David Peres Da Costa Regeneration and Planning Development Management London Borough of Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 8ND

25 Feb 2014

Dear Mr. Peres Da Costa,

Planning Application 2013/8275/P – Land Adjoining 148 Fellows Road, London NW3.

I write to object to the above planning application. I have lived at no. 32 Winchester Road, which backs on to the land in question, since 1971. This development, literally at the end of my garden, potentially affects my property in particular with respect to loss of green space.

I understand that this is taking place inside the Belsize Conservation Area, which is intended to preserve the character of the neighbourhood. The design of the proposed extension to 148 Fellows Road, according to the submitted elevations, is what I object to in particular. Adding to an existing Victorian house with a blatantly modern structure incorporating a large area of glass will detract catastrophically from the character of the Conservation Area.

I wonder whether you aware that the land to the side of 148 Fellows Road on which the new extension is being proposed, used to belong to the gardens of nos. 22, 24 and 26 Winchester Road. The gardens were truncated and sold off by the then leaseholder of these three houses about 20 to 25 years ago, as I understand it, over the heads of the tenants and probably without planning permission. I point this out because it does not shed a good light on the intentions of the owners of the site, who continue to act by stealth, against the Conservation Area and the interests of local residents.

I therefore strongly oppose the planning application.

Yours sincerely,

Anthony G.M. Pritchett 32 Winchester Road London NW3 3NT

Alon Shapira 24 Winchester Road London NW3 3NT

Mr. David Peres Da Costa Urban Planner Regeneration and Planning Development Management London Borough of Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 8ND

Dear Mr. Peres Da Costa

Date:23 February 2014Reference:2013/8275/P – Land adjoining 148 Fellows Road

I strongly object to the new planning application which evidently has superseded the original plan by considerable and unacceptable margins. Moreover, the manner of beginning with one plan shown in a graphic image at the front of the building site, that I noticed was removed about a year ago, smacks of stealth and deception.

Please understand I am not a professional in this field, and have no technological knowledge. However, I am indebted to my neighbours for their knowledge and appreciation of the issues; not least in noticing and alerting the council to the building of a wall explained as 'a mistake', This leads me to personally query what is the procedure for enforcing removal of structures that do not succeed in gaining permission?

This in turn prompts the uncomfortable question of precedence. Indeed as a matter of principle, I am greatly concerned about unregulated development in the Conservation Area, and the precedent such behaviour might set.

I must further emphasise that one of the great joys of living in this area is the greenery associated with it. Thus to have new neighbours who originally exhibit interest in some form of garden, only to change their minds a few months later suggests their intention was never authentic but rather an illusion intended to deceive. The preceding destruction of sumptuous trees is evidently a better indication of their true *nature*.

Now to have the last piece of evidently pretend green sanctuary removed from behind our terrace to be replaced by ugly concrete and masonry, and with it additional lights and no doubt noise, is an egregious intrusion on our view, peace and tranquility.

The applicant must be required to hold to the originally permitted footprint of the above ground portion of development, with no disproportionate additional building volumes allowed either sideways or further, beyond the historic building line of the main rear façade of Fellows Road houses.

Last but not least, I am obliged to bring to your attention the important factor of valuations of properties in our terrace. I am keenly aware of this issue as I recently underwent a protracted and tortuous 'negotiation' with the District Valuer for the purpose of Inheritance Tax following my mother's death. -- Part of this battle with the DV involved the issue of 'blight' resulting from the proposed HS2 construction, that includes tunneling in Fellows Road as you are no doubt aware. Nos 22 and 24 and half 26 in our terrace is designated part of the 'Safeguarding Zone' earmarked for potential compensation. Thus the DV accepted the issue in principle, but rejected it as a factor for 'discount' solely due to my mother's death occurring just a month before TfL Consultation letters were to be sent. Nevertheless, my solicitor dealing with another property in the road confirms that more recently 'blight' actually affected the sale of that flat. Consequently, if HS2 is passed by parliament 'blight' will be a significant factor. To have this issue compounded by unplanned and unwanted monstrosity at the back of the house will make it even more unappealing.

This issue singularly affects me at present as I am only able to pay Inheritance Tax on the property under the 10 year

instalment plan. My finances dictate that I have no certainty of keeping the family home of 30 years beyond a few years. And if I have to sell I will be horrified if the value of the property is further reduced by the selfish, inconsiderate, dubious and potentially illegal actions of my new neighbours.

In short, I trust you will take these considerations very seriously in drawing your conclusion. The evidence to date and reasonable arguments clearly convey that in all *honesty* the new plans should be rejected.

Yours Sincerely,

Alon Shapira

Ruaridh Macdonald Flat Raised Ground Floor 24 Winchester Rd London NW3 3NT

Mr. David Peres Da Costa Urban Planner Regeneration and Planning Development Management London Borough of Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 8ND

Dear Mr. Peres Da Costa

Date: 24 February 2014 Reference: 2013/8275/P – Land adjoining 148 Fellows Road

I am writing to express my objections to the above planning application, and considerable dissatisfaction that construction work had apparently commenced in relation to this application, prior to permission being granted.

The design and size of this significant new extension above ground level, is out of keeping with the scale of the neighbouring properties, and damaging to the local Belsize Conservation Area.

The height and western extent of the ground floor extension takes the building to an unacceptably close 10 metres from the nineteenth century houses at 22-32 Winchester Road. This will have a significant, negative visual impact on the lower floors and garden level of the homes in this block. What was originally intended to be a newly created green space above the property, is to be replaced with a substantial, featureless extension side wall, as viewed by residents of the Winchester Rd properties. The night-time light pollution and also daytime reflection from the significant additional glazed areas will have a detrimental effect on the privacy and comfort of the residents of the adjacent properties.

The applicant originally gained permission for a substantial house existing predominantly underground, which promised a single continuous area of roof that would be treated as a garden, with the installation of a "green roof" above. This was to be a form of compensation for the loss of the mature trees at the site, during the construction. The current proposal for an extension to the large permitted dwelling now seeks to interrupt and reduce the extent of green roof garden area. This is unacceptable.

Yours sincerely,

Ruaridh Macdonald