

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:  |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/4993/P     | Camilla Martin   | 20/12/2021 01:33:44 | OBJ      | <p>I live in the shadow of this house no. 58 at the garden flat no. 60 and I object to the proposal for breaching the following grounds:<br/>                     No light survey British Standard Code of Practice for Daylight BS 8206-02 was undertaken. [REDACTED] that can clearly be seen to be severely curtailed by broader, higher, darker brickwork buildings right up to the top of the new closet extension in my skyline. My privacy would be rendered effectively non-existent and light severely cut back due to the immediately proximate overhanging upper ground floor or first floor (floor-to-ceiling) terrace extension with wide doors that will be five foot deep right next to my window and a new overlooking upper ground floor or first floor oriel kitchen window, plus another large side window in the end all-brick room replacing the conservatory of the upper ground floor or first floor closet extension. There will no longer be even the brief light &amp; skyline glimpsed through the present conservatory transparent roof. That edifice was quite bad enough but it wasn't wholly brick with a solid roof. Both light and privacy will be badly afflicted by those new obtrusive windows opposite where even mitigation measures in the Camden Planning Guidance explicitly state: "restrictions on inserting new windows into blank walls." I can supply by email photographs demonstrating that upper ground floor or first floor new windows in side return wing walls would be very unusual in this conservation area and are not present in ours.</p> <p>The footprint of the replaced 2 stories including conservatory for dining room is much bigger than the original by 30% on our Eastern side, approximately a metre outwards using their rough scale, then returns to the rest of the rebuilt wing that I can only assume would be the same width as before but there is a steep return, meaning the clean lines of the return run from the closet wing i.e. the internal wing that I see, will be broken which I consider out of keeping in this conservation area.</p> <p>The plans do not show precise measurements for increases and we cannot fully compare the proposals with the existing structures since they are not shown which I would like to do. Where plans cross refer to no. 62 having a terrace, it is not similar, being below our level on the sloping ground on top of their lower ground floor which also does not extend out as far by quite a few metres, nor is it a 2 storey long enclosing closet wing. Nobody else's home is overlooked nor is their light adversely affected.</p> <p>The main points are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing structure was a significant extension to the original building envelope, and should be replaced only within its current footprint. It has already had a material and detrimental impact on the access of light to no. 60, and, because of the orientation of the properties, the presence of sunshine in the middle and latter parts of the day is impeded. Any increase in the height or volume of this extension will exacerbate this harm and should not be permitted.</li> <li>2. New balcony above the proposed lower ground floor extension to the bedroom in the main house is not necessary for the purposes of this bedroom and upper dining room, and would allow unacceptable overlooking of no.60 through two windows and top of the garden.</li> <li>3. The plans do not specify the height of the proposed new boundary wall between nos. 58 and 60. I would recommend that, should permission be granted, a condition is put on to limit the height of the wall (including any trellis or other feature which may be attached to it) to 2m.</li> </ol> <p>Camden's planning permission notification on the tree outside has the wrong date for comments to be</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:   |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
|                 |                  |                     |          | <p>returned on it, stating the 13th December not the 19th today which may have obstructed some responses.</p> <p>This boundary wall has weight and slippage unsafety considerations due to the slant of the gardens on London clay soil with an immediate step down between these two gardens, especially in the middle as seen at no. 60. There is a necessity to allow continuous pass through of sufficient top soil water during rains, between our earthen areas, to prevent flooding &amp; perennial bogging which as it has done overwhelms at flash flood times the main drainage by our homes thus undermining tanking anti-damp work if allowed. That situation which has occurred at least three times this summer and incurred into my home would be made worse by any lengthy garden wall despite attempts to underpin with any kind of flow bricks because not only would they end up at different heights shifting over time but the whole wall would become very unsafe as before (as a photograph will show where and why the last one collapsed decades ago) due to differential root clay soil slippage under its own weight. See many refs on our soils. There are now large bushes by that perimeter doing just this, my photographs I will send by email will demonstrate the looseness and unsafety of the remaining brickwork just about able to maintain the fencing. Consideration should be given too in that regard to the purely ecological aspects about paving over/annexing further portions of these gardens.</p> <p>A site visit here would be recommended and I shall supply photographs to illustrate the above statements.</p> |
