in Camden's 2012 Appraisal and Strategy for the Holly Lodge Estate and ii) in The Highgate Neighbourhood Plan passed in a referendum in 2017.</p> <p>The HLE Strategy says 'Alterations to the roofs need to take into consideration the slope, view from front, side and rear elevations.....Extensions have included building over garages and incrementally these result in the detached and semi-detached houses losing their character and amalgamating into a terrace form which is particularly harmful to the historic character of the estate'. The Highgate Neighbourhood Plan says in Core Objective 5 that 'Highgate has recently suffered from insensitive development that has undermined the integrity and coherence of the conservation area, their buildings and their settings buildings. These fall into three main categories, which include:....incremental alterations and extensions that detract from the character of individual buildings and cumulatively from the streetscape'.</p> <p>We ask you - in accord with your adopted policies - to reject this application, noting that the house already includes a side extension disguised within the garage, for which we understand planning permission was not sought, and a loft extension. Further extensions proposed in the current plans amount to overbuilding, with ugly and overbearing elevations which will unbalance the house and ruin the streetscape of the run of houses on that side of Oakeshott.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|

| | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------|--|
| 2017/6591/P | Anne Joseph | 68 Hillway London N66DP | 08/01/2018 17:30:59 | COMMNT | |
|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------|--|

I am writing to object to this planning application, which will result in a major alteration to the streetscape, both in relation to the roof line and the front elevation. This property has already been extended and adapted, with a) a loft conversion and b) the use of the garage as living space. This is clearly therefore an overdevelopment of the property. The proposed changes to the roof line will be large and overbearing. Houses on the Holly Lodge Estate each have their own external character, are individually delineated and are separate entities. The garage is well set back and is currently a subservient side extension. The ground floor extension proposed will merge the front elevation in a manner that will create imbalance, be unattractive and out of keeping with the original design of the house. We live directly opposite the property and our current attractive outlook will become unsightly. In making our objections we wish to remind you that such an application is:

1. Contrary to Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy adopted 6 December 2012, in Part 1 Section 7 of which it states that:

'There have been many extensions to the properties in the conservation area, some of which detract from both the appearance of the building as well as the wider area. There is concern about front and side dormers and side extensions and extensions.

Alterations to the roofs need to take into consideration the slope, view from front, side and rear elevations.'

2. Contrary to The Highgate Neighbourhood Plan which was passed at Referendum on July 6, 2017 with an 88% "Yes" vote and has now been formally adopted. Core objective 5 states as follows:

'Despite its conservation area status, Highgate has recently suffered from insensitive development that has undermined the integrity and coherence of the conservation areas, their buildings and their settings. These fall into three main categories, which include:

II. incremental alterations and extensions that detract from the character of individual buildings, and cumulatively from the streetscape.'

I urge you to reject this application on the basis that it is an over development of the property and that the proposed changes will create an unsightly and overbearing side and front elevation which are not in keeping with the house and will have a serious negative impact on the streetscape.