

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3041/P	Samantha Vaile	27/09/2022 19:08:55	OBJ	<p>We are writing to object to this planning application on the grounds that it represents manifest overdevelopment of the site. Specifically we object to the following aspects:</p> <p>1. Proposed roof terrace</p> <p>The developers are proposing to install a roof terrace on the first floor at the rear of the property. We strongly object to this. The garden of 49 Minster Road backs onto our garden and any roof terrace or balcony to the rear of the property would not only overlook our garden, but would also allow a direct view into our bedroom. This would constitute a significant invasion of our privacy, and that of other neighbouring properties which would also be overlooked. This is exacerbated by the fact that the developers, shortly after acquiring the property, cleared the garden, removing at least three mature trees which had previously provided screening between our properties.</p> <p>The Camden Planning Guidance for Home Improvements (at 2.1.2) states that the following principles should be observed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “• Design your home improvement to not infringe on your neighbour’s outlook from their windows and garden; • Ensure any opportunities for overlooking into or from your neighbour’s property are removed and privacy for all properties is maintained;” <p>While this particular passage relates to front and side extensions, we would argue that the principles are also applicable to balconies and roof terraces, and believe the proposed roof terrace would be in breach of both points. Furthermore, it would result in noise nuisance which would affect all neighbours, particularly those of us with bedroom windows close by.</p> <p>There are no other roof terraces or balconies to the rear of the houses in Minster Road, and we object to the possibility of any precedent being set that would lead to further loss of amenity should other householders seek to follow suit.</p> <p>2. The proposed rear extension</p> <p>The developers propose to extend the back of the building beyond the existing building line. This additional depth would extend the property beyond the rear of its immediate neighbours and, indeed, all the other properties in that stretch of Minster Road. The flat roof, at 4m high, would also make the extension far more imposing than the existing extension with pitched roof. This would lead to an excessively large and imposing construction that would no longer be subordinate to the existing building.</p> <p>Camden Planning Guidance (at 2.1.1) states that any extension should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “• Be subordinate to the building being extended, in relation to its location, form, footprint, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;” <p>We believe that the proposed extension breaches these principles.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

3. The proposed outbuilding

We object to the current proposals for the outbuilding. The proposed building would be approximately 8m wide by 4.5m deep. The garden is only slightly over 8m wide, so the outbuilding would fill the entire width. It would have a significant visual impact and would not be subordinate to what would remain of the garden.

The existing garden is 14m long. The effect of building the outbuilding as proposed, together with the depth of the proposed extension, would reduce the garden by 6m - a reduction of almost 50%. This would result in a considerable loss of amenity and a sense of enclosure for the residents of the ground floor flat of 49 Minster Road, together with a detrimental impact on the outlook for occupants of the first floor flat and other neighbours, and a reduction of natural habitat for local wildlife. In particular, the Sarre, Westbere and Minster Road triangle is home to a breeding population of hedgehogs, originally introduced in 2019 by the North West London Hedgehog Re-Introduction Programme. These endangered animals roam widely and current residents have ensured that wildlife corridors connect our gardens to provide a suitable habitat. This development would curtail their freedom of movement and impact on their ability to find food and shelter.

Camden Planning Guidance (at 5.5) says:

“As they occupy space in the garden, the size and design of outbuildings must consider their impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, biodiversity and character of the wider area, so they do not detract from the generally ‘soft’ and green nature of gardens and other open spaces.

Large garden buildings may affect the amenity value of neighbours’ gardens, and if used for purposes other than storage or other domestic uses, may intensify the use of garden spaces and cause loss of amenity through overlooking, overshadowing, lightspill and noise nuisance”

To this end development in rear gardens should:

- “• Ensure the siting, location, scale and design has a minimal visual impact on, and is visually subordinate within, the host garden;
- Not detract from the open character and garden amenity of neighbouring gardens and the wider surrounding area;
- Retain space around the building for suitable soft landscaping;
- Ensure the size will maximise retention of garden and amenity space;
- Ensure the position will not harm existing trees and their roots “

The proposed outbuilding breaches all of these principles (including that of harming existing trees since the developers have already removed these in preparation for their works).

With reference to the potential use of the outbuilding, we are particularly alarmed by the proposal to install a bathroom with shower and toilet, and what appears to be a sink/ kitchen area. The developers are

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3041/P	Michael Wolfson	02/10/2022 15:41:06	OBJ	<p>disingenuous in referring to the outbuilding as a gym and office, since there is a clear intention to create a sizeable self-contained residential unit. This would lead to a substantial loss of amenity to neighbours and the occupants of 49 Minster Road itself in terms of noise, light spill and overlooking, and would be completely unacceptable, as confirmed by the Camden Planning Guidance (at 5.5):</p> <p>“The use of outbuildings should always be incidental to the enjoyment of the main house. The use of an outbuilding as a self-contained (independent) residential accommodation would be subject to enforcement action if undertaken without planning permission specifically for this use”</p>
				<p>I am the owner of the ground floor flat at 47 minster road, my property is let out and wish to object to this proposed development for several reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) On the ground floor this is a significant extension at the back and way beyond the existing length of other extensions of 47 and 51 that Camden have allowed and on this basis it is not in keeping with the area and so should be rejected 2) The extension will also cast a shadow over my garden and impinge on my right to light in my garden 3) A first floor terrace is also being created on the extension and this will impact the privacy enjoyed in my garden at 47 Minster Road and for this reason the terrace should be removed. 4) A house is being converted into three flats dramatically increasing the number of people living in the property. No more than one car parking permit should be allocated to the property as the road is already congested with parking. 5) This is a significant increase in the occupancy of this property and the loft conversion dormer will look out of the garden of 47. for this reason the dormer should be removed 6) Noise and nuisance from development - the rear extension and dormer should be removed from the plans as this development will already cause a significant amount of noise, disruption and congestion in a quiet residential street and so needs to be simplified. 7) The development of the outbuilding is a significant increase in the footprint of the building and not in keeping with the look of the gardens in the road. The building will remove light from my garden and should be rejected. 8) Both the outbuilding and extension will effect the natural drainage in the area and should not be allowed <p>It is my strong recommendation that this development application is rejected as it stands.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3041/P	Elizabeth Webster	29/09/2022 13:05:36	INT	<p>Objections</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The proposed garden room appears to be relatively deep, and the rear extension deeper than the extensions of adjacent properties<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. When viewed together, this will form a sense of enclosure, resulting in inadequate amenity of garden space for the enjoyment of the resident and bulk in terms of the outlook and visual impact from neighbouring propertiesb. The outbuilding is material in proportion. While we note outbuildings can take up to 50% of the garden space under Permitted Development (PD), this is not a dwelling house but a flat and so PD does not applyc. We would further object to the outbuilding being greater than 2.5m in height within 2m of boundaries2. The outbuilding appears contains a shower and what appears to be a sink in the room, which despite its labelling as a Gym gives it the potential of being used as a habitat room annexed to the house, i.e., a bedroom. We object to this self-contained habitat configuration given<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. The incremental noise and light pollution that could be expected through into the evening and nightb. The setting of a precedent which would change the quiet nature of garden areas in the neighbourhood3. We object to the proposed depth of the rear extension, which would not be in keeping with the nature of extensions amongst adjacent properties and would have a materially detrimental impact on the passage of light to ours and neighbouring properties. The rear extension should therefore not go out further than the depth of the existing rear extensions to 47 and 51 Minster Road4. It appears the proposed new roof height will be elevated relative to the height the adjoining property the other side of the party wall, which is unusual and would create a disjointed appearance to the front of the building overall
