



Dear Samir

I see that 35 Hillway (the above application) is to be discussed at the Members' Briefing meeting on Monday with the recommendation for Approval, the HLE CAAC objects to the plans being proposed for approval.

- a. You have achieved much in the way of reducing the initial scale of the proposed development and for this the HLE CAAC is grateful however I am concerned that the rear terrace that can overlook the neighbouring garden (33 Hillway) remains. Yes, the screening is improved and is a requirement both of the build and then the ongoing maintenance but the latter is difficult to enforce, especially as it is soft screening, one year of forgetting to water the plants will destroy the screen. Either the screen should be hard (obscured glass maybe) or better, only a Juliet balcony should be allowed.

In other parts of the estate Camden has refused such terraces, 93 Highgate West Hill (2015/5061/P) is one such example, for 2017/6650/P (89 Hillway) the terrace is well set back between 2 houses with no side way views, etc. If this terrace is approved it would be a precedent other developers / residents would use.

- b. The rear extension is contrary to Camden's Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy which states that extensions should match the original house, *'Part width extensions are appropriate on houses that originally had a shallow part width extension, but on flat backed properties a shallower full width extension is likely to be more suitable'* 35 HW had an original part width extension. The height & depth of the rear extension will be significant as can be seen on the Proposed Rear & Proposed Side Elevation B (I assume the shaded area is the original garage at 33HW, the new conservatory is omitted) when viewed from 33HW it will be (as you identify) 5.1m high. Stepping the rear extension, making it part width, will help preserve the enjoyment at 33HW as the new 5.1m high extension will not be on the boundary.



Existing view from 33 HW