| 2021/4993/P     | Nichola Luck     | 17/12/2021 12:31:53 | INT      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The application does not provide an plans showing existing elevations: please can these be provided together with further time to comment?</li> <li>2. It is difficult from the perspective of neighbours to work out the dimensions: please can more detail be provided: as above, having a copy of the existing elevations to contrast to will assist.</li> <li>3. The scale of the proposed extension appears to be considerable and it will as a result block out a considerable amount of light on the neighbouring property no.60. Pilgrims Lane. This is totally unacceptable as the existing extension already has resulted in a substantial loss of privacy for number 60. and already blocks off a considerable amount of light to that property, and its garden and garden flat.</li> <li>4. I write with this objection as my sister occupies the basement/garden flat of No.60 and I bear witnessed to the loss of light and privacy caused by the current extension.</li> </ol>   |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:   |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2021/4993/P     | Camilla Martin   | 19/12/2021 23:20:54 | COMMENT  | <p>I live in the shadow of this house no. 58 at the garden flat no. 60 and I object to the proposal for breaching the following grounds:<br/>                     No light survey British Standard Code of Practice for Daylight BS 8206-02 was undertaken [REDACTED] that can clearly be seen to be severely curtailed by broader, higher, darker brickwork buildings right up to the top of the new closet extension in my skyline. My privacy would be rendered effectively non-existent and light severely cut back due to the immediately proximate overhanging upper ground floor or first floor (floor-to-ceiling) terrace extension with wide doors that will be five foot deep right next to my window and a new overlooking upper ground floor or first floor oriel kitchen window, plus another large side window in the end all-brick room replacing the conservatory of the upper ground floor or first floor closet extension. There will no longer be even the brief light &amp; skyline glimpsed through the present conservatory transparent roof. That edifice was quite bad enough but it wasn't wholly brick with a solid roof. Both light and privacy will be badly afflicted by those new obtrusive windows opposite where even mitigation measures in the Camden Planning Guidance explicitly state: "restrictions on inserting new windows into blank walls." I can supply by email photographs demonstrating that upper ground floor or first floor new windows in side return wing walls would be very unusual in this conservation area and are not present in ours.</p> <p>The footprint of the replaced 2 stories including conservatory for dining room is much bigger than the original by 30% on our Eastern side, approximately a metre outwards using their rough scale, then returns to the rest of the rebuilt wing that I can only assume would be the same width as before but there is a steep return, meaning the clean lines of the return run from the closet wing i.e. the internal wing that I see, will be broken which I consider out of keeping in this conservation area.</p> <p>The plans do not show precise measurements for increases and we cannot fully compare the proposals with the existing structures since they are not shown which I would like to do. Where plans cross refer to no. 62 having a terrace, it is not similar, being below our level on the sloping ground on top of their lower ground floor which also does not extend out as far by quite a few metres, nor is it a 2 storey long enclosing closet wing. Nobody else's home is overlooked nor is their light adversely affected.</p> <p>The main points are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing structure was a significant extension to the original building envelope, and should be replaced only within its current footprint. It has already had a material and detrimental impact on the access of light to no. 60, and, because of the orientation of the properties, the presence of sunshine in the middle and latter parts of the day is impeded. Any increase in the height or volume of this extension will exacerbate this harm and should not be permitted.</li> <li>2. New balcony above the proposed lower ground floor extension to the bedroom in the main house is not necessary for the purposes of this bedroom and upper dining room, and would allow unacceptable overlooking of no.60 through two windows and top of the garden.</li> <li>3. The plans do not specify the height of the proposed new boundary wall between nos. 58 and 60. I would recommend that, should permission be granted, a condition is put on to limit the height of the wall (including any trellis or other feature which may be attached to it) to 2m.</li> </ol> <p>Camden's planning permission notification on the tree outside has the wrong date for comments to be</p> |

