

From: Geoff Cheek
Sent: 18 January 2023 14:18
To: Planning Planning
Subject: OBJECTIONS TO 39A PROPOSED EXTENSION (Planning Application - 2023/0011/P)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Alex Kresovic at Camden Planning

Planning Application - 2023/0011/P

I wish to submit objections
to the planning application below.

My name is John Geoff Cheek.

SUMMARY OF 39A PROPOSED EXTENSION OBJECTIONS (Planning Application - 2023/0011/P)

The proposed single storey rear extension, by reason of its excessive size, footprint, and projection beyond the rear building line, would be detrimental to the integrity of the terrace, and the contribution this building makes to the character and appearance of the terrace and the wider Swiss Cottage Conservation Area.

The proposed extension also extends in width, on both neighbours sides, beyond the fence boundary line and trespasses into their gardens (thus reducing their property and garden size).

It is contrary to policies B1 (General design principles), B3 (Alterations and extensions) and B7 (Conservation areas) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan and to guidance contained within Camden Planning Guidance and the Swiss Cottage Conservation Area Statement.

CONTRARY TO POLICY B1 (GENERAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES) IN SIZE AND DESIGN AND B3 (ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSIONS)

- The excessive size and general design fails Policy B1 (General Design Principles), and B3 (Alterations and Design). It is generally considered acceptable to build any new extension to a maximum footprint size of 10% of the original building. The existing footprint is just less than 69 sqm. The extension adds 30.5 sqm. This extension increases the original footprint by nearly 45% which is unacceptable. This means the extension would fail to be subordinate to the host building in terms of footprint, scale, location and

proportions. It is considered that it would dominate the original building to the detriment of its appearance. In terms of detailed design, it is considered that the solid appearance would give the extension an unacceptable and bulky appearance that would be harmful to the original building.

- Except for three much smaller nearby rear extensions (none of which project further than a much smaller 3m from into the garden, or are full width), the rear of this terrace remains relatively unimpaired. The current proposed extension extends 8m; and is full width.
- It is considered that an extension of this scale would therefore fail to respect the historic pattern and established grain of the surrounding area and would spoil the existing integrity of the wider terrace, particularly at lower ground floor level.

- In summary it is considered that the proposed extension would be harmful to the appearance of the building and the integrity of the wider terrace contrary to relevant policy and guidance. It also encroaches into both neighbour properties, to their detriment.

CONTRARY TO POLICY B7 (CONSERVATION AREAS)

-

- This is a conservation area, and this would be both damaging to conservation area appearance, and contrary to Policy B7 (Conservation areas).
- The proposed extension is too large and bulky and would be obtrusive and take away from the existing openness of the rear gardens. There would be a loss of sunlight and daylight to neighbouring properties and gardens, and outlook and privacy from adjacent properties. The proposal does not respect original features of the building and would destroy the integrity of the terrace and the Conservation Area.
- There would also be a negative impact of exchanging soft landscaping with built form.
- The proposed extension would create a damaging precedent in size and scale. There are no full width extensions in neighbouring properties, and so this would be out of character with the specific area in Goldhurst Terrace. It would also set an unfortunate and damaging precedent that could result in further harm. The extensive and open nature of the rear garden spaces make an important visual contribution to the local townscape and also to the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. It is considered that an extension of this scale would be unacceptably obtrusive and disrupt these long views to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- The proposal does not respect original features of the building and would destroy the integrity of the terrace and the Conservation Area.
- It is noted that a full length extension was refused previously for the direct neighbour 37A Goldhurst Terrace by Camden Planning in 2007, and the subsequent built extension was thereafter, as required, built to half width. This is the same case with the other direct neighbour at 41A Goldhurst Terrace

who also had permission to build only a half width extension from Camden Planning. The further away neighbour at 45A Goldhurst Terrace illegally built a wider extension (still not full width as it still allows a side walkway entrance from the front to the back via a gap left next to the building and the fence.) They were retrospectively allowed their extension after making significant modifications as required by Camden, but still leaving a gap on the side of the extension to the wall, so this was not a full width wall to wall extension. Therefore, there needs to be consistency in the application of Camden Planning rules. There must not be any damaging precedent created.

- Furthermore, having any brick wall of the proposed excessive size to the right side of our own garden at 37A Goldhurst Terrace would be detrimental to our property value, and appearance. As this is a conservation area, this is unacceptable, the purpose of a conservation is to maintain the existing historical and visual appearance of the area, to the benefit of all neighbours
- In summary it is considered that the proposed extension would be harmful and fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to relevant policy and guidance.

BOUNDARY WALL ILLEGAL SIZE NOT APPROVED BY NEIGHBOUR 37A GOLDHURST TERRACE

- The walls of the proposed building are beyond the party wall line on our side as neighbours (37A Goldhurst Terrace). Similarly it extends into the opposite neighbours (41A) property We do not give any permission for any building or other development which reaches over our own property boundary line, or which undermines our own garden structure. We have landscaped and developed our own garden, steps, pergola, walkways and soil reinforcing landscaping and soft fencing, and wish to maintain this in size, structure and appearance. We do not wish to have any solid wall which projects onto our side of the boundary line, or which damages any of our own garden landscaping in any way.

IN CONCLUSION

We object to this proposed extension, as it will:-

- Reduce our property size, encroaching beyond the boundary line (currently a soft fence, not a party wall, with gardens on both sides) – not allowed
- Contravene Planning and Conservation Area rules and guidance.
- Proposal is excessive in what has previously been given planning permission (and proposal is in fact similar to what has had Camden Planning previously rejected to direct neighbouring properties).
- Detrimental to the conservation Area, in the integrity of the terrace, character and appearance.

- The extension size is far too large. This is almost five times the accepted increase of the current building footprint size, making it not subordinate to the existing building - not allowed
- The proposed extension extends too far beyond the building line (the length) – not allowed
- The proposed extension is full width – not allowed.
- The proposed extension is too bulky, making it detrimental to the existing terraces and conservation area.
- Loss of green garden usable space – takes away far too much of the existing openness and usability of the existing garden.
- Loss of light, and/or feeling of openness to neighbours. Changes soft boundary walls, to hard brickwork.
- Also physical not possible to build without the use of the neighbours property while in construction – resulting in trespass, disruption and loss of use – not allowed
- Loss of property value to neighbours.
- Reduction in the living environment to neighbours.