

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2744/P	Dr. S Theophilou and Dr. A. Stechmann	21/08/2021 23:45:01	OBJ	<p>As the owners and residents of the adjacent property to 30 Lisburne Road, we object to this application on the following grounds.</p> <p>1. We contest the claim made by the architects that the design has been carefully considered to ensure the additional bulk and mass would not harm the amenity of the neighbouring properties as we note from the published plans that it will extensively affect both neighbouring properties.</p> <p>In our view, the proposed rear extension development is highly disrespectful of neighbouring residents who will feel the considerable impact of the development as well as loss of the extended vistas, openness of the neighbourhood environment, reduction in fresh air and sunlight. Likewise, the attitude of the architects is also disrespectful in assuming there will be no impact on the amenity to the immediate neighbours on either side or to the neighbourhood as a whole.</p> <p>We furthermore dispute all of the claims made in the architects' DEVELOPMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT:</p> <p>3.1 Design Impact upon Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area, and</p> <p>Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) state that development should incorporate the highest quality materials and design appropriate to its context and have due regard to the pattern and grain of the existing street in terms of orientation, scale, proportion and mass.</p> <p>These are further reinforced and supported by policies A1, D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan, stating that developments should complement the street sequence, building pattern, scale, materials and detailing and should achieve a high standard of amenity for users and adjacent uses.</p> <p>3.2 Impact upon Residential Amenity:</p> <p>Policies 3.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 are relevant with regards to the impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties, requiring that buildings should not "cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy, overshadowing, wind and microclimate." This objective is supported by Camden Local Plan 2017 which provides that new development must achieve a high standard of amenity for adjacent users.</p> <p>The rear extension proposal is NOT in keeping with the host building and Conservation Area, and it would have a harmful and detrimental impact on the residential amenity of both neighbouring properties in terms of ecology, privacy, microclimate, overshadowing and views as well as consequences to other neighbouring (opposite) properties and garden spaces.</p> <p>2. The application documents do not clearly show the 'side view/side elevation of the extension or how it would look from the perspective of the neighbours and does not indicate the harmful impact it would have on the neighbouring properties in terms of amenity, air quality, reduction of sunlight and loss of view to the south. The proposed 3m eaves height extension i.e. a wall 3m high on the south side of the boundary would not only block our view to the south but also block sunlight to our ground floor kitchen and garden. The erection of a wall 3m high would be approximately 1.5m higher than the existing garden fence which presently does not limit our view to the south, and would block off the only sunlight to our garden and ground floor from approximately 10.am onwards. This would reduce light levels in our ground floor kitchen/living space which receives sunlight until approximately 12.00am. Additionally, approximately half of our outside garden space will be further plunged into permanent shade.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

3. The so-called 'precedents' quoted for the size and heights of similar extensions have been set by the council NOT enforcing the planning regulations throughout the locality and in Lisburne road. A typical example is the loft extension to the front of No 5, Lisburne road. Another example of the council 'overlooking' inappropriate and unauthorised building, or not enforcing the planning regulations is the wall between nos 34 and 36 Lisburne road, above the rear extension of no 36 and which serves no purpose at all other than to reduce views along the gardens towards the north. Where such extensions and party wall erections over 3m height have been allowed, it has been in contradiction to the planning regulations on existing character and amenity, and have ignored existing long-term residents who have been accustomed to the quietness and views along the length of the street and sunlight falling on their houses, and plunging them into darkness and permanent shade. All these extensions are excessive in height and size in proportion to the space between the houses and sizes of gardens. When existing residents and owners purchased their properties, it was these attributes and amenities that brought them to the neighbourhood. Instead, the council has ignored the loss of amenity, environmental damage and reduction of garden space to create a high population-density rabbit warren in which the garden spaces and views are sufficiently depleted so as to facilitate future 'upward' building, as part of Camden's downgrading of our neighbourhood.

4. The resulting increased noise and loss of privacy has increased as a result of extensions from Rodderick road side reaching towards Lisburne road gardens almost to the ends of the gardens. We can now hear people in Rodderick road extensions talking on their telephones in Lisburne road. This extension should be prevented or reduced in both height and extent. This is another consequence of the council not respecting local conditions or residents - the allowance of extensions coming close to the boundaries of the gardens on the opposite road.

5. 'The roof is designed as a flat roof with rooflights and the height is commensurate with the extensions to the properties on the same side of the road. Similar size single storey rear extensions appear to be typical of a number of these properties'. This is because the council has not enforced the regulations on amenity and environmental impact on the neighbourhood. They are not typical and are not typical of the area.

6. According to the architects: 'The proposed extension is located at the rear of the house, it will not be visible from public view and will not affect the visual appearance of the house when viewed from the street. It will therefore not bear a discernible impact on the character of the Lisburne Road street scene. That may be the case for the council officers who do not live here. The local residents see this otherwise in that the extensions are harming the amenity as well as ecology of the whole rear aspect of the terraces. Most people look to their gardens for privacy and quiet rather than the fronts of their houses overlooking the street. What the current policy is allowing is the replacement of outdoor garden areas with extensions and eventual expansion upwards until we have no more visible sky or views across the gardens. These precedents have been made due to the poor standards of enforcing regulations and overseeing developments. The council has in recent years shown no signs of enforcing the amenity of the neighbourhood. What is to prevent the neighbours from building another storey on top of the proposed extension and extending the upper floor of the rear addition?

