

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1697/P		29/05/2020 14:26:57	INT	<p>OBJECTIONS PROPOSED EXTENSION 8 OAKHILL AVENUE (PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 2020/1697/P)</p> <p>After we bought Oakhill Avenue in 1984, we had a conversation with the vendor. He said he owed us an apology. He told us that when the owner's of No.8 applied for permission to build their kitchen-breakfast room in 1982, he had not objected, because he was planning to sell Oakhill in a year or two and didn't want to upset the neighbours. Looking at the extension, which was obviously obstructing the view from the morning room, we joked that although it was obviously an eyesore, the vista certainly couldn't get any worse in the future! Contrary to the statement in the heritage report that our morning room was "an extension to 6 Oakhill Avenue", we wish to point out that it has always been part of the house, having originally been a loggia, and it is not an extension. Out of interest we did view the original plans after we bought the house.</p> <p>Prior to 1982 the vista from our kitchen-morning room was about 120 degrees. The No.8 kitchen-breakfast room reduced the vista to about 90 degrees (Photo. IMG_1237.JPG). The living room extension is also an eyesore, but it has a large semi-circular window and doesn't impact significantly on the vista. The current proposals would reduce the vista further to about 60 degrees (Photo.IMG =.1201.JPG) i.e. by 50% of the vista once enjoyed by previous occupants of 6 Oakhill. Had the early 20th century houses of Oakhill Avenue been part of an Conservation Area 30 years before 1985, it is highly unlikely that Hampstead Council in 1960 Camden Council in 1982 would have given consent to the two extensions that have blotted the appearance of the rear of No.8 and damaged the amenities of No.6 with particular reference to the loss of light and the reduced vista.</p> <p>The proposed plans, which include the extension of the solid wall of the kitchen- breakfast room from 5.5 metres to 10 metres i.e. a 90% increase, would further damage the amenities of No.6, by the considerable reduction in the amount of light we receive and a significant reduction in the vista. The effect would be particularly striking in mid-afternoon in the winter, when the low lying south western sun provides welcome light and indeed warmth. We would also like to point out that we spend more time in the morning room than any other room in the house and that it is often used for informal entertaining. Although the proposal mentions that the "neighbour's amenity would be protected" by the moving of the solid wall by by a short distance(approximately 40 cms!) this euphemistically so-called "amenity protection" is completely negated by the considerable amenity loss that would be produced by such a development.</p> <p>A lot of 'weight' in the planning is based on the long footprint of the living room extension, for which permission should never have been granted in the first place. The proposals also disingenuously state that the new extension would only be a "little longer" than the post 1960 footprint. It would be more pertinent to base planning on the original footprint, rather than the footprints of the extensions for which approval was fortuitously given pre-1985. In it's recommendations to the applicants, Camden Council (appendage of letter of 18/02/20) encouraged them to engage with the residents of adjoining properties about their plans before any formal submission of these plans. An informal pre-lockdown discussion may have been helpful in that it could have given them some insight into the potentially adverse effects of their project. We have not, however, been contacted by the applicants or their representatives.</p> <p>As part of their of their proposals the applicants have very reasonably had a tree survey. An arboricultural impact assessment of the effect of an extension a 'little' beyond the 1960 footprint was made on the rooting</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

system of the No.8 Oak, which has an preservation order. We did not however see any comments on the impact on the root system of our Magnolia, which is close to the boundary and significantly closer to the proposed extension than the Oak (Photo.IMG-1256.JPG and diagram on p.48 of Tree Survey).It is the most admired tree in our garden and it's health has to be safeguarded. Although we are not certain of it's age, the Magnolia was fully mature when we bought in 1984 and the height has subsequently been reduced on a few occasions.

We have roughly calculated the area of the proposed kitchen-breakfast room to be 55 sq.M compared to the existing kitchen-breakfast room's 27 sq.M. We fully appreciate the applicant's wish to have a larger kitchen-breakfast room. Instead of achieving this to the considerable detriment of their new neighbours, they need to limit the breadth of the new solid wall to the existing measurement, namely 5.5 M, while extending the area of the kitchen-breakfast room in a SW direction, stopping short by an appropriate distance from their new French Doors. This could provide them with with an area similar to that in their current plan, ensure the safety of their ancient Oak and our Magnolia and genuinely protect their neighbour's amenities.

We object to the proposed extension in the strongest possible terms. We trust that Camden Council will reject the application and advise the applicants to submit a plan that does not have such a disturbing impact on their neighbours at Oakhill Ave

The photographs and diagram will be forwarded by
Council

Planning Officer, Camden