

Sent by e mail

Flat G
17 Frognal
NW3 6AR

26 June 2014

Nanayaa Ampona
Planning and Case Officer
Camden Council
Town Hall
Judd Street London
WC1H 8ND

**Ref Planning application 2014/ 3625/P
8 Lindfield Gardens, NW3 6PU**

Dear Nanayaa Ampona

I am writing as Freeholder of the above property. You will have had a separate submission prepared by Mr Stephen Stark of Stark Associates and submitted by them on my behalf. This letter, therefore, is additional to the above mentioned report and expresses objections not directly addressed in the Report.

Number 8 Lindfield Gardens is identified in the Conservation Area consent as a building that makes a 'contribution' to the Conservation Area. However, the new plans still propose the use of contemporary design and materials that would destroy the original character of the host building.

The house has suffered from previous subsidence problems and a major remedial project was carried out in 2011/12. This, combined with the structural engineer's report makes it clear that the planning proposal would cause structural instability.

Flat A (front basement) has suffered in the past from considerable rising damp and the likelihood of this being increased by the proposed works is high risk.

Planning Statement it is claimed that '*we have spoken to neighbours through-out the process*'; unfortunately this is not the case. There has been no formal consultation with the four other lessees or with the neighbours, all of who object to the development.

Application for Permission

Item 6 (Pedestrian and Vehicle Access, Roads and Rights of Way) the applicant ticked the box for NO. I would posit that the change from an infrequently used garage entrance to the main entrance of the proposed development, pedestrian access is changed, particularly as the main entrance to Flat A (front basement) is only

accessible from the same path. There are also serious issues of access to emergency and fire services as the path is designated for car parking as well as pedestrian access to the new proposed entrance.

Item 7 (Waste Storage and Collection) the applicant ticked YES but then goes on saying '*as existing*'. This is ambiguous. The current arrangement by the side of the current main entrance cannot accommodate waste generated by such an increased in occupancy and it seems that no arrangements have been made in the plans to address these issues. The same objection applies to the provisions for the separate storage and collection of recycle waste.

Item 12 The question of the increased flood risk I addressed in the Stark Report. However, as large parts on the garden area would be concreted over and run off would be considerable, again increasing the possibility to rising damp in Flat A. The Report also makes clear that *disturbance to the waterproofing and alteration to the ground water flow as well as settlement of the soil...could cause damage.*

Design and Access Statement

Page 11 4.3 and 4.4

'...the size of the glazing ad structure frame members are likely to have been determined by the cost and the limitation of the technology available at the time to manufacture the components.'

'..it is fair to say that should the technology have existed at the time to manufacture larger pieces of glass that were affordable, the design of the winter garden might well have included for larger glazed elements, expressing connection to the garden.'

I am afraid that this is complete nonsense by way of supporting evidence and is spurious speculation. The Crystal Palace was built in 1851; 8 Lindfield Gardens at the end of the 19th century! The illustration is speculative and not supported by a 1930 survey that describes the conservatory as opening from what was then the morning room of the whole house. The house wasn't converted into flat until 1949.

Page 22

Much is made of various conversions carried out in the neighbourhood, including one on the corner of Arkwright Road and Lindfield Gardens. However, this and other quoted sites of previous basement conversions in the neighbourhood on this scale were completed by single occupancy owners. This is not the case here and the disruption would be severe to other occupants of the building. Light pollution of the glass rear box at night is still a major concern & now with addition of side glass panels, will cause even more light spillage to neighbours.

I urge you and your Committee to take these objections into account.

Yours sincerely

Kate Colleran