

---

**From:** Catherine Higgitt [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10 June 2024 21:39  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Application - 2024/1046/P Site Address 48 Flat 2nd Floor Mazenod Avenue London Camden NW6 4LR

Dear Sir/Madam

As owners of Flat C, 50 Mazenod Avenue, we wish to register an objection to the Planning Application - 2024/1046/P relating to 48 Flat 2nd Floor Mazenod Avenue London Camden NW6 4LR.

The proposed changes are quite inappropriate in scale, unsympathetic to the location and the suggested finish will also be very dominating. Each element of this proposal is far larger than any of the other examples cited elsewhere along Mazenod Avenue, making the proposal inappropriate in scale and volume.

The very large construction on the outrigger roof (consisting of both a larger dormer volume and roof terrace) can in no way be described as modest. It will dominate the views from No. 50C and block the light to both the top and lower flats in No. 50, as well as to the outside spaces of No. 48. The dormer window on the main roof will also lead to direct issues of overlooking onto our modest roof terrace.

Further, the way that the roof terrace for No. 48 is being constructed (i.e. with a fully built room that extends to a terrace with a canopy) strongly suggests that it will not function as a simple external terrace, but as an integral living space to be used 24/7, 365 days a year – yet it will not be properly acoustically sealed nor light tight. As such, its addition and use are likely to cause significant disturbance to the residents of No. 50 (and probably to others in the local vicinity too).

The choice of materials and design of the dormers and the canopy are also not in keeping with the properties in the vicinity. The architectural examples given as illustrative precedents are modern architect-inspired updates of vernacular farm buildings, implemented on detached properties often set in green space. There is therefore no aesthetic connection to the building materials or style of the distinctive Mazenod terrace. And given the architectural importance of preserving the end profile of the outrigger roof, which was clearly articulated and enforced when we installed our smaller, uncovered roof terrace, this proposal seems totally inappropriate.

We are also extremely surprised that as the neighbours who will be most directly affected – not only by the resulting changes but also by the construction process – we have not been contacted in advance of the submission of this planning application. We are aware it is not a necessity but is normal good practice in a case where a Party Wall Agreement would most certainly be required should any work go ahead.

Yours faithfully

Catherine Higgitt and Richard Naylor