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

returned on it, stating the 13th December not the 19th today which may have obstructed some responses.

This boundary wall has weight and slippage unsafety considerations due to the slant of the gardens on London clay soil with an immediate step down between these two gardens, especially in the middle as seen at no. 60. There is a necessity to allow continuous pass through of sufficient top soil water during rains, between our earthen areas, to prevent flooding & perennial bogging which as it has done overwhelms at flash flood times the main drainage by our homes thus undermining tanking anti-damp work if allowed. That situation which has occurred at least three times this summer and incurred into my home would be made worse by any lengthy garden wall despite attempts to underpin with any kind of flow bricks because not only would they end up at different heights shifting over time but the whole wall would become very unsafe as before (as a photograph will show where and why the last one collapsed decades ago) due to differential root clay soil slippage under its own weight. See many refs on our soils. There are now large bushes by that perimeter doing just this, my photographs I will send by email will demonstrate the looseness and unsafety of the remaining brickwork just about able to maintain the fencing. Consideration should be given too in that regard to the purely ecological aspects about paving over/annexing further portions of these gardens.

A site visit here would be recommended and I shall supply photographs to illustrate the above statements.

---

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:   |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2021/4993/P     | Ms Wood          | 19/12/2021 16:49:12 | INT      | <p>Key: throughout this Comment, abbreviations in square brackets can be understood as follows; eg "[AF7]" relates to "point 7 of the Application Form", "[PD]" relates to "Proposed Drawing", "[PS2.4]" to "paragraph 2.4 of the Planning Statement", and so on.</p> <p>The Planning Statement states "Taking precedent from the existing, the proposed structure will be finished in brick with a hipped pitched roof" [PS2.4]. There are many more precedents on which this Application also relies, all of which fall under the Council's Planning Department's remit as "material considerations" under "loss of light and the privacy of neighbours." As none of the other precedents are mentioned within the Planning Statement and, I believe, if these were approved they would set a precedent which would cause loss of light and privacy not just immediately for the private dwelling in the Basement flat at the neighbouring number 60 Pilgrim's Lane but also long-term for the rest of the borough in the enablement of similar applications, a few of the main precedents are listed below. I confirm I am a Camden resident.</p> <p>The Application seeks to not just replace the Ground Floor structure [PS.Fig.03 (first photo)] with a brick one to accord with the Lower Ground which it sits atop, but to widen both parts by encroaching sideways towards No60. This will necessarily place the new structure with an even clearer view directly into the private main living areas of the basement flat at No60 than the present one has done since it was first put up.</p> <p>If approved, the trellis fence which was erected to afford privacy to No58 (as the windows of the current extension look straight in to the private main living areas of the basement flat at No60) and already blocks light to said neighbour by doing so, will be replaced by a "new brickwork garden wall to full length of boundary" which will extinguish the little light that currently penetrates the leaf-filled trellis [PD].</p> <p>The lack of detail in the application documents together with the omission entirely of a copy of the existing plan makes it difficult to obtain the whole picture. Nevertheless, whether the upper floor of the garden structure is glass-walled and calls to mind visions of a border look-out [PS.Fig.01] or whether it is brick the aspect is the same either way - a direct view into the private main living areas of the basement flat at No60 next door.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:  |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/4993/P     | Andrew Wood      | 20/12/2021 10:04:50 | OBJ      | <p>There is clearly a prima facie case that this application threatens the already restricted light and privacy of the neighbouring basement flat at 60 Pilgrim's Lane.</p> <p>This case is laid out in the relevant Camden Planning Guidance: Amenity which reads:</p> <p>&gt;2.2 Interior and exterior spaces that are [REDACTED] which can affect the quality of life of occupants. The Council will therefore expect development to be designed to protect the privacy of the occupants of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree. Therefore, new buildings, extensions, roof terraces, balconies and the location of new windows should be carefully designed to avoid overlooking. The extent of overlooking will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>&gt;2.3 The places most sensitive to overlooking are typically habitable rooms and gardens at the rear of residential buildings. For the purposes of this guidance, habitable rooms are considered to be residential living rooms, bedrooms and kitchens. The area of garden nearest to the window of a habitable room is most sensitive to overlooking.</p> <p>This could be a direct criticism of the extensive proposed balcony (1.5 metres deep and nearly the full width of the dining room - pace the planning document which describes it as "a small balcony") which overlooks the neighbour's kitchen window and adjacent garden.</p> <p>The aim of the guidance is said to be that it: "aims to ensure that the potential impact of development on the privacy and outlook of neighbouring properties and their occupiers is fully considered."</p> <p>There is no such consideration in the proposal. The only acknowledgement in the submitted documents of any impact on neighbour amenity is a misleading comment that the impact [of the new oriel kitchen window] on neighbour's amenity is minimised. By "partially concealing it" from the far end of the garden with the increased width of the extension, it seems, and setting it "well back" (ie the width of the small balcony) from the boundary.</p> <p>Followed by a note that there is extensive existing glazing to the side elevation of the existing raised ground floor closet wing, which is to be reduced in area. From the plans, instead of the conservatory windows and a door there will be a wide full length window, which will be advanced considerably towards the boundary.</p> <p>I understand that enquiries addressed to the responsible architects have established as yet no consideration has been given to how the side of the balcony will be handled - there is no information in the plans - or how the proposed brick wall along the boundary will balance privacy and lighting considerations. An issue that Camden rightly highlights as an issue of singular importance in development planning is ignored in the application, and postponed for resolution independently of the planning process.</p> <p>The following comparison is misleading.</p> <p>&gt;2.9 Along the street there have been numerous alterations and extension that form the context of this application. Recently a similar rear extension to the upper ground floor has been approved at No. 62 Pilgrim's Lane, with roof terrace.</p> |

