

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
------------------------	-------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

2022/4765/P	R Mulchandani	12/02/2023 11:18:17	OBJ	
-------------	---------------	---------------------	-----	--

For the attention of the case officer Matthew Dempsey:

1. The applicant states in their Design And Access Statement that (5-l) "The roof extension would not obstruct light or outlook entering neighbouring windows" and (6-b) "There would be no harm to the living conditions at neighbouring properties." However both these statements are palpably and unambiguously false.

The application site is less than 14m due east of my dwelling (which occupies the 2nd and 3rd floor of my building). Presently the rooms on the rear (northeast-facing) aspect of my dwelling benefit from direct sunlight in the morning on the 3rd floor from March to September and on the 2nd floor from April to August. Were the applicant's proposals to be permitted and built out, the 3rd floor of my building on this aspect would obtain direct sunlight from April to August only while the 2nd floor rooms would be in permanent shadow, receiving no direct sunlight whatsoever.

Furthermore, the overall level of natural light entering these rooms at any time of day – already limited due to their proximity to the long terrace on Compayne Gardens on which the application site sits - would be significantly and irrevocably further reduced. This would cause enormous harm to the amenity of my dwelling and have an overwhelmingly negative impact on the quality of life and wellbeing of occupants present and future.

In addition to the significantly lower level of natural light entering my dwelling were the proposals to be approved, the views enjoyed from my dwelling would be negatively impacted.

2. The applicant states that (5-l) "The previous approvals at the site for a roof extension raised no objections in relation to impact on neighbours amenity." However this is a highly misleading statement, since the previous proposals did not include provision to add a further storey to the application site and raise the height of the front and rear elevations. The previous proposal would therefore have had less of an impact on the sunlight, daylight and amenity enjoyed by occupants of 70-82 Fairhazel Gardens as this proposal. It stands to reason that lack of objection to a previous scheme should not constitute a presumption of lack of objection to an altogether-different and more significant scheme.

3. Broadhurst Green is a communal garden space for use by residents on Compayne Gardens and Fairhazel Gardens whose flats back on to the communal gardens. This comprises in excess of 60 flats and hundreds of people. The garden enjoys abundant sunshine in summer and more limited sunshine in spring and autumn. The application site lies approximately in a south/south east direction from the centre of the green, and if the applicant's proposals are approved, the sunlight and amenity enjoyed by the occupants of 60+ apartments would be negatively impacted, especially in spring and late summer/early autumn.

4. The addition of an extra storey to the application site would involve significant structural work, which would inevitably cause enormous disruption to neighbours in the form of noise & visual pollution and harm the wellbeing and quality of life of those living close to the application site for a prolonged period of time, which those who choose to live in conservation areas should not expect to have to endure.

5. Previous applications in close proximity to the application site, which have proposed to modestly alter the

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

roofscape without increasing the height of the front and rear elevations, have been refused. For example, application [2012/1313/P] was refused for being contrary to the SHCAAMS even though this proposal would not have added a storey or increased the height of the front/rear elevations.

The SHCAAMS conservation area statement states that “alterations should not result in increased visual bulk to the roof, nor should they draw more attention than existing to the roofslope,” yet the applicant’s proposed alterations would have both these impacts. It would be inconsistent, unfair and absurd to approve a scheme which increases the height of the front/rear elevations when far more modest schemes with less visual impact have been refused.

6. The applicant states that the extension (5-i) “simply continues the existing building upwards in the same design” and that therefore “the proposals preserve the character and appearance of the South Hampstead Conservation Area.”

However if approved, it would set an unwelcome precedent whereby future applicants in the South Hampstead Conservation Area (SHCA) will seek to ‘continue their buildings upwards in the same design’ – and cumulatively these changes would have a devastating impact on the look, feel and amenity of the SHCA.

7. The applicant references the need for Camden Council to meet local and national new housing targets. However the housing targets include a requirement for a diversity of housing types to be offered. Most of the large dwellings in the SHCA have already been converted into smaller flats. Furthermore, within a 500m radius of the application site are several recently completed or soon-to-be-completed developments consisting almost entirely of 1-bed and 2-bed dwellings. These include ‘The Quarters’ on Finchley Road and numerous developments on or just off West End Lane such as ‘West Hampstead Square’ and ‘West Hampstead Central’. Consequently there is now a huge growth in supply of smaller dwellings and an acute shortage of family-sized 4-bed and 5+-bed dwellings, which will in turn have a knock-on impact on the demographics and socioeconomic status of the area. Approval of this and similar proposals will only exacerbate this problem.

