

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1872/P	Nicola Pohl	18/06/2022 14:23:46	OBJ	<p>I am the homeowner of the adjoining house at 2a Hillfield Road and strongly object to this application on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. Inaccuracies and omissions</p> <p>In the description of the proposal in the Application for Planning Permission it is claimed that 'The proposal is to utilise the roof space further to create a second floor more in line with the neighbour houses'. However, as can be clearly seen from the diagrams in the Design and Access statement, such as the context rear view image on page 9, this proposal adds a 3rd level extension that protrudes far deeper than the 3rd level of any of the neighbouring houses in the terrace, with larger bulk on the upper level than the neighbouring properties. Therefore this proposal is certainly not bringing the existing property or previously approved applications 'in line' with the neighbouring houses, but doing quite the opposite.</p> <p>The reference to other houses in the cul-de-sac being 3 levels high is misleading. The properties on Hillfield Road in the cul-de-sac which have 3 levels have loft rooms which are not developed all the way back and are far smaller than the proposed extension at 2 Hillfield Road, which will project significantly beyond any of this row of properties on Hillfield Road. 2a Hillfield Road, which is directly adjacent and adjoined to 2 Hillfield Road, only has 2 levels and the proposed development will tower above and beyond and be entirely out of keeping with its next-door neighbour.</p> <p>The application claims that 'most of the houses in the area are at least 5-bedroom houses' and this application is 'seeking to bring the house more in line with the remaining houses'. However, this is misleading information to justify and rationalise overdevelopment at this site. The houses on the opposite side of the road may have 5 bedrooms but these are larger houses in their original Victorian design, with a larger footprint. The houses which form a terraced row with 2 Hillfield Road in this cul-de-sac are significantly smaller, with 3-4 bedrooms. Certainly 2a Hillfield Road which adjoins 2 Hillfield Road, is a 3-bedroom house. This proposed extension will take 2 Hillfield Road out of line with the neighbouring houses and the justification for this proposal is therefore flawed and inaccurate.</p> <p>Each drawing provided of the proposed front elevation misleadingly includes in red the details of the 2008 planning permission approval for a roof extension at the next-door property, 2a Hillfield Road, as if one should look at this diagram bearing in mind there is or will be an extension there. The Design and Access Statement also references this planning application for a roof extension at 2a Hillfield Road. However, this does not provide any support or relevance to the proposed extension at 2 Hillfield Road. The previously approved small roof extension at 2a, to replicate the lofts present on neighbouring houses, has not been built in the 12 years since that application was approved and that approval has lapsed. So there is no roof extension, there is no existing approval for a roof extension and there are no plans for a roof extension at the adjacent property 2a Hillfield Road. The current proposal should not be misleadingly compared to or based on an extension on an adjacent property that does not exist and has no approval to be built.</p> <p>The drawings of the proposed rear elevation of the development all carefully omit the adjoining property at 2a Hillfield Road, though the property on Gondar Gardens is included. The inclusion of the adjoining property on Hillfield Road in these drawings would no doubt put the proposed development into context with its neighbouring properties on Hillfield Road, and would demonstrate very clearly how out of character and out of line the proposal is with its Hillfield Road neighbour. Appropriate inclusion of the adjoining house would also</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

give a clearer indication of the overshadowing, loss of privacy, light and amenity this application entails for our property at 2a. It is therefore no surprise that the developer has chosen to omit this important information, as these issues raise significant concerns about the proposal.

2. Out of character with the existing property and neighbouring properties

The description of the proposal states that the building is 'not in a conservation area and not listed'. This statement is being used by the developer as an excuse to propose a rear extension that is entirely out of keeping with the character of the street and neighbourhood. However, 2 Hillfield Road is a Victorian terraced house in a row of pretty Victorian terraced houses in a quiet cul-de-sac. The proposed extension of the rear aspect of the building will be clearly viewed from the street on Gondar Gardens, from all the neighbouring houses on Hillfield Road and from the Mansion building flats on Mill lane which back onto it. Therefore it is important that the rear of the property remains in keeping with the character and design of the neighbouring properties in the terrace. But this application proposes a design for 3 levels above ground which jut out beyond the neighbouring properties and will look ugly, imposing and out of place.

As outlined in this application, the 2020 application to extend a proposed dormer loft further to the rear than that approved in previous 2007 and 2008 applications was rejected. As the Design and Access Statement document for this current application notes, the previously rejected application was criticised by the planning officer as 'massing is excessive and out of scale with the building and the established pattern of neighbouring rear development. The massing should relate to that on Hillfield Road'. This objection still stands for this current re-vamped application, as the rear extension proposed adds additional bulk and mass on the top floor at the rear beyond the previously approved applications, and it is out of line with any of the houses on this side of Hillfield Road in the cul-de-sac (ie. the houses 2 Hillfield Road is adjoined to as part of a terrace).