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:

Response:

The rear extension cited is dissimilar. In particular it does not extend the property deeper into the remaining garden.

However, as an extension on the other side it does highlight a consideration flagged up in the Camden endorsed BRE Guide to Site Layout and Planning.

>Special care needs to be taken in cases where an extension already exists on the other side of the window, to avoid a tunnel effect (Figure 19). ... A tunnel effect can occur if a window is obstructed by extensions on both sides.

Aerial photographs of the rear of the property establish that the Kitchen window is already very gloomy.

The concluding assertion:

>We believe the proposal will positively contribute the character of the property without detriment to the neighbouring properties.

has no basis in the document despite the extensive available guidance about what should be considered in an assessment of detriment to neighbouring properties.

This planning application violates both the letter and the spirit of the relevant Camden Planning Guidance. It is not a serious attempt to engage with the planning process.

---

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:   |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2021/4993/P     | michael murphy   | 19/12/2021 22:16:18 | OBJ      | <p>There was only one notice put up in the street regarding the application in question. It was very small and easy to miss or confuse with others. I know most locals missed seeing it, and I myself needed a third party to point it out. I suspect this is the case for most proposed schemes and may explain why so many dubious ones get through.</p> <p>As for the development itself, my objections are as follows.</p> <p>1. I think its out of keeping with the existing architecture in what is a conservation area—this is major change to the rear of the building with a huge 30% extra lateral increase plus the quite unnecessary grandiose balcony (presumably for entertaining). Note the history on the planning database of previous development at 58 Pilgrims Lane. In 1986 approval was given for the retention of a small conservatory on a balcony. By 1988 this had expanded to a 2 storey conservatory, contrary to Camden's Conservation Area Statement at H29, which says 'conservatories, as with extensions, should be small in scale and subordinate to the original building and at ground level only.' Somehow that got passed. It should not have. Then not surprisingly an application came in 1997 for a 2 storey rear extension. This is very much like the present application. It was rejected. The reasons given were:<br/>'The proposed extension, by reason of its size, location, and detailed design, is detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area, and thereby fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of this part of the Hampstead Village Conservation Area.' Reference PW9702502. My view is that bad development is a bit like abuse: it starts small and gets progressively bigger unless a hard line is drawn to stop it. The retention of a small conservatory on a balcony may be thought harmless. But it soon ramped up to a 2 storey conservatory. Then a 2 storey extension. The latter's rejection was the line the council drew. I don't see any reason to change that. If anything the present proposal is larger in scale, and the precedent set by the refusal in 1997 should not be overturned. Further subsidiary points arising from the Conservation Area Statement are found at H26: that extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible; H28: that they should not spoil a uniform rear elevation, and H30: that infilling of yards and rear spaces is unacceptable. My view is that the scheme is in breach of all 3 clauses.</p> <p>2. Looked at logically, there has to be a very significant impact on the privacy and amenity of those living closest to the suggested development. This can't be otherwise. In particular the tenants of 60 Pilgrims Lane who live in the lower ground and ground floors are going to be very adversely affected. Going by the measurements on the plans, the people in 58 are moving closer by several feet—more with the balcony—and will be overlooking those in 60 as though in an observation tower. One can imagine a situation where they will be looking directly into the windows of those on the lower ground and ground floors of 60. If one refers to Camden's own advice on this contained in the document Home Improvements, Camden Planning Guidance Jan 2021, we can see the problem very clearly. On page 16 it discusses Overlooking/Privacy. Here it says:<br/>'Ensure any opportunities for overlooking into your neighbours property are removed and privacy is maintained.'<br/>It is submitted that far from removing opportunities for breach of privacy, the present scheme is actually creating them. If the council passes this proposal, it will be contradicting its own policy.</p> |

