

Jeanette Murch



28 June 2018

Mr Stuart Clapham
Planning Officer
Camden

Dear Mr Clapham

Planning application 2018/2514/P at 32 Kylemore Road NW6 2PT

I note that this application is one of **seven** in total made this year by the same applicant.

2018/0369/P conversion of two flats into a single dwelling house was **withdrawn**.

2018/1499/P conversion of 2 x 2 bedroom flats into 1 x 3 bedroom dwelling house including single storey rear infill extension at lower ground floor level **permission granted**.

2018/1513P Erection of rear dormer extension and installation of 3 x roof lights to front elevation **permission granted**.

2018/2483/P Loft extension and alteration including construction of rear dormer and insertion of front roof lights **permission granted**.

There are three applications awaiting decisions:

2018/2481/P Excavation of basement incorporating front light well.

2018/2514/P Use of rear third floor flat roof as roof terrace.

2018/2515/P Erection of a single storey rear extension.

Observations

Before commenting specifically on 2018/2514/P I would like to request that the planning authority consider whether this number of applications for development is not in fact over development of a modest terraced house. Indeed, although it is stated in more than one Design and Access Statement that 32 Kylemore is to become a 3 bedroom home it is obvious that the planned configuration allows the applicant to easily convert the lower ground floor into a separate self-contained dwelling at some future date and also possibly the loft area into another as well.

If 32 Kylemore is to become a modest 3 bedroom home perhaps the applicant/his representative/s could explain why on some of the plans 5 bedrooms are indicated.

I note in the comments submitted by an immediate neighbour sharing a Party Wall with 32 that they had not received any documentation regarding a Party Wall agreement. Building work has already commenced and a Party Wall agreement should have been in place before this happened.

My understanding is that if work proceeds without any formal notification being served, an Adjoining Owner has the right to apply to the court for an injunction to be served and if granted the work should cease immediately until such time as surveyors are appointed and the statutory provisions of the Act adhered to.

I think it's possible that Camden Council may be the owners/freeholders of a property adjoining 32 Kylemore and if that is indeed the case they should investigate forthwith whether a possible illegality has occurred.

Objections to 2018/2514/P Use of rear third floor flat roof as roof terrace.

In the Design and Access Statement to this specific application mention is made of a number of properties in Kylemore Road where planning permission has been granted for roof terraces.

Those mentioned as being at numbers 1C, 7 and 15 Kylemore are irrelevant as they are on the opposite side of the road to 32 Kylemore and back on to the gardens of properties in Gladys Road. Mention of these should be disregarded as they do not share the rear garden environment of 32 Kylemore and other even numbered properties in Kylemore all which face the gardens and rear elevations of even numbered properties in Lowfield Road.

It is understandable that any applicant would wish to list precedents in support of their application as after all if the Planning Authority has granted permissions previously then surely they should grant permission again for any similar development.

Regarding this I would urge Camden to reflect on the fact that not all their previous permissions have been wise ones and a significant number seem to have been made with little regard given to the likelihood of negative over development should numerous similar applications be made in the immediate neighbourhood in the future.

The Design and Access Statement states at 6.2 '... the Council has approved a **host** of similar roof terraces along Kylemore Road and at 7.2 'There are **numerous** rear roof terraces which have been consented by the Council along Kylemore Road, and it is clear that the principle of development is acceptable.' And at 7.4 '... Overall, amenity will be appropriately protected for all, a position supported given the **prevalence** of roof terraces along the street to which this proposal is directly comparable'.

No, there are **not** a host of roof terraces, or numerous rear roof terraces nor are they prevalent in Kylemore Road. These statements are all exaggerations and, even if the principle of development is acceptable overdevelopment certainly is not.

As a resident of Lowfield Road I have not noted any roof extensions to even numbered properties in Lowfield whose gardens back on to the gardens of 32 and other even

numbered properties in Kylemore Road. In fact it is the residents of Lowfield Road whose amenity is significantly affected by roof terraces in Kylemore Road rather than residents in Kylemore having to look out on roof terraces in Lowfield Road.

The Planning Authority may recall application 2015/0256/P Erection of front terrace extension and rear roof terrace at 22 Kylemore Road. The applicant sensibly withdrew his application as it was clear the rear roof terrace was going to cause significant overshadowing and other amenity loss to a neighbour and thus was unlikely to receive planning permission.

Similarly with the planned roof terrace at 32 Kylemore, contrary to what the Design and Access Statement says there would be significant overshadowing of the neighbouring property at 34 to the detriment of the amenity and enjoyment of the residents therein.

6.10 states that 'Any formal socialising would occur in the larger garden, meaning that noise generated by the use of the terrace will be very limited. It will not therefore affect the amenity of the area by way of noise intrusion.'

If only that were true. The builders currently on site at number 32 are working quietly, not raising their voices at all. However, because the sound of their voices ricochets between the rear elevations of even numbered properties in Lowfield Road and the rear elevations of even numbered properties in Kylemore Road this ensures that everybody in the immediate vicinity is disturbed.

I do not support this application and would be grateful if my comments above are noted when this Planning Application 2018/2514/P is being considered.

Yours sincerely

Jeanette Murch