

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/6167/P	Dr. Maurice Rothschild	08/02/2020 17:57:18	OBJNOT	<p>We object to the creation of a patio area on the south-east elevation. It contravenes Council policy on separation distances. Its use will result in disturbance to us as neighbours, and intrude on our privacy. It is also unnecessary.</p> <p>We live at 27 St. Edmund's Terrace, which has seven windows facing that south-east elevation, all with a direct view of it. The proposed patio would be approximately 8 to 9 metres away from us. The drawings show space for a table and chairs on that patio, and steps to it from a bedroom door. It will inevitably be used for socialising, generating noise in the narrow space between our respective properties.</p> <p>Regarding privacy, the distance of 8 to 9 metres is insufficient to avoid a direct line of sight into our property. The structure where the proposed new residential unit is to be made was designed for non-residential use as a bin store, with no windows on the south-east elevation, specifically because it is so close to our neighbouring property. The closest windows on the south-east elevation of that block of the Regents Gate development were to be (and currently are) approximately 17 metres away. They are on the upper storeys and are angled so that they do not face towards us. This was a deliberate and considered feature of the design, and resulted in large part from our objections at the time of the original planning application for the Regents Gate development and engagement with the then owners (The Guinness Partnership) in 2009-2010.</p> <p>The distance of 8 to 9 metres is about half of the minimum acceptable distance in the Council's policy. Paragraph 2.4 of the Camden Planning Guidance on Amenity states: "To ensure privacy, it is good practice to provide a minimum distance of 18m between the windows of habitable rooms in existing properties directly facing the proposed (either residential or non-residential) development, assuming a level topography. In instances where building heights, design or topography mean that opportunity for overlooking would be increased, it is advisable to increase this separation distance. The 18m should be measured between the two closest points on each building (including balconies)."</p> <p>The patio area on the south-east elevation is also unnecessary, because there is already proposed to be a private patio on the north-east elevation, and the Regents Gate development as a whole has communal gardens (in the central courtyard and immediately to the west of this proposed new residence). It is not in the plans already approved by the Council and should be refused.</p> <p>Our primary objection is for the above reasons to the patio on the south-east elevation, which should be rejected, but we have two further comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We do not understand why, even though the basement excavation is now closer to us than under previous plans, it has not been thought appropriate to assess any impact of excavation on our property. The letter from Barden Chapman dated 10 December 2019 gives no explanation. We do not know if there would be any impact; we would ask that the Council's surveyors check this. 2. The applicant has never contacted us about its proposals (the present application or the one it seeks to amend), despite our proximity. We would ask the Council to encourage liaison with neighbours before planning applications are made, so that issues can be avoided in advance, reducing the burden on the planning department. Looking forwards, if any building work does take place on the site, we hope that we will be contacted.