

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1640/P	Felix Moldenhauer	13/06/2022 00:50:48	OBJ	<p>As owner of the basement flat at 55A Hillfield Road, I object to the proposal (no. 2022/1640/P) for the erection of an 'infill' side extension at 57 Hillfield Road in its revised form.</p> <p>In addition to the points raised for the ground floor flat, I want to highlight the particular implications for the occupier of my basement flat in the following.</p> <p>The proposal to build directly next to the 2.2 m deep light-well a wall with height exceeding 3 m (when including the parapet wall) would lead to a substantial loss of amenity (including loss of light and outlook) for my basement flat and create a sense of enclosure, in particular affecting the bedroom and its light-well: a full-height, panel-glazed door is the only source allowing light to enter the bedroom from the light-well.</p> <p>The submitted plans of the revised application still misrepresent the size and location of this door: it is a door (not a window), narrower than shown on the plan, and located much deeper in the light-well than shown on the plans. Hence, the plans do not allow to fully assess the impact of the proposal on my property.</p> <p>The side extension of the proposal would effectively create an overbearing wall of more than 5.5 m height bordering the light-well. It would further reduce the already limited amount of light entering the basement flat, and impact the quality of life for its occupier.</p> <p>The 45 degree test fails. And my right to light would be affected.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1640/P	Felix Moldenhauer	12/06/2022 23:56:55	OBJ	<p>As owner occupier of the ground floor/garden flat at 55 Hillfield Road, I object to the proposal (no. 2022/1640/P) for the erection of an 'infill' side extension at 57 Hillfield Road in its revised form: due to its size and bulky design, the proposed extension would severely impact the amenity, light, and outlook of my property.</p> <p>The proposal to build directly on the boundary line a 6 m long wall with height exceeding 3m (including a parapet wall) would negatively affect the quality of life for my family (including a young child) at our flat.</p> <p>It would negatively impact the outlook from my kitchen window, which would be directly facing this overbearing wall.</p> <p>Furthermore, it would obstruct light from entering my property and also overshadow my side garden, whose enjoyment would be reduced.</p> <p>Likewise, the bedroom window (in the rear wall of the main building) would be overshadowed, and its outlook generate a feeling of enclosure/tunnel effect.</p> <p>In all instances, the 45 degree test fails. And my right to light would be affected.</p> <p>Finally, the proposal does not respect the local context and character: in the whole terrace, no rear extension infilling a side garden between 2 properties has a wall of 3m height at the boundary. Under the regular planning application process, such development would generally not be approved.</p> <p>In summary, the proposal does not comply with Camden Local Plan's Policy A1 "Managing the impact of development" by failing to adequately consider the impact on my property, nor does it meet its Policy D1 "Design" by not respecting the local context and character.</p> <p>It also does not fulfil the information requirements for Permitted Development applications since it only states the "maximum eave height" of 3000 mm, but does not give the "maximum height" of the extension including the parapet wall - which is listed as "the maximum height of the enlarged part of the dwelling house" in paragraph A.4(2)(a)(ii) of Schedule 2, part 1, The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015.</p>