

For the Attention of Seonaid Carr
By email and by registered post.

The Director,
Environment Department Development Control Team,
London Borough of Camden,
Camden Town Hall, Argyle Street,
London WC1H 8ND
28th February 2014.

Dear Sir or Madam,

We are the owners and occupiers of No 9 Netherhall Gardens, which backs directly onto 14-45 Froggnal Court. We have lived here for nearly 10 years. We have reviewed the documentation for the new planning application for the above roof extension and object to the proposed application for reasons set out below.

This proposal or one similar was rejected by Camden previously. Our objections were made to you then. None of these would be resolved by the new application.

General concerns about the application

We have a number of general concerns with the application itself. There are several aspects of it that are wrong and so misleading and important information which is not included in it, which could potentially lead to an incorrect assessment of the position:

- The drawings are not clear.
- The current property is a five storey building (not four storeys). There are garages under the property on the ground floor level. This would lead to the new building being 6 storeys – not five, as stated.
- Notably these garages are not shown on the new west elevations of the proposed plan at all.
- The plans furthermore do not show detail of the mansards, the roof mechanics (technical items such as lift shafts) which would normally go above the roof line and the solar panels – all of which are generally unsightly, so we cannot estimate their further impact on the environment.

We note that the occupants of No 11 Netherhall Gardens have not been notified of the application, as they should be.

In terms of specific objections, even based on what we can see from the plans:

Height causing loss of privacy, detriment to the environment, loss of ambience and overlooking to No 9 and other properties in Netherhall Gardens

- The new property would be much higher than the existing one. This directly affects the environment of no 9 where there is currently no overlooking. Moreover, at present no 9 enjoys an open vista to the horizon (including from the ground floor and garden) which would be blocked by the new extension.
- The new extension would cause overlooking to no 9 which currently has no overlooking whatsoever. The new properties have east facing windows which would overlook our living areas and bedroom area, as well as the garden. This would cause loss of privacy.
- It would block the evening sun on no 9 which faces west and cause loss of enjoyment from the property.
- From the perspective of no 9, Frogmal Court is at the foot of the hill and so currently the environment of enjoying the Finchley escarpment (the historical layout of the land caused by the ice age) is preserved.
- The gardens of the properties on the side of the Finchley escarpment have a very special wildlife, vista and environmental aspect to be preserved for future generations. Finchley Court sitting at the bottom of this escarpment, would have a serious and permanently detrimental affect on this delicate environment if its height is raised.

Danger to railway and to surrounding properties

Given that Frogmal Court sits immediately over the railways tunnels, we have serious concerns about the increased risk any further development and weight on the the land would cause to the tunnels and surrounding land. This was raised previously in the last planning application. We have concerns about the application on the basis of the potential for loss of life and property alone. If nothing else Camden must ensure that Network Rail has fully understood the position and considered the implications and approved them in the light of their statutory duties.

Following due consideration on our part, we strongly oppose this application. Please feel free to contact us if you require further input.

Yours faithfully

Chris and Cathryn Vanderspar

Dear Planning Department

I strongly oppose the planning application above for the following reasons:

Previous rejections of proposal

This application has been continuously rejected since 2000. Why do planning applications continue to be allowed when the views of residents have been made very clear that they are opposed to it. What were the grounds that they were rejected on last time?

Noise and rubbish from works

Any works particularly of this scale will cause significant noise, waste and rubbish. It is unfair to impose this on residents who have stated time and time again that they do not want this.

Noise and rubbish

Many of the flats are rented with a high number of residents currently residing already in property. The estate is already very noisy with many people creating noise up and down stairwells early in the morning and very late at night as well as late night parties. Further flats will compound this issue.

Similarly waste and rubbish is often overflowing from bins; more people will create more rubbish which can attract vermin.

Parking

Parking is already minimal. More people will create further demand for these spaces.

Structural

The block continues to experience difficulties with aspects of the building structure. Building on top of this will compound current issues.

Heating and fireplaces

Each flat is entitled to its own chimney and boiler system which I understand is located on the current roof. Changes to the structure will directly impact on each flats legal requirement to these features.

I would like to reiterate that many of the flats are rented and therefore leaseholders and landholders are unlikely to have received the letter addressed to 'The Occupier'. In fact many residents (those renting) said it wasn't passed onto the Landlord. This is unfair and a failing on councils part to accurately and openly inform ALL residents and leaseholders about the proposals. Please advise as to how you will insure all leaseholders are successfully informed in the future?

Please can you acknowledge receipt of email.

Kind regards
Sara Bagheri

