

Dear Ms Chana,

Further to our discussions, regrettably I feel I am obliged to formally object to planning application 2021/6234/P. I am sorry I missed the formal deadline of the consultation; I understand you are still able to accept the objection and thank you for doing so.

I am aggrieved to have to object to the application, it feels un-neighbourly to object, and I believe it would not have been necessary if the Council had considered the application in greater detail before validating it.

My objection is due to the following:

1. The application does not include a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA). I am aware this is a requirement of Camden Council if there are excavations that may impact on the foundations of terraced properties and / or the support of the public highway. The applicant's drawings clearly state they intend to lower the level of the existing basement and front lightwell. Without the Basement Impact Assessment, including Geology analysis based on surveyed data, it is not possible for consultees or the Council to consider the risks to their properties or the physical changes that may occur due to the basement. If the applicant retrospectively submits a BIA, I assume the Council will re-consult on the application to afford consultees the opportunity to consider the information.
2. It is not clear from the drawings or the design and access statement how the front boundary wall at pavement level will be retained / reinstated. The Belsize Conservation Area Guide clearly explains the importance of the boundary wall, that planning for their removal will be resisted and further that when the opportunity arises, the walls should be restored to their original form.
3. No details are provided about the hedge above the front boundary wall. Again, the Belsize Conservation Area Guide states 'Hedges should be retained and replanted where they are a feature of the streetscape'. The front boundary hedges are a significant feature of the Glenmore Road Streetscape. The application / scheme does not respond to this. I assume it should either state how the hedge is to be retained (physically impossible given the alterations to the front lightwell) or the design should provide for adequately sized planters and irrigation for the growth of the privet hedge (*Ligustrum ovalifolium*) that is a feature of the streetscape.
4. Due to the lack of a BIA, it is not clear whether the lowered manhole in the front lightwell is sufficiently high enough / measures are in place to prevent sewage flood. Current resilience should be retained or improved for the benefit of the property itself and the neighbouring properties.
5. The application is for part of the property not the entire property but seeks to alter the configuration of the bin store for the entire property. It should not be acceptable for alterations to be made that do not respond to the Council's current refuse collection processes, doing so results in wheelie bins blocking the public highway and causing blight to the Conservation Area. The design should ensure all bins used by the building, not just the application property, are capable of being housed within the front bin store.
6. The garden / Greenhaven between the properties of Glenmore Road and Glenloch Road is very narrow, in most parts the rear of the properties are closer to each other than they are

to the properties opposite them at the front elevation across the public highway. This extremely close proximity and very limited green environment gives rise to a number of concerns regarding the proposed rear extension. I consider the extension to be over-development. Despite the application not providing section drawings of the extension or view points from neighbouring properties to allow consultees to fully assess the proposal, my concerns are:

- (i) The extension will narrow the already narrow gap between Glenmore Road and Glenloch Road properties. You may assume the impact will only be felt by the properties on Glenloch Road but that is wrong. As I look from my property down the Greenhaven, I will be met with a brick wall where currently there is sky and greenery.
  - (ii) Due to the lack of a section drawing it is impossible to determine whether or not any change in level will result in increased over-looking.
  - (iii) The extension is likely to block sunlight to the garden of No 12 Glenmore Road, an already shaded garden.
  - (iv) The foundations of the extension may harm the roots of the tree located in the rear garden of 12 Glenmore Road or any trees located at 14 Glenmore Road. The trees are critical for nature, greenery and for offering some privacy from neighbouring properties given the close proximity. I assume the trees are not subject to a Tree Preservation Order but if the Council does grant planning permission, I hope the trees will be protected as if they were the subjects of Preservation Orders.
  - (v) The proposed rooflight in the rear extension will result in unacceptable light pollution. Aside from increasing the existing light nuisance to neighbouring properties, I imagine the light could result in harm to the wildlife in the Greenhaven. It isn't clear to me if the 1<sup>st</sup> Floor of 14 Glenmore Road forms part of the application property, if it does not, I am surprised if no objection is received from the owner of that property, the rooflight is directly below their window.
  - (vi) The side return windows of No.16 Glenmore Road will receive less daylight due to the rising of the boundary wall, the side return windows of No.16 will already have unacceptably low levels of daylight if they are like those of other properties on the street. Linked to this is that the rear elevation drawing showing intentions for Grd / 1<sup>st</sup> Floor window of existing 'side return' does not explain how this window will be altered to accommodate the proposed side extension.
  - (vii) The extension abuts right up to the boundary of the properties, it isn't setback to minimise its impact. I note in some places it is only 40mm (4cm!) from the boundary wall.
  - (viii) I can't recall seeing details of the rear-elevation but any stained glass and traditional window and door arrangements should be retained. If energy efficiency is a concern, it is possible for the original stained glass to be built into double glazed units. If the windows were at the front of the property, planning permission would be resisted (refused) to their change in accordance with the Belsize Conservation Area Guide that seeks to protect decorative glass that has an important ornamental role. Given the proximity of the Glenloch Road properties, the rear of the properties should be treated the same as the front.
7. It isn't clear to me what windows are proposed at LG on the front elevation. Whatever is proposed should be in keeping with the Conservation Area design of the windows at higher

level in terms of dimensions and materials. Presumably, the design will need to include for adequate ventilation without creating a security risk. Given the intended use of the room as a bedroom.

8. Hopefully the intentions for the front gate and tiled entrance is for them to be retained and improved to enhance the Conservation Area.
9. As a note, not an objection, the proposed ceiling height for the LG is approximately 2.12m, I wonder if that creates sub-optimal space or does not leave sufficient construction tolerances to ensure the space complies with Building Regulations.
10. Although not stated, it appears there could be a future intention to separate the LG Floor from the Grd Floor. If the floors were separated resulting in a studio flat at LG Floor, it would necessitate additional bin storage and result in a greater occupational density. I hope officers will consider whether sufficient policy exists to ensure this does not occur or that if policy doesn't exist, any consent will be conditioned to prevent the LG Floor being separated at any time in the future.

In Summary, I am aggrieved to have to object to the application. Most of my objections are due to lack of information being available, information that would presumably have been produced by the applicant if the Council had reviewed the application in greater detail before validating and consulting. Assuming the necessary information is provided and due process is followed, I don't see why the basement works and front elevation alterations wouldn't be acceptable but as above, I believe the rear extension is over development and unacceptable.

Ben