**OBJECTION to Planning Application 2018/3991/P**

**This is a confidential submission; please do not share personal details.**

**Key points:**

* This is a strong objection to the proposed Mansard roof extension and roof terrace at No.5 Bolton Road NW8 0RJ.
* There are a number of concerns but the main objections are that the proposed roof extension means a loss of daylight and more importantly a loss of privacy. Due to the positioning of the proposed roof terrace it means living rooms will be overlooked by people 1 metre away.
* Regarding the proposed roof terrace, we quote from CPG1 5.23

*“Balconies and terraces can provide valuable amenity space for flats that would otherwise have little or no private exterior space. However, they can also cause nuisance to neighbours. Potential problems include overlooking and privacy, daylight, noise, light spillage and security.”*

**In relation to this, No.4 and No.6 Bolton Road are split into flats, No.5 is not. It is a 4-storey house with a large garden, which is solely used by the occupants. No.5 already has been granted significant planning for the basement and extensions to the lower ground the ground floor on top of that. That additional ground floor space also provides a roof terrace.**

* Camden Council is asked to please seriously consider if the proposed 5th floor roof terrace is necessary, especially as it is contrary to CPG1 5.23, and as has been mentioned living rooms and valuable, small, private exterior space will now be overlooked. There are serious added concerns about security and noise.
* Only No.4 and No.6 have 5th floor roof terraces out of the 8 properties. They are sufficiently far apart to ensure that privacy/overlooking is not an issue. The current height of the proposed privacy screen for the 5th floor terrace at No.5 will not be sufficient to prevent overlooking to neighbouring roof terraces. This will result in a loss of views, at what ever height, for No.4 and No.6 and the terrace at No.5 will be dwarfed by the necessary screens and will create an out of balance design.
* The proposed Section drawing indicates that the existing sloping parapet boundary/party walls, between No.4/No.6 and the applicants at No.5, are now proposed to be built up and levelled off. This is strongly opposed, as this design does not comply with CPG1 5.25.
* The proposed drawings do not show the layout of No.4 or No.6 correctly. No.6 has a Velux window and not a door next to the parapet boundary/party wall with No.5. No.4 does not have a full flat fronted Mansard extension. The final 1.10 metres that border the sloping parapet boundary/party wall with No.5 is not flat. It slopes 50cm below the line of the parapet boundary/party wall and No.4 has a small Velux window in that section, not a Dormer window.
* With the proposed build up of the party wall and the width of Mansard extension, No.6 and No.4 will not only lose privacy but also daylight, as the proposal indicates a new brick wall, towering over the Velux windows, just 50cm away.
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**Please address the following points in the Design Statement:**

*“PROPOSAL: Mansard Roof Extension to Dwelling House.”*

1.4 *“The existing Maisonette forms the Upper Ground, 1st & 2nd floor.”*

1.5 *“The original 4 storey terraced dwelling was converted into flats as have many of the neighbouring properties...”*

**There are a number of conflicting statements relating to the status of this property, along with the further points below. This is a fundamental point and raises concern about accuracies throughout the whole Design Statement and does not** **reassure that what is being applied for, will match what is intended or would be constructed.**

3.3 States that 7 Bolton Road has a roof terrace.

**This is incorrect; it only has the Mansard roof extension.**

3.5 “*On this application the visual continuity of the front facades remains unaltered by the suggested amendments, which are all to the rear facing roof slope.”*

**This is inaccurate, as there will be an addition of 2 Velux windows to the front of the building as per the proposal drawings.**

4.*1”This application seeks minor internal amendments, which although not part of the consideration for the scope of this application are integral to the proposals that are bringing the attic into habitable use.”*

**The proposed plans show a substantial, not minor, change to the first and second floors. Why is the addition of bathrooms on those floors integral to bringing the attic into habitable use?**

4.1 “*By designing the proposals to match the strategies already implements to the rear roofs of the adjoining properties…”*

**There is no consistency with the existing mansard extensions. Only 2 have roof terraces, which have been done sympathetically with neighbours’ privacy in mind and provide the only private exterior space for each of the top floor flats at No.4 and No.6**.

4.1 “*These minor alterations to the roof external appearance*…“

**An addition of 2 Velux windows at the front, a mansard roof and outside terrace are not minor.**

4.5 *”… due to their visually unobtrusive location.”*

**The proposed raising and squaring off of the party walls bordering No.4 and No.6 will be very obtrusive.**
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4.5 *” This application has carefully balanced this with our experience of Camden’s desire for co-ordinated rear dormer designs and specific refence has been taken of 4 & 6 Bolton Road in this respect.”*

**This proposal is in no way co-ordinated with the rear dormer designs at No.4 and No.6, which are very different. Again, the proposed drawings do not accurately represent No.4 and No.6.**

4.7 “…*the alteration and extension to this attic will greatly enhance the sustainable credentials of this top floor flat through greatly enhanced thermal insulation which will dramatically reduce this flats carbon footprint*…”

**Currently, this attic space is part of the house, is this now going to be a separate flat to the rest of the house?**

**Thermal insulation could be added to the existing structure without the need to build a Mansard roof.**

5.1 “*We understand that the existing walls are structurally sound and could accommodate support for the proposed additional dead & people loadings.”*

**What testing of the existing walls, specifically party walls, has been done to validate this?**

6.3 “…*creating a design that enhances and improves the adjoining area…”*

**How does this enhance and improve the adjoining area, as it invades the neighbours’ privacy and is of a larger design than the existing Mansards?**

6.3 “...*whilst providing as much new accommodation as possible within a site that is within easy walking distance of the commercial center of Harrow Road thus decreasing the dependency on car use that additional accommodation elsewhere would retain.”*

**Does this proposed roof addition really mean that it is going to reduce the traffic on the Harrow Road, over 2km away?**

7.2 “*The most visually significant feature of Bolton Road are the front facades. Our design retains this features dominance unaltered”.*

**Not true, as there is a proposed addition of 2 Velux windows to the front.**

7.2 “*The rear dormers will minimise the visual impact by being set back from the rear facade and of a design and formed in materials sympathetic to the period of the original building.”*

**The proposed rear dormers will have an impact. They are not consistent with the existing ones as they are full width and length. This also is contrary to the CPG1.**

**In conclusion, please can Camden Council seriously consider all the**

**objections raised. Given that only 3 of the 8 properties have rear Mansards combined with the fact that Bolton Road exists in the St. John’s Wood Conservation Area Appraisal June 2009 Report, this heritage asset would be far better preserved if no further development at roof level was permitted.**