

**From:** Malcolm Roberts  
**Sent:** 18 April 2021 17:27  
**To:** Planning; Sofie Fieldsend  
**Cc:** Stephen Stark  
**Subject:** Response to Planning Application 2021/0143/P 12 Eldon Grove

To: Sofie Fieldsend  
Camden Planning Solutions Team

From: Malcolm and Maroulla Roberts

We live at 11 Eldon Grove, NW3 5PT, directly next door to No. 12. We have lived here since 1993.

While we have some empathy with the substance of the Hampstead Neighbourhoods Forum's response to the planning application, we wish to confine our response to matters that will, if the application is permitted in its present form, negatively affect us the most.

1. **The proposed ground-floor extension is intrusive and too large.** The rear facades of our house and No. 12 are in line with each other. The proposed ground floor extension to No. 12 extends 3m from the existing rear façade at the corner closest to our property. The boundary of the rear garden of our property and of No. 12 is an identical 8.5m from the rear façade. So the proposed extension takes away over 35% of the length of the garden, which we consider to be excessive, and probably contrary to Camden's policy.
2. **Our green and lovingly-tended back garden will suffer a serious loss of already-limited sunlight as a result of the extension.** Our back garden is small, NE facing, and deprived of sunlight for the majority of daylight hours throughout the year. The extension will reduce considerably the already-limited hours of sunlight. The "Daylight & Sunlight Report" blandly quotes its computer-model finding that the extension will reduce the proportion of the garden enjoying 2+ hours of sunlight from 61% to 54% and offers the conclusion that ". . . this will not significantly reduce the sunlight to existing surrounding properties". We beg to differ: a dark garden suffering a 12% loss of sunlight is bound to be more harmful to both horticulture and humans than a south-facing sunny garden suffering the same percentage loss.
3. **We have concerns about the possible finish of the extension.** One version of the plans shows a black-coloured flank wall to the extension bordering our property. We hope this is just a mistake. Surely a brick finish to match the existing bricks is the only acceptable option.
4. We urge Camden to require the extension plan to be modified in recognition of our concerns.

---

Note: We received no notification from Camden Council of this planning application, and no documents associated with the plans. We were alerted only by a chance sighting of a scruffy notice low down on a lamppost nearby on Thursday 8 April, which indicated that the submission date had passed. Immediately after seeing this I (Malcolm) repeatedly tried to contact the planning

department and then emailed Camden planning and phoned the number of Sofie Fieldsend given in the notice. I repeated my efforts the following day. To date – a week later – I have still not received any communication nor any documents from anyone in the Planning Department. All to no avail. I then contacted and have spoken to Councillor Stark to request his assistance and am copying this to him. I don't think you have any grounds to exclude our submission. Incidentally, three of the reports within the suite of documents on your website cannot be opened properly by my (up-to-date) computer beyond the covering page, so surely providing hard copy of the whole suite and checking their delivery should be (and at least used to be) a requirement.

Regards

Malcolm & Maroulla Roberts