7. Our garden is presently over-shadowed for most of the morning by the existing overgrown trees including a large Eucalyptus tree, a fig tree and other trees and shrubs that have overgrown the 6ft fence between the 2 properties, putting our garden in the shade and also preventing any plants from growing including our lawn. We previously had lawn growing but the trees have put a considerable portion in shade.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>The proposed 3m high extension would drastically reduce sunlight to our garden and block our view to the south which the owner has grown up with.</p> <p>8. The proposed extension does not indicate that it will follow the boundary line according to that shown in the proposed site plan. The existing fence, which was positioned incorrectly and without our knowledge by the previous owner, does not follow the correct boundary line. We believe that the proposed work will seek to follow the existing line of the fence to claim additional area in the garden at 30 and also of the extension. We expect a surveyor to verify this is the case.</p> <p>9. The construction of a wall along the boundary with our property will lead to build-up of rainwater and water-logging of ours and the neighbours garden due to the inability of water to drain through the existing soil. This is a further consequence of the concreting over of garden spaces and reduction of natural drainage.</p>
2021/2744/P	Professor PM Pilbeam and Mr SJ Pilbeam, BSc.Econ., MA	22/08/2021 15:33:23	OBJ	<p>We are disappointed that despite repeated attempts, we have received no reply from Patrick Marfleet the Camden agent appointed to deal with this application and were prevented from leaving a message. We are surprised that Camden have not sent us an email about this application. We have been dependent on the owner and architect sending us information. It would seem that Camden do not care what owners do at the back of their houses. Soon there will be no gardens and we will be living in a depleted environment resembling the unhealthy back-to-back houses of the working classes in the nineteenth century. This is a terrible development and should be considered much more carefully by the Town Halls advisers.</p> <p>This application talks of the absence of any impact of this development because it cannot be seen from the front. Of course not, it is a plan to build a large extension in the rear garden of 30. We are concerned that a wall 3 metres high by 2.8 metres long will render our house into a dark, oppressive urban slum. [REDACTED] could [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Our garden is the shortest in the road and is already rendered dark by two enormous bay trees in the garden behind and also by a huge eucalyptus tree in no 30. We do not consider no 30 need to build a wall 3 metres high in order to extend their kitchen. We will lose the view of sky, air and vegetation to the north and be unpleasantly enclosed. The ceiling height is 2 metres 20. Surely the building does not require almost another metre for the flat roof? We ask them to reconsider the need for this military bunker-sized extension by reducing the wall height to 9ft, as is in the regulation height for party walls, and also suggest that they could have just as much space by building a lower, conservatory- type extension, similar to that at 34 Lisburne road, which would provide more light to the resident and also not completely wall us in. A shorter extension with sloping wall, possibly with glass at sides to allow light through would be less obtrusive and allow us to enjoy our garden and views.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2744/P	Dr. S. Theophilou and Dr A. Stechmann	22/08/2021 16:26:01	OBJ	<p>We object to the proposed extension on the additional grounds of: detrimental impact to the neighbours amenity and to the local environment, due to loss of natural and background sounds from our gardens and neighbourhood, which we are accustomed to, since birth.</p> <p>In addition to our main submitted objections, clearly outlining how there will be terrible detriment to the local environment and loss of amenity for the whole neighbourhood (as we are already experiencing noise from encroaching developments from Roderrick road), we wish to add a further example of how this will impact the immediate neighbours. In building a 3 meter high extension, the construction will not only block our sunlight and view to the south, it will also reduce the natural sounds of the local environment and possibly add to noise, if a kitchen extractor is included in the plans.</p> <p>At present, on quiet days and nights when there is little or no background noise from traffic, we are able to hear the chimes of Big Ben in Westminster, 4 miles away to the south. The proposed 3 meter high military-style bunker will almost certainly block off the natural background sounds of gardens and birds to our garden and reduce our air quality. To our understanding, there is a 9 foot height limit for party walls. This proposal exceeds that limit by more than 3 feet.</p> <p>We are already suffering from noise from other neighbours' air conditioning unit placed at the back wall of the garden at 34 Lisburne road and can hear the unit operating even when we are inside the house. This is yet another example of Camden refusing to take responsibility for enforcing regulations on preserving amenity-including excessive noise and noise pollution.</p> <p>We therefore object to this proposal on the grounds that it is in violation of Policies 3.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, with regards to the impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties, requiring that buildings should not "cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy, overshadowing, wind and microclimate." This objective is supported by Camden Local Plan 2017 which provides that new development must achieve a high standard of amenity for adjacent users.</p> <p>We expect Camden council to enforce these directives in this case and propose that the scale of this extension must be reduced drastically in both height and extension.</p>