

**37 Elliott Square
Hampstead
London NW3 3SU**



Attn: Mr Nathaniel Young
Planning Officer
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND

22nd February 2021

Dear Mr Young

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS 2020/5880 P, 2020/6008 P and 2020/6009 P

Further to my phone call, made before the deadline for objections (which by chance I happened to find out about from seeing notices posted on a lamp post in the Square) and a couple of emails sent since confirming I was putting my response together, I am now writing to put my objections in writing. This matter is extremely important to me as I live on my own and this development will severely affect my quality of life having now retired and wishing to stay in my house where I have lived since 1983. At that time, the Quadrangles were a new development and the houses behind me in Lower Merton Rise had not even been built.

I realise that the three house owners are trying to maximise their properties in line with revised legislation which impacts on Camden's previous Planning policy which insisted on whole terraces being built on together and which formed part of their reasons for refusing an earlier application in 2015. All three houses already have ground floor extensions and the addition of another storey will further add to the feeling of our houses in Elliott Square being hemmed in and overlooked and losing even more privacy.

Furthermore, I understand that whereas before the previous plans included set backs in line with Chalcots Estate Architects Forum Guidelines and as agreed at an Elliott Square AGM in 2018, these no longer form part of the new plans which will just be built straight up making them even more overbearing. The three other properties in Lower Merton Rise (nos.11,13, and 15 which are not within the Elliott Square Sector) and are cited as having been agreed in respect of a 4th storey, all have setbacks and are in keeping with the height of existing properties adjacent to them and not causing any loss of amenity to properties behind.

The other problem is that by assessing individual applications, you are not getting the full picture of what this would look like in reality with other houses not building up. I have tried to demonstrate this by attempting to mock up a drawing as I have neither technical capacity in terms of skill or computer software to be able to provide a more professional view. I have likened it to 'missing teeth' and this is illustrated with No. 24 remaining at a lower level than No. 22 on one side and Nos. 26 & 28 on the other. To the other side of No 22, No 20. and the rest of the block will also be at lower levels.

I will email you a Dropbox link which contains all the documents on which I am relying – Camden documents - Amenity Jan 2021; Home Improvements Jan 2021 in which I have marked up various sections which I will list for you. The Daylight and Sunlight report produced by Delva Patman Redler and comments thereon. Various screenshots from

Cont'd

-2-

documents for instance the before and after illustrations from the Delva Patman Redler drawings which show the overbearing impact of no 26's height extension above the houses backing on to it in Elliott Square (gradient height difference already exists and is exacerbated by further extension.)

I am also sending a number of videos and photos which illustrate the loss of sunshine and skyline which the Daylight and Sunlight reports dismiss as being satisfactory - on paper they may be but that is computer generated opinion and my recordings illustrate **reality**. I am also including some recordings from 2015 as the narrative in the videos is still valid today. I would also be happy for you to visit my house and stand in my kitchen (which is my main living room despite a different assumption being made in the report), so you can see the reality I am talking about.

In summary I am objecting on grounds of:

1. **Loss of Amenity** – severe loss of **actual sunshine** rather than simulated sunshine, particularly in the summer months. We already lose the sun when it hits the houses behind so we will lose it earlier, similarly daylight. Camden acknowledges the positive benefits of sunshine and its loss will no doubt have a detrimental effect on my health and mental well-being.
2. **Overlooked** - feeling of being hemmed in and overlooked even more than currently. If these applications are successful, *then the very least is that they should be required to include set backs* as per the 2014 plans and the existing buildings opposite at 11,13 and 15 Lower Merton Rise.
3. **Loss of Privacy** - in line with being overlooked more windows will be facing my property 24 hours per day.
4. **Outlook** - the outlook from my main living room - my kitchen will be obstructed – currently I can see the tree at the entrance to Elliott Square above no 28 – a sign of life every morning when I open the blinds – this will not be visible any more. The immediate outlook will no longer be uniform and familiar but as described earlier 'like missing teeth' due to uneven development creating a visual eyesore not only from behind but at street level.
5. **Community** – these plans do nothing to enhance either the look of our community or the spirit engendered by having to fight yet again to maintain my quality of living and that of my close neighbours.

I trust you will give full consideration to all the points I have raised and the supporting evidence provided and repeat the invitation above for you to visit my property for a 'hands on' view of the practical issues raised.

Kind regards.

Yours faithfully



Mrs Gillian M King
Owner 37 Elliott Square since 1983