

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0301/P	M E Steuerman Kinston	24/02/2025 12:00:12	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>Regarding the planning application for 41 Rudall Crescent NW3 1RR (Camden Reference 2025/0301/P</p> <p>We are very concerned about the first floor rear terrace on the proposed plan. The terrace appears to be flush to number 39 and set back from where our house number 43 protrudes out to (the plans are not very clear). However, due to the fact that the terrace is much higher than our balcony, this will create a sharp angle from which people from 41 will be looking directly onto our property. I believe that it was precisely for that reason that an earlier development application concerning the rear extensions for numbers 37 and 39 explicitly stated that they shall "not be used as roof terraces and any access out onto these shall be for maintenance purposes only" (planning reference 2016/4897/P)</p> <p>Therefore we formally object to the use of this flat roof as a terrace.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Dr Martin Kinston Dr Emilia Steuerman Kinston</p>

2025/0301/P	Jenny Stevens	24/02/2025 12:24:09	OBJ	<p>Unsatisfactory aspects of these plans are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.While rooms are labelled there is NO labelling on the proposed 1st floor roof terrace</li> <li>2.Inadequate description of proposed guard rail to end of 1st floor terrace</li> <li>3. Ground floor plan does not show the extent of proposed extension</li> <li>4. Materials to form the top floor boundaries are not provided.</li> </ol> <p>Are these missing details designed to obfuscate possible objections?</p> <p>The Association objects to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed 1st floor roof terrace will involve undesirable overlooking of gardens at 39 and 43 and neighbours to the rear in Gayton Crescent. The small roof terrace at no 43 is much lower and does not constitute an invasion of privacy precluded the use of a similar flat roof at 1st floor as a roofer terrace in accordance with Policies CS5 and DP26, thus setting a precedent for No 41.</li> <li>3. The proposed ground floor rear extension reduces the size of an already very small garden.</li> <li>4. The new top floor front and rear boundaries are presumably to comprise glazing though lack of labels on the plans makes this unclear. As it is the front elevation enclosure looks to be very high and thus overbearing. Otherwise the rest of the proposal appears to be satisfactory.</li> </ol> <p>Planning Rep and Chair, Rudall Crescent Residents' Association</p>
-------------	---------------	---------------------	-----	--