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

3. The proposed structure will also cut out most of the natural light reaching 60. If you look at the dimensions, a new extension wall is proposed that will be built a metre at least nearer 60, plus a large balcony looming over the lower floors—clearly the total effect will be to cast the lower floors of 60 into near permanent darkness. Most of the daylight/sunlight in the garden of 60 comes from the right as you look out. With both a much nearer extension wall and a large balcony overhead, that light will be drastically reduced. For no plausible reason, suddenly the lower ground flat especially at 60 will be plunged into gloom. The advice from Camden on page 16 is unambiguous: 'Design your improvement to not infringe on your neighbours outlook. Ensure your proposal does not reduce your neighbours access to daylight and sunlight.' What could be clearer? Yet the scheme in question does the opposite! It reduces very considerably access to daylight and sunlight, and for that reason should be rejected.

4. This scheme is part of a trend which is chipping away at both the architectural integrity, the character and the quality of life in the conservation area in my view. Most people just like the area as it is. Only a rich, privileged few want to create a mini Versailles at the expense of others and thereby push up the price of property so no locals can live here any more. The price of a flat starts at say £500,000. Then it is enhanced or major refurbishment takes place. So it gets to maybe £750,000. Then an extension is added. Now its £1,000,000 and way beyond the means of local people. Then its a trophy asset for the wealthy. The community is broken up as those with average incomes are forced out. Camden has 4 criteria for development. Home, sustainability, neighbours and community. So community matters, its not an optional feature. This scheme is detrimental to the community. It benefits only the people who put it forward at the expense of the majority who cant afford to live in luxury and opulence. And for that reason it should be rejected.

Again contrary to Camden guidelines, no discussion or attempt to engage with affected neighbours has taken place. The scheme has been presented without due respect for neighbours rights. It suggests an attitude of arrogance and selfishness that should not be rewarded, and is inimical to any notion of community.

Finally consider the noise and mess and upheaval that will result if this proposal gets approved. The construction is due to go on for most of a year. Neighbours who otherwise might get some quiet enjoyment from their homes will get none. Lorries and workmen and materials will be coming and going all day. Parts of the road will be cordoned off for deliveries. Parking, which is always difficult, will be made more so, not just while works are on but, with the extra visitors drawn by the dining and entertaining opportunities in the new extension. The calm look of the road will disappear for many months. All to serve the selfish purposes of the applicants, who have a very nice home already but still want more embellishments. Even after the works are done, neighbours will most likely find parties taking place at 58 and people drinking and chatting on the newly installed balcony.

My overall submission is that the scheme has very little to recommend it.

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:  |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2021/4993P      | Nichola Luck     | 19/12/2021 22:12:58 | OBJ      | <p>1. There are no dimensions given, but an attempt at 3d modelling reveals that the proposal is too big and totally changes the character of the gardens and property. The proposed extension, by reason of its size, location, and detailed design, is detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area, and thereby fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of this part of the Hampstead Village Conservation Area.</p> <p>- Planning approval for the existing extension and conservatory had only previously been decided upon appeal: this proposal plans to extend the previous extensions by at least a third. This is excessive and if allowed, will set a dangerous precedent.</p> <p>2. Erection of a new boundary wall will have substantial issues for wildlife who cannot pass through walls. -if any planning permission is granted height levels should be agreed.</p> <p>3. New window openings are proposed which will lead to a loss of privacy for neighbouring property: window which overlook should have obscure glazing, the new dining room window opens right over the neighbouring garden - suggest, that any such window should have a restriction to either prevent window opening or to use obscure glazing. A new windows is being inserted into a blank wall - this is detrimental to planning guidance.</p> <p>4. As previously submitted: adding to the already large extension will have a negative effect on light and solar qualities of neighbouring properties and their gardens. The planning statement fails to take into consideration best practice and British Standard Code of Practice for Daylight BS 8206-02</p> <p>5. The proposed new balcony attaching to the original building further absorbs valuable light from the not only the rest of the house below but also to the neighbouring property.</p> |

---