



Dear Obote Hope

**2017/5365/P**

Thank you for your email dated 16th April advising that there is a further 21 day consultation period following the amended plans.

As indicated in my earlier correspondence, I act for Mrs J Kemble of Flat A, 15 West Heath Road, the immediate neighbour to Flat B. On her behalf, I wish to object to the current amended application.

One aspect that I would take issue with in your email is that you advise that the permission (2014/4765/P) is still extant; that is not the case. That planning application expired on 23rd November 2017 and is therefore no longer extant and is not material to the granting of a further application based on the considerations then made.

This current application must be considered on its own merits in relation to current policy.

The main objections relate to:-

1. The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building, bearing in mind that the building is within the Reddington/Frognall Conservation Area.
2. The harmful increase in the sense of enclosure and the loss of outlook from Flat A.

The harmful impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building

Whilst I appreciate that the scheme has been amended and reduced in height and there is now a partial retention of the existing roofslope, it is still a fact that the extension will have a significant,

detrimental impact on the overall appearance of the building and the change in the roof profiles and the materials used will substantially detract from the architectural style of the building and the rhythm of the architecture used throughout the design.

As you have previously been reminded, Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. I do not consider that the alterations and the increase in bulk would either preserve or enhance the appearance of this part of the conservation area. Planning policies require a high quality design to positively complement the character of the area and this, the proposal, fails to do and is a reason for refusal.

The harmful increase in the sense of enclosure and loss of outlook from Flat A

There is a considerable addition to the bulk of the building resulting in substantial extension of the rear projection adjacent to my client's Flat A. In total, the rear wall adjacent to my client's property will be some 15m long on the south-west side of Flat A, within which will be located double patio doors which will lead to a significant diminution of residential amenity to my client as well as loss of sunlight in the afternoon.

In the previous application, which had single obscure glazed doors on the side, a condition was added to protect neighbouring amenities by ensuring that the glazing was obscure glass. With the current application, there is now double patio doors on the side elevation which will allow for overlooking and loss of privacy to Flat A and the creation of an additional terrace area which, despite being behind a relatively low glass screen, would have a significant and detrimental effect on the principal living rooms and immediate patio area of Flat A. The use of this terrace from the double patio doors will lead to direct overlooking of the private amenity area and direct overlooking of the rear main living room of Flat A.

In the circumstances, I believe that the amended scheme is unacceptable and should be refused both because of the effect on the appearance of the building and its important setting within the Reddington/Frognall Conservation Area and also because of the detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the occupier of Flat A.

Please advise me of the decision of the LPA in this case.

**Kind regards**  
**Robin Pearson, BSc. Econ. Dip.TP. MRTPI**  
**Director**  
**Pearson Associates**

**8 Baronsmere Court**  
**Manor Road**  
**Barnet EN5 2JZ**





Obote

Following your recent email, I note the amended drawings and planning application and regret my wife and myself totally object to certain parts of the proposal.

In our opinion our outlook and amenity would be dramatically affected and as clearly stated in your revised Local Plan adopted in 2017, there are Council Policies that seek to retain amenities for neighbouring occupiers and that these must be taken into account when a planning application is being considered. The application, as it stands, is clearly in breach of Policy A1(a) set out below.

***Policy A1 Managing the impact of development***

***The Council will seek to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours.***

***We will grant permission for development unless this causes unacceptable harm to amenity.***

***We will:***

- a. seek to ensure that the amenity of communities, occupiers and neighbours is protected;***
- b. seek to ensure development contributes towards strong and successful communities by balancing the needs of development with the needs and characteristics of local areas and communities;***
- c. resist development that fails to adequately assess and address transport impacts affecting communities, occupiers, neighbours and the existing transport network; and***
- d. require mitigation measures where necessary.***

***The factors we will consider include:***

- e. visual privacy, outlook;***
- f. sunlight, daylight and overshadowing;***
- g. artificial lighting levels;***
- h. transport impacts, including the use of Transport Assessments, Travel Plans and Delivery and Servicing Management Plans;***
- i. impacts of the construction phase, including the use of Construction Management Plans;***
- j. noise and vibration levels;***

***k. odour, fumes and dust;***

***l. microclimate;***

***m. contaminated land; and***

***n. impact upon water and wastewater infrastructure.***

I note that the proposal looks to create new windows and doors directly overlooking our living area, and two sets of opening doors directly alongside my property. All within a small space of about 50cm from my living room and from my own windows and doors

The application mentions screening by freeholder but firstly this is in sections and clearly leaves areas exposed and open-ended, also it is not guaranteed to remain, and in no way is guaranteed to be maintained. Finally it will not stop any noise from arising or overlooking to occur. The property at flat B is proposing a new terrace at a height of about 35 cm above our ground level meaning the screening would only reach approx 1.5 metres at most. The elevated nature of flat B further accentuates the affects that the proposal will have on our living conditions. If the screening is raised more to compensate for this then the additional height of the screen would totally overshadow and darken our property. There is also the sense of perceived overlooking as we will have a constant view of the new doors from our own property.

The previous application submitted for Flat B has now lapsed was, in any event, prior to my own new extension being built. The site conditions are therefore materially different to what existed when the previous application was being considered. In addition you have also now adopted your new revised Local Plan. The proposal also differs from what was previously proposed in that the windows that were located along the flank elevation did not open and were totally opaque purely to protect our privacy and address the concerns which we have set out above. The new proposal includes doors which are fully openable in an area directly opposite our own which will have a dramatic affect on us. The owner of B has not shown any consideration for the extra noise he would be creating alongside my living space and to all other residents on this side of the block. I feel this entire area needs to be redesigned to create no doors, no new windows and no new terrace.

The height of the proposed extension would also affect our light as sun comes around especially during the autumn and winter months where the sun sits much lower and daylight is at its shortest levels again in contradiction of your plan:-

***Protecting amenity***

***6.3 Protecting amenity is a key part of successfully managing Camden's growth***

***and ensuring its benefits are properly harnessed. The Council will expect***

*development to avoid harmful effects on the amenity of existing and future occupiers and nearby properties or, where this is not possible, to take appropriate measures to minimise potential negative impacts.*

*Visual privacy and outlook*

*6.4 A development's impact upon visual privacy, outlook and disturbance from artificial light can be influenced by its design and layout. These issues can affect the amenity of existing and future occupiers. The Council will expect that these elements are considered at the design stage of a scheme to prevent potential harmful effects of the development on occupiers and neighbours. Further detail can be found within our supplementary planning document Camden Planning Guidance on amenity.*

*Sunlight, daylight and overshadowing*

*6.5 Loss of daylight and sunlight can be caused if spaces are overshadowed by development. To assess whether acceptable levels of daylight and sunlight are available to habitable, outdoor amenity and open spaces, the Council will take into account the most recent guidance published by the Building Research Establishment (currently the Building Research Establishment's Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice 2011).*

Para 6.3 above, clearly states that development which detrimentally affects neighbouring amenity will not be supported. This proposal will have a dramatic detrimental affect on us, our amenity and general living conditions and we strongly oppose it.

I also note there is no information on the plans about drainage and guttering and how this will fit into the proposed development and the water removed.

If however the above matters were amended and corrected we would not be against the development.

Sincerely

Howard Stein