The context rear view image on page 9 of the design and access statement claims to show 'how the building is blended with the neighbouring building in context of the terrace'. But this diagram in fact shows that the proposal looks entirely different from any of the neighbouring houses on this terrace and the third level extension is far larger than any of the nearby houses and especially the neighbouring property at 2a. Contrary to the claims that the design 'blends' in with the rear designs of the adjacent properties on Hillfield Road, and 'preserve the character and appearance of the neighbourhood', the diagrams provided in the statement show clearly that the proposal is not in keeping with the appearance of the neighbouring houses. The design's 'modern twist' black aluminium framed windows and doors, which will be visible from street level, are entirely out of character with the surrounding period properties both in terms of size and design.

The further alteration is certainly not designed 'to make the buildings blend with the general elevation proportion of the buildings' as the application claims. 2 Hillfield Road is at the top of a hill and Hillfield Road slopes down from there, so the extended 3rd level on the proposal will be higher than any of the other houses in this terraced row, further emphasised by the fact it is one level higher than its adjacent neighbour. As outlined above, the proposed extension on the top floor will also jut out much further back than the 3rd levels of the other houses. The proposal will therefore not appear in line with the other houses in the row or 'blend into the general elevation proportions of the buildings' in any way.

3. Overshadowing, loss of privacy, loss of light and loss of amenity

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

The proposed bulky rear extension will overlook and overshadow our garden and rear rooms at 2a Hillfield Road next door. The aerial view on page 10 of the Design and Access Statement shows how the extension will project out and completely overshadow 2a. Privacy and sunlight will be lost to our small back garden, with a major loss of amenity. Any enjoyment of the outdoor space in this family home will be destroyed. The proposed enlarged extension will also overlook and overshadow the other gardens in this row of terraced houses, as well as the flats in the Mansions building on Mill Lane. Therefore the privacy, light and amenity of all the surrounding properties and their residents will be reduced.

The proposed rear extension will also lead to significant and concerning loss of light and therefore amenity within our house at 2a Hillfield Road. As can be seen in the daylight and sunlight analysis submitted by the applicant, multiple windows at 2a Hillfield road will have significant reductions in daylight and sunlight below required levels. This has been dismissed in the opinion section of the report as one is a bathroom (but still needs light) and the kitchen windows affected are referred to as 'secondary windows', and not seen as being of any importance. But this kitchen is not currently well lit from the what the report refers to as the 'main' window (actually the back window), due to the narrow and long dimensions of the room and the very close proximity of the 4-storey Mansions building on Mill Lane, which backs onto and overlooks the property. Therefore, maintaining current levels of daylight and sunlight to the multiple side windows ('secondary windows' according to the report) is vital to provide adequate light to the kitchen. The kitchen should not be considered a 'secondary living space' as suggested in the report. It is the most utilised and important room in a family home during daylight hours. In addition, the dining room on the ground floor and a bedroom on the first floor are directly adjacent to 2 Hillfield Road at the rear of the property, are each only served by one window and already have limited light as other rear rooms of both 2 Hillfield and 2a Hillfield Road protrude on either side of these windows, as per the original layout of these properties. The proposal to further extend at the back of 2 Hillfield Road with a more substantial structure will further affect the sunlight, daylight and habitability of both these important rooms, which are already partially obstructed and cannot afford further loss of light.

4. Overdevelopment

The Application for Planning Permission notes that this proposal is for a 5-storey building at 2 Hillfield Road. The plans already approved in 2007 and 2008 unfortunately allowed an overdevelopment of what is currently still a 2-storey Victorian terraced house sitting in a row of terraced Victorian houses in small cul-de-sac. The previous approvals allow an extension to the rear at both current levels, building of an additional 3rd level above ground, excavation of a basement with 2 underground swimming pools and garden-grabbing with the garden replaced with a smaller basement outdoor space instead. This new application, to further increase the size of the proposed development, would enable yet further overdevelopment of this small property. This developer is repeatedly pushing for further overdevelopment of the site with no regard for the surrounding neighbourhood or local residents, with what appears to be a sole aim of increasing company profits.

