

From: reverb [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 April 2019 11:38
To: Meynell, Charlotte [REDACTED]; Planning [REDACTED]
Cc: Georgia Masters [REDACTED]; 'Paul Watson' [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Planning Representation 2019/0323/P

Dear Charlotte,

thanks you for your reply, can you tell us by what deadline you would like a more substantive response?

Sowe have time to adequatley review them with Paul Watson our planning consultant.

However, in the interim, I wish to make an initial objection to the proposed increase in terrace size from the one granted in 2017.

As you know in 2016 when we made our joint application with number 3 the terrace was initally increased from the existing one at that time.

I note that in 2016 as part of our proposal for extension and alteration works at No.2 (now completed) a proposal was advanced for a terrace similar to that now proposed at No.3. Officers took the view that this would be inappropriate for all of the reasons outlined in our initial objection and so it was removed. A condition was added to the permission that was eventually granted prohibiting use of the ground floor roof as a terrace.

In 2017 planning approval was given to increase the terrace a second time, as noted in Paul Watson's initial objection, we were unaware of this due to our house being refurbished and we would have strongly objected to this second increase had we known about it.

The latest proposal, dated on the floor plans 28.3.19, seeks to increase the size of the terrace a third time, pushing the terrace over 1 meter closer to the edge of the roof.

This would lead to significantly adverse impacts in terms of overlooking of our garden area. Such overlooking and so loss of privacy would be clearly contrary to Policy A1 of the Local Plan and paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 of the Camden Planning guidance (extensions and alterations to residential properties), which state very clearly that proposals leading to a reduction in the residential amenity of neighbouring properties will be refused.

By extending the terrace forward much further even than the 2017 permission, as now proposed, this would create a large external first floor area where users could readily sit out and / or entertain. It would be easily large enough to accommodate a table and chairs. I

assume by continuing to request the terrace depth be increased from 2017 this may well be an intention of the owners.

The result would be a very significant reduction in the levels of privacy currently enjoyed and also a very real perception of overlooking in the garden which would reduce the amenity of our property beyond what is reasonable and expected between residential properties of this nature.

This is wholly unacceptable to us and would worsen the already concerning situation created by the 2017 permission and so we strongly object to it.

I also note that some form of planting, although exactly what is unclear to me, is proposed along the boundary of our property. We would request that we are consultant on any screening used on the terrace which will affect the view and light out of the second floor bedroom windows and depending on how it's done and how high it is may still allow users of the roof terrace to look back into our windows and down into the ground floor living room through our roof lights.

It's our submission that if a terrace is to be again permitted at first floor level it should not be of any greater scale nor should it be any closer to the shared boundary or roof edge than that which was approved in 2017. Even if a terrace similar to that approved in 2017 were again to be granted it is considered that the opportunity should be taken to seek to mitigate the harm by erecting a screen to the terraces outer and front edge. This screen, set at least 1 metre in from the shared boundary would provide some limited assistance in mitigating the overlooking.

In this regard it is noted that Camden Planning Guidance (1) at paragraph 5.24 states quite clearly that the use of screens may be used to *"prevent overlooking of habitable rooms or nearby gardens, without reducing daylight and sunlight or outlook"*

As set out in the guidance the design and scale of any screen would of course need careful considerations so that by mitigating overlooking it would not then result in inappropriate bulk close to the boundary which itself may be objectionable resulting in an overbearing impact

Kind regards,

Eitan Arrusi and Georgia Masters