

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0011/P	Yvette Pole	24/01/2023 10:54:02	OBJ	<p><b>39A PROPOSED EXTENSION OBJECTIONS (Planning Application - 2023/0011/P)</b></p> <p>I am the owner of 37B Goldhurst Terrace which is a direct neighbour to 39A Goldhurst Terrace. I overlook this garden, as a neighbour. I totally object to the proposed extension of 39 Flat A Goldhurst Terrace due to the excessive size which is hugely out of context to other extensions that have been allowed to date by Camden Planning in the neighbouring properties, and furthermore does not follow Camden's own Planning Design and Conservation Principles for this area.</p> <p>In terms of Conservation Area rules of Camden, the proposed extension will destroy the character and appearance in the back gardens of this area of Goldhurst Terrace, damage the natural beauty of these gardens, as well as the entire terrace character, and which have been protected to date by Camden. It will be furthermore contrary to Camden's own Conservation Principles in conserving the natural space and gardens of Goldhurst Terrace, as the loss of green garden usable space takes away far too much of the existing openness and usability of the existing garden, and thereby impacts surrounding gardens too. There will be a loss of the feeling of openness and naturalness of the back gardens to myself as a neighbour overlooking the back gardens from the first floor, which will spoil my enjoyment of the back garden views from my first floor flat. The 'green roof' of the large proposed extension will not hide the fact that it is a hard brick walled building extending excessively into the conservation area garden area at the back, and will be an unsightly and unacceptable to view from my neighbouring flat which overlooks it. The size will thereby be detrimental to my flat's commercial value as it damages the view onto natural gardens from my flat which was a significant reason for my purchase of the property. It will also be damaging to the wider Swiss Cottage Conservation Area in its damage to the back gardens as a whole.</p> <p>In terms of Design, the proposed extension will destroy the terraced character and appearance. It contravenes Camden's own Design and Size principles which do not allow large extensions which dominate relative to the original building. It will therefore be harmful to the original building, and to neighbouring buildings. No other previous directly neighbouring extensions approved by Camden Planning have been allowed to extend more than 3.5 meters from the bayline, and none have been allowed to be full width from fence line to fence line. The proposed extension at 39A is 8 meters from the building line, and the others that have been approved in the neighbouring areas less than half of this. In addition, the extra footprint of the proposed 39A extension is an extra 30.5 square meters (original 39A footprint of original flat is under 69 sqm) so its nearly a 45% increase in building footprint which is hugely excessive, and been dis-approved to date by Camden in previous similar large extension applications by other neighbours in Goldhurst Terrace. Number 45A which is used as an example in the design drawings is also incorrectly reflected, as it is actually not full width fence line to fence line, as it has a gap on the left hand from the building to the fence for a walkway, which runs from the back to the front of the building. The 45A extension is also built from the inside of the bay and not the building edge, so including this and the side walkway there is an even bigger gap from the extension to the fence on the left hand side. So there is a significant space on the left hand side of the example 45A extension to the left hand fence line which is not built on. It is also significantly smaller in length size extending into the garden than the 39A proposal. An extension of this 39A proposed size would therefore fail to respect the historic pattern and established design of the surrounding area and would ruin the existing integrity of the wider terraces. In summary other approved extensions in the neighbouring gardens in Goldhurst Terrace have not been allowed to be full width fence line to fence line, and previous approved extensions are all about half the length, and less than half the footprint into the garden (all others less than 14.5 sqm in extra footprint for the approved extensions).</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0011/P	Nicola Ebison	23/01/2023 10:01:15	OBJ	<p>So, the proposed 39A extension is double the size of anything else that has been approved for neighbouring properties. This would set an enormously damaging precedent if approved, as others could do the same, and thereby destroy our lovely Goldhurst Terrace back garden conservation area and be hugely determinantal to all our Goldhurst Terrace property values. In conclusion, the above points indicate that 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. This proposed extension therefore must not be approved by Camden Planning as it does not follow their own Design or Conservation rules for this area.</p> <hr/> <p>39 Flat A PROPOSED EXTENSION OBJECTION (Planning Application - 2023/0011/P)</p> <p>I, as a Freeholder of the adjoining property and Owner of my flat there, wish to raise an objection to this proposed development extension to 39 Goldhurst Terrace. This is due to:-</p> <p>The proposed extension is far too large, too bulky, extends in length excessively into the garden, is full width, and encroaches on the adjoining properties. It replaces too much of the soft boundary fencing with solid brick wall and reduces too much of the usable garden area</p> <p>– it will thus impact on the appearance and character of the terrace / conservation area.</p> <p>This planning application does not meet Camden Planning and the Swiss Cottage Conservation Area policies and guidance requirements.</p> <p>This will result in a loss of the current living environment, reduce the value to my property (and all others), result in a loss of light or a feeling of openness; and overall be detrimental to / damage the Conservation Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The extension size is far too large, making it not subordinate to the existing building - the proposed extension footprint is about four times the allowed increase of the current flats floor area size.</li> <li>- The side walls of the extension extend into our private freehold land (in the adjoining properties gardens), which is both unacceptable and illegal. This would reduce the area of no 37's garden, as a not allowed encroachment beyond the boundary line (currently a soft timber fence, not a brick party wall, with gardens on both sides).</li> <li>- Proposal is excessive in what has previously been given planning permission for (and similar to what has previously been rejected by Camden Planning, to direct neighbouring properties) – this would set a dangerous precedent to future unacceptable planning applications</li> <li>- The proposed extension is full property width, unlike all the other nearby properties, which not in accordance with the Planning / Conservation Area guidance and regulations.</li> <li>- It is also more than double the length of all nearby extensions – and much longer than allowed, this being excessive in accordance with the Planning / Conservation Area regulations and guidance.</li> <li>- Loss of too much of the green garden usable space – takes away far too much of the existing openness and usability of the existing garden.</li> </ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0011/P	Debbie & Kevin Scott	23/01/2023 14:26:12	OBJ	<p>The application does not meet the planning requirements in terms of total space. Ie as with other extensions these were only approved on the basis that the extension was not more than 10% of the total area of the footprint of the original plan. This application goes far beyond this.</p> <p>The information provided on the application is incorrect. At 41a there is a side window to extension which would be impacted by a brick wall as would the light the rear side (bedroom) window.</p> <p>I would not give permission to allow for a brick wall to be built on the boundary wall.</p> <p>Any planning extension should meet the requirements as previously set out by Camden. This does not do this and goes beyond any extension approved (by the authority of similar houses (either side to this one). In summary we object as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-this is proposed in a conservation area and does not meet the requirements</li> <li>- the proposal reduces our property size (going beyond a boundary line and wooden fence to our garden) and therefore not agreed or allowed. The proposal seeks to fundamentally change the look and integrity of neighbouring buildings by changing from wood (light fences) to bricks (no light). Changing the light to side bedroom and kitchen</li> <li>- the size of the extension is excessive and does not meet the current regulations (to wide and too long).</li> </ul> <p>Finally I can see no way of the building (in current form) being executed without access to our property and as such would not give consent for this.</p>

---