

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4162/P	Diana Bradford	62 Parliament Hill NW3 2TJ	05/04/2018 09:49:31	COMNOT	<p>I wish to object to the proposed roof extensions of this planning application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.This proposed development is in a Conservation Area.It does not enhance the area but detracts from it. 2.This is an over development of a small row of post war houses 3.The proposal is to increase the area of each house by adding a high roof extension with large glass windows to the front of the buildings leading on to a row of new balconies with etched glass which run the whole length of the frontage of the building which is unsightly. 4.The proposed side window of house No.4 will directly overlook the side wall of No.6 Upper Park Road The side wall contains windows especially appertaining to the 1st floor flat. 5.The South facing terrace of the Raised Ground Floor flat of No 6 Upper Park Road will be directly overlooked by the rear windows of House No 4 taking away it's privacy.. <p>This property was recently purchased by my son,this being the reason for the objection. What is the proposed time span of the building works?This appears to be a very large development.</p> <p>There is a private side road leading to garages at the bottom of this road.Will this road be used for the construction?If so there will be much noise from the building works which will severely affect the neighbours in No 6 Upper P ark Road.</p> <p>I strongly agree with the comments Gene Adams,Vice Chair of CAAC has made which are that the proposal is rigid and unimaginative and most importantly this large extension may well provide a precedent for other developers to distort the roof line in a Conservation Area...this we see happening so often.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4162/P	Diana Bradford	62 Parliament Hill NW3 2TJ	05/04/2018 09:49:17	COMNOT	<p>I wish to object to the proposed roof extensions of this planning application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.This proposed development is in a Conservation Area.It does not enhance the area but detracts from it. 2.This is an over development of a small row of post war houses 3.The proposal is to increase the area of each house by adding a high roof extension with large glass windows to the front of the buildings leading on to a row of new balconies with etched glass which run the whole length of the frontage of the building which is unsightly. 4.The proposed side window of house No.4 will directly overlook the side wall of No.6 Upper Park Road The side wall contains windows especially appertaining to the 1st floor flat. 5.The South facing terrace of the Raised Ground Floor flat of No 6 Upper Park Road will be directly overlooked by the rear windows of House No 4 taking away it's privacy.. <p>This property was recently purchased by my son,this being the reason for the objection. What is the proposed time span of the building works?This appears to be a very large development.</p> <p>There is a private side road leading to garages at the bottom of this road.Will this road be used for the construction?If so there will be much noise from the building works which will severely affect the neighbours in No 6 Upper P ark Road.</p> <p>I strongly agree with the comments Gene Adams,Vice Chair of CAAC has made which are that the proposal is rigid and unimaginative and most importantly this large extension may well provide a precedent for other developers to distort the roof line in a Conservation Area...this we see happening so often.</p>
2017/4162/P	Dr Zeynep Unluer	6 Upper Park Road	03/04/2018 23:08:03	OBJ	<p>The proposed plan will have a detrimental visual impact to the area, in a block of developments, which is already out of keeping with the existing houses on Upper Park Road. The extension will reduce the privacy of the neighbouring properties' terraces and gardens. The proposed extension is unsympathetic to both the existing architecture of the block in question and to surrounding properties. Approval of the planning permission will provide a precedent for other developers, which will spoil neighbouring conservation area houses by distorting the rooflines.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4162/P	Anita Hoffmann	150a Haverstock Hill NW3 2AY London	04/04/2018 16:48:46	COMNOT	Dear Sirs, Ref: Planning application 2017/4162/P - refusal A full version of this letter including pictures have been emailed to Lisa McCann. Scrutinising the plans for the proposed development of Upper Park Road 2-4, I find it interesting that the developer has provided drawings with the impact on every property this development abuts, except the two it actually has serious impact on. My property, 150a Haverstock Hill (and the one owned by Alexandra Misseldine, 152C Haverstock Hill) will become completely blocked in by the proposed second floor addition and extension of the first floor to 2 Upper Park Road, which was not part of the original planning applications for the row of houses in Upper Park Road. I fully understand that leaving a gap with no second-floor addition to 2, Upper Park Road would not look good to the street view on Upper Park road. This does not mean that all the properties need to look the same towards the garden side – in fact nr 2 is already different, originally built with a reduced floor space on the first floor to allow light and views to the properties behind. The existing two floors of the Upper Park Road houses are already higher than two of my three floors. Adding a second floor means that 2 Upper Park Road will tower over my entire three-floor property by almost a floor and a half. See picture 1. In 2017, the Secretary of State approved the addition of a floor to 150 Haverstock Hill (the hairdresser) to the right of my property. This will wrap closely around the whole southern side aspect and most of the west facing front of my property cutting out ALL daylight to my ground floor living room, though the living room windows and skylights. It will most of the light to the front of my first-floor work room and severely restrict the view towards Haverstock Hill. See picture 2. The building will come up over the top of the front window. See documents for Camden Planning Application 2016/2507/P and Appeal APP/X5210/W/16/3163673 – where the very severe effect on 150a Haverstock Hill is acknowledged by the Planning Inspectorate. This means that the only daylight I will receive in my living room will be the little light coming from the kitchen skylights – See pictures 5 and 6. If the proposed application for 2 Upper Park Road goes ahead as planned there will be a two floor wall going up vertically on top of my kitchen wall directly behind the skylights. I.e. it will become extremely dark in the kitchen, the living room and also my first floor workroom, viz; The workroom has two main windows, one facing towards Haverstock Hill and a second window facing towards 2 Upper Park Road. Today there is light coming through the side

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>door, but with the approved addition of a floor to 150 Haverstock Hill, the light sources from the front windows towards Haverstock Hill and the side door will be blocked out by the new floor and terrace divider for 150 Haverstock Hill, only 120cm away from my windows. Hence the only real light for the first floor of 150a Haverstock Hill will come from the window facing towards 2 Upper Park Road.</p> <p>In effect, if the planned extension of 2 Upper Park Road – extending the floor surface with what today is a balcony up to the party wall and the addition of a second floor on top goes ahead, there will be a two floors solid wall blocking all light and view, just 120 cm from my workroom windows and right on top of my kitchen skylights. See Picture 4.</p> <p>That would mean that two floors out of three of my property will be completely blocked in on four sides and no light or view of any kind will be available. I am sure that this cannot be considered reasonable.</p> <p>If the development stays within the current first floor footprint (i.e. the cut out where the balcony is now stays as it is) and a second floor is added in the same size and shape, I don't have an issue, but the plans as they stand are not acceptable.</p>
