

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/4710/P	A Kelly	15/11/2019 18:54:01	OBJ/NOT	<p>COMMENTS ON PLANNING APPLICATION 2019/4710/P</p> <p>These are substantially the same as for application 2019/4621/P as many of the points are as relevant for this application so I have repeated them below.</p> <p>The only material difference is that the extension here is slightly smaller. It still fills the side return but just does not square off at the garden end so the impact on number 5 i.e. the loss of amenity is the same since the biggest impact on number 5 is the loss of the infill.</p> <p>It is important to note that, contrary to what is stated in the application, the extension is still going to be visible to neighbouring properties.</p> <p>This application purports to be to make alterations to 'the family home'. This is incorrect. It was a much loved and well maintained family home which, under the current owner, has become dilapidated and derelict; in short, nothing more than a building site. The owner has begun and left unfinished various works over the past five years which is the pattern we have become used to as he has adopted the same strategy with regard to his other property, number 2 Hillfield Road. Number 2 is now in a worse state than number 3 and has steadily deteriorated during his ownership over the past 10 years with a series of stop / start uncompleted works.</p> <p>It seems nonsensical to have to consider planning applications from someone who has amply demonstrated an inability to finish any alterations whatsoever.</p> <p>I would strongly urge a site visit to appreciate both the current situation and the likely impact of the proposed works.</p> <p>The application claims to 'preserve the character and appearance of the neighbourhood' and not to result in significant impact upon levels of amenity enjoyed within residential neighbourhood properties.)</p> <p>The original design of the property is the same as others in Hillfield Road. It is a typical late Victorian terraced house with a side return which enhances the appearance of the property and also provides much needed space between the property and the adjoining property at number 5, which has a mirror image layout as is normal in Victorian terraces.</p> <p>The proposed extension is not in keeping with the original Victorian design, will be unsightly and will result in loss of amenity to the neighbouring properties, particularly number 5. As it proposes building to the boundary fence/wall, it will simply create a long, dark corridor totally at odds with the late Victorian architecture.</p> <p>As is clear from the plans, the proposed extension essentially nearly doubles the footprint of the property. The current length of the two reception rooms from the bay to the beginning of the side return is c.9.4M. The original rear addition is c.7.25M. Mr Sebba is already building out a further 6M and this proposal increases that extension by almost squaring the end off thus subverting the original Victorian design. As such it is hardly 'subservient to the already granted side extension application'.</p> <p>The length of the square (front) part of these houses is c.15.25M from the front door to the kitchen door and if this application is granted, the length of the building from the kitchen door to the garden will be c.13.25M and</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>be squared off so have a width of c.6.25M. It will turn a pretty Victorian terraced house into a monstrosity and is far from 'modest in terms of its' (sic) scale' as the Design and Access statement asserts</p> <p>In addition, there are several other issues I would like to comment on:</p> <p>The D and A statement notes that the rear garden slopes upwards. This is correct. However, it is not correct to say that this will reduce the impact of the overall height of the extension. It will result in considerable loss of amenity as the sloping nature of our gardens will mean that we will all be able to see it.</p> <p>It would not have 'an acceptable relationship' with number 5 and will inevitably reduce daylight and sunlight to that part of the garden of number 5 and, more importantly, to the bedrooms of the ground floor flat, which are both at rear.</p> <p>Part of the current extension has been built (under Mr Sebba's build a bit and leave it for several years strategy) and it has already affected number 5 adversely. Therefore the works in this application would only have a worse impact. A site visit would demonstrate this clearly.</p> <p>Finally, it is also of concern that the extension appears to raise the height of the existing ground floor up to the height of the bay window on the first floor. Surely this cannot be acceptable? It rather belies the statement in the D&amp;AS that 'the extension would not have a significant impact of (sic) the architectural integrity of the building nor a negative impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area'. They cannot seriously assert this.</p> <p>I would hope that the Planning Authority would simply refuse this application. It did not have a choice in relation to the permitted development but, this time, there is a choice. The monstrosity should just be refused.</p>

