
From: Amanda Kelly Turton [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 March 2021 15:36
To: Planning
Subject: Re: Comments on 2020/5951/P have been received by the council.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

I submitted comments a week ago but they are not on the website. Nor are comments submitted by some of my neighbours.

We have all had acknowledgements but can you please confirm that the fact they are missing is just due to a backlog at your end and that all comments will be taken into account.

Kind regards

Sent from my iPhone

> On 1 Mar 2021, at 13:39, planning@camden.gov.uk wrote:

>

> Before commenting on the detail of this application, I must reflect on the fact that this application is the third application to extend the Ground Floor flat at number 5 Hillfield Road in three months.

>

> The previous applications were 2020/4971/P and 2020/4908/P. These were applications which also covered a much applied for (and much refused) extension to number 3 which is essentially in the same ownership as the GF flat at number 5. The current applicant is the owner of number 3 and a director of the Company which now owns the GF flat at number 5.

>

> The first of the two previous applications (2020/4971/P) was refused and we await a decision in relation to the second application.

>

> The applicant is a serial applicant in relation to the same same properties and, fortunately, serially refused, although he appears to remain undeterred. He has now made 6 applications to extend number 3 further than the existing half-built (for many years) rear extension - applications 2019/4621/P, 2019/4710/P, 2020/3034/P, 2020/4603/P, 2020/4971/P and 2020/4908/P.

>

> The plans for this extension are very similar to the plans for number 5 in application 2020/4971/P which was refused. The officer's report on that refusal notes that that application was very similar to the application 2019/4710/P which had also been refused in 2019. Why renew an application which has in effect been turned down twice?

>

> It seems likely that this current application in relation to number 5 is to facilitate a further application in relation to number 3 on the basis of plans that have already been refused. The applicant hopes to create a precedent in the neighbouring property which will allow the development at number 3. It may well be that he does not intend to build at number 5 at all but is using this application as a device to obtain leverage in relation number 3. Indeed, the

cursory nature of the application points to this, in particular the estimated cost of works which is stated as up to £2M. This is ludicrous given the value of the flat.

>

> Since all the previous applications have been refused, the same reasons for refusal must apply with equal force to this application.

>

> Overdevelopment

>

> Extending this flat in the way that is proposed would be over-development. It would increase the size of the flat by more than 50% and result in an extension which would be excessive in size and garden-grabbing. The unsightly structure would not be in keeping with the character of the property or the area and would over-dominate the existing dwelling. It would detrimentally affect neighbouring properties both because of its visual impact and the consequential loss of amenity.

>

> Design and the effect on the character of the building / neighbourhood

>

> The original design of this property is the same as others in Hillfield Road. They are typical late Victorian terraced houses with adjoining side returns which enhance the appearance of the property and also provide much needed space between each property. This mirror image layout is normal in Victorian terraces and part of the distinctive character.

>

> As the officer's report in relation to 2020/4971 makes clear, while there are side infill and rear extensions to neighbouring properties on this side of Hillfield Road "these extensions are much more modest in overall size, are subordinate to the host dwelling and are appropriate in their context".

>

> The proposed extension at number 5 is not in keeping with the original Victorian design and will be unsightly. It will simply create an unsightly box stuck on to the original Victorian property and totally at odds with their late Victorian architecture and the architecture of the other properties in the road. It will extend the GF flat considerably and will not be subordinate to the host dwelling, even if that were the whole building.

>

> To quote from the officer's report on 2020/4971/P the "proposal constitutes an excessive and over-dominant addition to" the application property "which detracts from the form, character and visual amenity of" the existing building and its garden. The proposal "would detract from the aesthetic quality of the building and the spacing and character of the area".

>

> This is as true of this proposal as it was of the joint number 3 and 5 proposal 2020/4971/P.

>

> The design of the new ground floor flat is also unsatisfactory. It involves the construction of a light well as otherwise there would be no natural light to the two small bedrooms on either side. Currently "bedroom two" has a window to the garden. The new "bedroom three" will be very small. It seems likely that there will be insufficient natural light to these bedrooms.

>

> Adverse effect on the amenity of neighbours The proposed extension

> will fill the side return and beyond and so impact on neighbouring properties, including the upper floor flats at number 5.

>

> While application 2020/4971 was held to have no effect on the amenity of number 3, this application will clearly have such an effect because it is not for two mirror image extensions merely one in relation number 5.

>

> The officers's report in relation to 2020/4971/P dismisses the loss of amenity to my property at 7 Hillfield Road. A site visit would demonstrate that the assumptions made are incorrect.

>

> As this extension builds out beyond the current boundary it will cause loss of daylight to the part of our garden that we use for sitting out and to our kitchen. This is because the ground level outside the rear of number 5 is about 1 m higher than that outside number 7. Erecting a 2m wall at number 5 will therefore have a serious effect on light to my kitchen and patio.

>

> Very recently, the applicant has, without any consultation, nailed an additional piece of wood to the boundary fence the length of the proposed extension. I am taking this up with the company which owns the flat. This has deprived the patio area and my kitchen of the light I have enjoyed for 36 years. It is obviously an attempt to block any arguments about loss of light from the extension.

>

> The original unaltered fence allowed the light into what is already a darker part of the garden as it faces north, as well as into my kitchen. The loss of light from the proposed extension would make sitting out far less attractive and would make the kitchen even darker.

>

> The patio would be completely overshadowed by the new extension. There would inevitably be overlooking and our privacy would be greatly reduced.

>

> There will also be noise. This has been a problem in the past with the current layout and will obviously be exacerbated by the fact that the living accommodation is to be moved from the front of the flat to the back with doors which are likely to be left open as there will be no other ventilation.

>

> There will also be loss of amenity to the other flats at number 5. They will be deprived of a direct view onto the garden and will inevitably be disturbed by noise from the extension.

>

> The effect on the amenity of South Mansions is also dismissed but the reality is that the view from this property will inevitably be affected and the noise from the extension will be greater because it extends well into the existing garden.

>

> Visual impact

> Adding a large box onto the rear of the property would result in an unsightly construction. The previous Design and Access statement for 2020/4971/P asserted that the extension to number 5 would not be visible because of the sloping nature of the gardens. In reality the slope will exacerbate the visual impact.

>

> In addition, it will be very visible from the upper floors of neighbouring properties.

>

> Finally, while I appreciate that the detrimental affect of the works is not a material consideration, you should be aware that the owner has a track record going back over 13 years of starting and not completing works at numbers 2 and 3 Hillfield Road.

>

> Works have already started at number 5. It seems likely that if this application is granted further works will be begun and then left undone for an extended period causing more rats and an unsightly vista. Sebba only seems to employ five or six people and he puts them which seems to be one of the reasons work does not proceed to completion.

>

> He has a real talent for turning perfectly habitable houses into derelict sites. Number 5 is just the next victim.

>

> The adverse impact on the quality of life of the residents of the cul-de-sac cannot be over-emphasised. It seems nonsensical to have to consider planning applications from someone who has amply demonstrated an inability to finish any alterations whatsoever.

>

>

> A J Kelly

>

>

> Comments made by A J Kelly of 7 Hillfield Road, London, 7 Hillfield

> Road Phone [REDACTED] Preferred Method

> of Contact is Post

>

> Comment Type is Comment

