

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

11 June 2018

Camden Council
Planning & Built Environment
[REDACTED]

RE: Objections to Planning Application 2018/2292/P [REDACTED]

Dear Mr. Hope,

I am writing to object to part of the planning application 2018/2292/P submitted for [REDACTED]. While we do not object to the extension being built, the height of the extension is inappropriate and not in keeping with the built environment and previous planning permissions. When previous extensions have been granted planning permission, careful consideration was given to the height so as to minimize impact on views, sunlight, and appearance in an environment of tightly built terraced houses with very small rear gardens.

Dynham Road is situated on a hill, with houses built and leveled in pairs. Our house, number [REDACTED], is built at the same level as number [REDACTED], and the ground level of number [REDACTED] and its various elevations is significantly lower (roughly .6 – 1 meter lower). When the side return extension on our flat was built, it made logical and historical sense to level the back elevation with number [REDACTED] and the existing brickwork underneath our upstairs neighbours' balcony/balcony fence. Similarly, the roof level of our side return was kept to roughly the same level as the floor of our upstairs neighbours' balcony. Additionally, the roof of our side return closest to the boundary with number [REDACTED] was lowered so as to not block sunlight or affect their amenities. Similarly, when number [REDACTED] built a side return, they did not match the elevation of much higher situated number [REDACTED], but rather their own existing elevations.

By this logic and precedent, there should be a natural stepping down of built heights as has historically been the case and has been followed with any granting of similar planning permissions in the surrounding area. The rear parapet elevation of [REDACTED] should not be level with ours, but rather with the existing rear elevations of [REDACTED] and those of number [REDACTED]. The side return/flat roof should similarly be limited in height and naturally step down from our side return roof towards a height similar to the existing flat roof above the current bathroom/back of kitchen of [REDACTED] (equivalent to the balcony floor limit when our side return was constructed).

The plan as submitted will block sunlight, be claustrophobically high in an already tightly built up area, and not follow the natural stepping down in height of the built environment that has historically been enforced. We are happy to support Mr. Benayahu's extension, should he submit plans with a rear parapet elevation and side return/flat roof that are at an appropriate and sympathetic height. Until then we hope

Camden Planning will enforce historical precedent and only grant approval of a planning application of appropriate scale.

Kind regards,