5. Concerns regarding the developer's track record and use of the site

At least 5 planning applications for this site were granted in 2007/8 and 1 was granted in 2015, all to the same construction company, Elevations, which is now making this further application. In this application, the company states that the building work started in 2009, 13 years ago. For at least this time period, if not longer, the property has been a dilapidated building site and eyesore affecting the amenity of all surrounding local

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:****Response:**

residents. We have provided photographic evidence of this to Camden Council already. The site appears to be utilised as a storage area for building materials for other developments, although it is not zoned as a commercial property for this use. It has a rat infestation which has spread to neighbouring homes and has an enormous hole dug in the back garden. But in 15 years of planning applications, site mismanagement and neglect, no clear progress has been made in creating useful accommodation for Camden residents or returning the property to its previous habitable state. This is particularly appalling given the housing shortage in Camden. Elevations' poor track record at this site is grounds for very serious concern about this and any further applications, which are likely to just stretch out the number of years over which this company degrades the local area, causes loss of amenity to local residents and prevents appropriate use as a residential property.

Of note, the planning application was not available for public view on the Camden Planning Applications Search the day prior to the closing date for comments, and possibly for many days prior as well. This issue was remedied on 17th June when I notified the Planning Office, but it is very possible that other local residents were prevented from finding the application or submitting objections as a result of this issue.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1872/P	A Kelly	16/06/2022 09:20:11	OBJNOT	<p>I wish to object to this application on the following grounds.</p> <p>It is unsightly, much too dense and totally out of character with the road and the area. 2 Hillfield Road was a pretty property which is older than the rest of the street and should be preserved with its historical facade and footprint. In addition the development, if approved, would result significant loss of amenity to the neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Density / overdevelopment It is obvious from the pictures and plans that this development would result in an overlarge building shoe-horned into a tiny space and totally out of keeping with its surroundings.</p> <p>The development seeks to build over almost the entire plot. It is clear that very little of the garden would remain. The garden is, in any event, very small, so should be maintained in its entirety.</p> <p>It is simply far too dense and and seeks to overdevelop a very small site. This is exacerbated by the height of the proposed building which is just trying to squeeze far too much development out of a small footprint, presumably to try to maximise the developers profits. None of the accommodation will be social housing so will not provide the housing that Camden desperately needs.</p> <p>Visual impact and the character of the street and neighbourhood Hillfield Road is a typical Victorian Road and this development would detract from its charm and historical importance.</p> <p>The current facade of the building along with the neighbouring property is of historical interest. While it is lower than the facades of properties further along the terrace, the actual roof is at the same level as those properties. These proposals will increase the height so that it exceeds the height of the other properties in the terrace</p> <p>Increasing the height of number 2 would therefore take it out of line with the rest of the terrace, particularly 2a, the neighbouring property. What is currently a pleasing aspect which has existed for over 150 years would become an unsightly, over-large anomaly totally out of keeping with the rest of the road and the local area.</p> <p>Loss of amenity The proposed development will result in significant loss of amenity for the properties in the rest of the terrace particularly those immediately adjoining number 2. Significant loss of light is likely as well as overlooking resulting in loss of privacy.</p> <p>I have raised the issue of the effect on properties in Mill Lane in comments on the many previous applications in respect of this property. I remain to be convinced that those interested in the Mill Lane properties have been made aware of the proposals.</p> <p>In addition, I have previously commented on inaccuracies in applications from this applicant. One has to query whether such inaccuracies are errors or attempt to mislead the planning authority.</p> <p>This application states that most of the houses in Hillfield Road are 5 bedroom houses. This fails to distinguish</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>between the larger houses in the road with larger gardens and covering a much larger area and the smaller houses which are part of this terrace. That is a highly relevant factor in determining this application and so it is regrettable that this sort of inaccuracy has been included in the application.</p> <p>Finally, others have commented on the track record of this “developer” in Hillfield Road. He owns two properties and we have seen very little development, lots of planning applications, major disruption and the steady deterioration of his properties. It is disappointing that Camden has failed to address any of these issues. Enforcement action is well overdue.</p> <p>The tactic seems to be to keep enforcement action at bay by making planning application after planning application, all the while using the site for commercial purposes in breach of the current planning use.</p>
2022/1872/P	Vesta & John Curtis	17/06/2022 19:55:18	OBJ	<p>We would like to object to this application in the strongest way possible. As Camden planning authorities will know (or should know) this developer has the most appalling track record in this part of Hillfield Road. The site of no 2 Hillfield Road has been derelict for at least 17 years, and what was once a nice house has been turned into a rat-infested hulk with enormous holes in the ground at front and rear. This is not only a local scandal, but has the capacity to become a national scandal. The new application is for a much larger development than was envisaged previously with an attendant knock-on negative effect on neighbouring properties. And how long would it take? It is impossible to have any confidence in this proposed development. The developer should be forced to complete as soon as possible what he has already been given permission to do. In our view nothing else would be acceptable. The present state of 2 Hillfield Road (solely down to the developer) is a blight on all neighbouring properties, and with the present housing crisis to have kept such a property empty for 17 years is quite unacceptable.</p>