

23 Langbourne Avenue
London N6 6AJ

10 July 2020

Camden Council
Planning Department

Objection to Planning Application 2020/1715/P

Dear Planners,

I am writing to object to aspects of the above planning application as the next door neighbour who will be significantly affected.

I have no objection to:

- front elevation
- side dormer
- side ground floor extension
- rear dormer

Ground floor extension

I object to the excessive size of the proposed 4m rear ground floor extension but would have no objection to a 3m extension.

The application is mistaken in suggesting that “most houses have been developed in this manner”. The aerial view on page 4 of the application is misleading as it shows the South side row of houses which have a completely different aspect and relation to the steep hill on which the house is built. Fortunately there is an aerial view on page 2 which demonstrates that none of the North side row of houses has a back extension beyond the original building line.

Other houses in the row have wings in the original plot (not later extensions) which extend 1.6m.

The proposed 4m extension would require considerable excavation of the steep slope of the garden and such a large addition would have an excessive impact on the two neighbouring houses.

First floor rear extension

I object to any first floor rear extension.

The application is mistaken in suggesting that the proposed extension is “similar to the immediate neighbour in 23 Langbourne Avenue”. 23 Langbourne Avenue has not been extended in any way. The original design of 23 Langbourne Avenue included a 1.6m wing so that some rooms are larger than others.

There is no house in Langbourne Avenue or, as far as I have been able to ascertain, in any Avenue of the Holly Lodge Estate, with a first floor extension. Allowing permission for the first first-floor

extension would create a precedent which others would surely follow and result in a further rash of building projects which would change the nature of the Conservation Area.

The application is mistaken in suggesting that “the first floor extension is replicated on the adjacent house so there will be no loss of light”. The proposed extension would extend well beyond the building line of 23 Langbourne Avenue and would overshadow its terrace. The backs of the houses face due North so get very little sunlight and two hours of light on a summer morning allow residents to have breakfast on the terrace – this precious sunlight would be lost.

The first-floor extension should not be permitted. If it is permitted, it should not extend beyond the building line of the back of 23 Langbourne Avenue.

Holly Lodge CAAMS

The Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy (CAAMS) highlights only 5 key issues. Two of these are “side extensions which fill the gaps between separate houses” and “impact of large rear extensions”.

It states that “Rear extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or the Conservation Area. In most cases such extensions should be no more than one storey in height, but the general effect on neighbouring properties, views from the public realm, and relationship with the historic pattern of development will be the key factors in the consideration of their acceptability.”

1. The proposed 4m extension cannot be classed as unobtrusive and the proposal certainly adversely affects the character of the Conservation area.
2. The proposed 2-story extension has a general effect on neighbouring properties and, being the first in the road, has a very real impact on the relationship with the historic pattern of development.

Thank you for considering these objections.

Yours sincerely,
Mark Rogers