

Subject:

Planning application 2023/0207/P

Dear Camden
Planning application 2023/0207/P
For 26 Netherhall Gardens NW3

Here is my OBJECTION
Thank you can you please confirm thins received.

YASMINE BELILTY
24a Netherhall Gardens NW35TH

There are some improvements from the last application notably a front entrance for all the appartments and a better layout for 3 dwellings instead of 4.

Netherhall Gardens is part of the London Plan Healthy School Streets Neighbourhoods of the Future, with emphasis on creating clean air especially for the schoolchildren. Mature trees contribute to this through carbon capture.

Trees on the boundary of 24a and 26 are tall and mature with good size canopies. They should not be allowed to be cut down. The correct measurements for Trees T8 and T6 in february 2021 were 13m and 9 m respectively (greenwoods report 2019 application). The applicant's tree report has recorded incorrect measurements

these trees are category B, as they form a grouping of 4 limes, traditionally planted to mark boundaries and an important feature of the conservation area.

If heat pumps are to be placed on the roof of no 26, the trees will also help absorb the noise generated and act as a shield from it travelling around the neighbourhood

Tree T2. This large tree has been plotted incorrectly in previous applications. The correct measurement from the corner fence to the trunk of Lime T2 is 2732mm. The tree plan presented shows the position to be 6000mm."

(Gifford report 31/03/17 planning application 2017/0579/P

Notes on the planning statement

Paragraph 5.31. there is no lower ground floor at no 24a. This is a misleading statement. 24a is a ground floor and 1st floor dwelling.

Paragraph 5.3. reduction of natural daylight. A habitable room will be affected with total loss of daylight at no 24a next door.

A planning officer visited in the summer not the winter when there is brighter light, and offered observations of other sources of light. However, there have been no reports to confirm these observations and this needs to be verified. The application should be set back so there is no loss of light for neighbours it currently overshadows.

Paragraph 5.21. the height of the new building will be higher and not similar to that of no 24a and no 24. this drawing is misleading. It portrays no 24a and 24 higher than what they actually are.

The 2nd floor is raised too high against the corresponding floor at no 24a. so looking out of the back bedroom window (window 14 of the daylight and sunlight report) will be looking out on a high wall and creating a sense of enclosure and loss of visual amenity. The design needs to be amended so the 2nd floor is the same level as the neighbours; by wanting to build closer than the last application this will only enclose window 14 even more.

The general effect of this high density large mass of a building on its neighbour at no 24a is overbearing. the design and layout needs to be amended to fit the plot better. The mass is too close to the no 24a and is sitting on top of this property. The sunken terrace extends too far into the green space and is unusually too close to its neighbour within the conservation [area.it](#) will deprive no 24a of their privacy. For the benefit of residents both at no 24a and 26 this needs to be amended.

Paragraph 5.29. the original gap between properties no 26 and 24 was intentionally large. if a narrow gap is allowed between no 26 and 24a this will affect the amenity of no 24a regarding their entrance. The front door is set to the left of the property so will create a sense of enclosure on entering the property, as the building line of no 26 will push out to the the same of no 24a and 24. The entrance of 24a will then be hemmed in within this tiny gap between the buildings and be deprived of their current amenity.