8. The applicant states that (5-g) “The extended building would sit comfortably alongside the five storey mansion block” and that “the height of the mansion block and the setback wing of the neighbouring property allows the proposals to not appear dominant within the street scene as required by Camden Planning Guidance and the SHCAAMS.”

However it is noticeable on Fairhazel Gardens and Compayne Gardens that only the corner mansion blocks have a higher elevation, with the remainder of the terraces on both streets having a lower elevation. Permitting other buildings to have a higher elevation would change the character and appearance of these streets in the SHCA.

9. Approval of this and similar proposals will place additional strain on local services such as waste collection & recycling, and worsen the existing shortage of local residents’ and guests’ parking spaces.

In light of all the above reasons, I would urge the case officer to refuse permission for this development.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4765/P	Max Turnell	11/02/2023 12:47:08	OBJ	Will completely block out light to garden and home and breach right to light (easement). Also will lead to overlooking and reduced privacy. Wholly opposed to any increase in height of building.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4765/P	Benjamin Keown	12/02/2023 19:24:36	OBJ	<p>We strongly object to the proposed application for the following reasons.</p> <p>Our flat and back patio already suffers from very limited light. For most of the year it is in shade. As a result we have issues of damp and mould which cause problems both for our property and our wellbeing. We have tried to counter this issue by planting shrubs and flowers, something that is encouraged to reduce the ever-increasing risk of flooding in our area. There is no question that raising the elevation of this property will further block the already limited hours of sunshine that our flat and back garden receive. As it is, we only really enjoy direct sunshine between the months of late May to late July. This elevated extension will not just deny the occupants the light we are entitled to, causing detriment to our wellbeing, but will also have a negative impact on the viability of the plants, indirectly increasing the risk of flooding and damp in our and neighbouring properties and further the growth of mould, algae and moss which is already an issue in our back patio.</p> <p>The statement from the application "The roof extension would not obstruct light or outlook entering neighbouring windows" and "There would be no harm to the living conditions at neighbouring properties" is flatly rejected as nonsense, offensive in its insensitivity and selfishness and completely devoid of any consideration of our situation and aspect.</p> <p>We believed, in good faith, that when we bought this flat, Camden Council would be entrusted to protect this unique and beautiful part of London. The South Hampstead Conservation Area is a unique architectural gem in Zone 2 of London. We have undergone renovations ourselves and have spent considerable sums of money to ensure the architectural integrity and look of our property are kept in keeping with the SHCA rules. An elevated extension would absolutely, without question, compromise the existing look and feel of the conservation area.</p> <p>In addition, the SHCA conservation area statement reads "alterations should not result in increased visual bulk to the roof, nor should they draw more attention than existing to the roofslope." Clearly this application directly contravenes this statement in the most blatant of terms. It would also set a precedent for future property developers to disregard the look and feel of our community area and the rules of the SHCA. We understand the need for more living space in the Camden area, but planning permission of large complexes very close to us have been granted and are under construction, so there is no need to facilitate the conversion of a 5 bedroom building into sets of 2 bedroom flats. Indeed there is a strong argument to say there is a plethora of 2 bedroom flats in our area now thanks to these new complexes along West End Lane. We need to accommodate large families as well as small families and couples. Diversity is important.</p> <p>The applicants claim that "The extended building would sit comfortably alongside the five storey mansion block" and "the height of the mansion block and the setback wing of the neighbouring property allows the proposals to not appear dominant within the street scene as required by Camden Planning Guidance and the SHCAAMS." is ludicrous and again, disingenuous. It is only the corner buildings in our conservation area that have five stories. If you were to grant this building the right to extend on that basis, then the building next to it would argue the same point in a few years and then the entire SHCA would be 5 stories. There would be limited light for everyone.</p> <p>In short, we object in the strongest possible way to this application. It would without question infringe on our right to light, would have a detrimental impact on the light to our property and garden, would affect our mental and physical wellbeing as a result of this, would devalue the essence of the SHCA and would set a dangerous</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				precedent. We would urge you to stop this application and we thank you in advance for your time and consideration.
2022/4765/P	Ruth Prenter	12/02/2023 18:18:09	COMMNT	Object as the proposal will: 1. fundamentally reduce the light to our home and garden; and 2. impact the privacy of our home and garden as we will be overlooked.