---

2019/4710/P	Bruno Linder	14/11/2019 15:19:21	COMMNT	<p>I write in reference to the planning application referenced 2019/4710/P</p> <p>I strongly object to this application being given permission to move forward and my concerns are thus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr Sebba has already built a considerable roof extension, the result of which has been to deny me of any direct sunlight after 5.00pm, which in itself significantly reduces the amount of natural light I receive in my one-and-only living space.</li> <li>2. In addition to this, yet another extension in Mr Sebba's garden will only further reduce the very fine garden views that I and others currently enjoy (provided we manage to ignore the junkyard that the garden at No 3 has been for years). It is worth noting that the majority of the owners/landlords on Hillfield Road seem to appreciate this and have refrained from concreting over what little green space there has been available.</li> <li>3. Finally, and whilst I am not an expert in renovation or residential architecture, I would be surprised if the extension referenced in Point 1 above is fully compliant with its original planning application, and thus I am not confident that any further development would also remain compliant.</li> </ol> <p>It is for these very justifiable reasons that I ask and request that this application be denied.</p>
-------------	--------------	---------------------	--------	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/4710P	John and Vesta Curtis	12/11/2019 21:39:35	COMMMNT	The applicant (Elevations Company ) has an appalling track record. The applicant has been developing a house on the other side of the street for at least three years causing a huge amount of disruption to the local community and to the environment. This development is now infested with rats and there is filth and rubbish in the street outside the site. This company should not be allowed to do any further work in Camden or anywhere else. The fact that they have been allowed to continue for so long is a disgrace and reflects very badly on Camden's planning procedures. Therefore, any application for further work on No. 3 Hillfield Road should be rejected out of hand.
2019/4710P	Eleanor Naughten	14/11/2019 11:05:06	OBJ	I object to this application. The applicant owns 2 Hillfield Road where planning was given for a basement in 2008. Since that time he has stopped and started the work a number of times and the house has now changed from being a well maintained house to a derelict shell which is probably endangering other houses in the road. We have endured multiple rat infestations in this time (I have personally had to spend over £1500 on pest control) and significant disruption with the road regularly being blocked as they do not apply for parking restrictions. Given this project has still not been completed, and the applicant has being also doing stop start building work on this property for 5 years, I object on the basis that the applicant should complete his existing projects before being given permission for another major development in close proximity.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/4710/P	Darion Pohl	16/11/2019 11:23:46	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>We are writing to object to this application. [REDACTED]</p> <p>The reasons for our objections are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amenity of the street Alexander Sebba has been granted a permit many many years ago to undertake major works at 2 Hillfield Rd (across the road from 3 Hillfield Rd), a property which he also owns. This work has been left in a derelict state for at least the past 6-7 years with little progress. It has meant that what was once a lovely street scape at the cul-de-sac which forms the end of Hillfield Road has been left as a complete mess with his building materials and hordings in place, having a significant diminishing effect on the amenity of the end of Hillfield Rd, and really making the area look miserable for that whole part of the street. You should take the time to investigate his building works at 2 Hillfield to understand how little has been done in the past 5-10 years since his permit was granted. To understand this, and the impact it is having on the amenity of the street please come by and take some photos of the works at 2a Hillfield and compare these to any photos you would taken in 2014/15 or even earlier and you will see that nothing has changed - he still has the hording up and seems to be using the area for nothing more than a storage place for his building materials. It is an ugly eyesore for all of us.</li> <li>2. Mr Sebba has made the area completely unpleasant for all of us and simply should not be granted any further permit to undertake any further works at that end of Hillfield Road, until he has finished the work at 2 Hillfield Rd. Should any permit for number 3 be granted to Mr Sebba whatsoever, the likelihood is that the area will become a complete tip with his extra building materials and hordings being up and left up without seemingly a concern from the council for the next 10 years.</li> <li>3. It is really a disgrace for all of us that Camden Council have not stepped in and required Mr Sebba to complete the works he has been undertaking at 2 Hillfield by a set date. Mr Sebba bought this property over 10 years ago and shortly thereafter received planning permits and erected hordings. We have all had to suffer</li> <li>4. Mr Sebba's non-action has caused us all incredible inconvenience and loss of income to the point that we had to move out of our home (and are still out) as we have been unable to live with the unsightly hording and building materials outside 2 Hillfield which have not come down or changed for many many years now. His stop/start works have ruined what was once a lovely part of the street to the point we can no longer remember what a nice area it was.</li> <li>5. If he was granted the ability to do work at 3 Hillfield, it really would make the area unliveable for many of us, as he would simply erect further hordings for many many many years to come. How are we expected to live with this??? Would you, knowing his track record? It is simply not fair to us as council tax paying residents.</li> <li>6. The net impact of this non intervention by Camden Council to require Mr Sebba to complete the building works at number 2 by a set date is costing us a fortune in lost rent from tenants (we have had to offer our tenants significant discounts as a result of his works), a decline in property prices enjoyment and amenity overall. Further, as owners of 2a Hillfield Rd, we had to move out of our own home altogether and have not been able to return as the site has been quite unsafe at various times for our 3 young kids.</li> <li>6. Part of our objection is on the basis of the applicant (Mr Sebba's) incredibly poor record of getting any works done and on the basis that he has ruined the street scape</li> <li>7. We would only support his application for further works once the works he commenced 7-10 years ago at 2 Hillfield are completed.</li> <li>8. As well as the significant loss of amenity for the surrounding neighbours, we further object to this application being granted to do works to number 3 Hillfield on the basis that it is unsightly and will destroy the original character of the late Victorian House.</li> <li>9. The property at number 3 was in a good state of repair when purchased in 2013. It is now dilapidated due to a series of works which we understand Mr Sebba has commenced but failed to complete.</li> </ol>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

In summary we 100% object to any further applications being granted to Mr Sebba to do any further works at our end of Hillfield Rd. He has been given many years to finish the works as per permits allocated to him and has simply ruined much of the amenity and enjoyment of what was once an attractive streetscape at the end of Hillfield Rd. He has not completed these works over a 5-10 year period and any further permits will simply exacerbate the misery for all of us, until he has completed the works he commenced many years back.

We have a right to enjoy our street, not have someone come along (Mr Sebba) and completely destroy the amenity for us all with seemingly no regard for our well being over many many years now by Camden Council.

Yours sincerely  
Darion and Nicola Pohl

[Redacted Signature]

which you should visit and investigate at has had the impact of diminishing the property value for all of us who live at that end of the street, and even after complaints

---