

First floor Flat
75 Canfield Gardens

London NW6 3EA

25 February 2014

Dear Sir/Madam,

Application Ref: 2014/0721/P

With reference to your letter of 19 February 2014, I wish to express my alarm at the proposal to provide a roof terrace to the first floor flat at number 73 Canfield Gardens.

Because the buildings are attached (built adjacent with no space between them), this proposal directly affects the situation of my parallel first floor flat at 75 Canfield Gardens and is an intrusion on my property. My concerns are aesthetic (in view of the fact that this is a conservation area) as well as structural.

Aesthetically, such a terrace would interfere with the privacy of my flat and voices carry in the open air. Should the neighbours use the terrace (even speaking in normal tones), the voices would be directly in my house, thereby causing hardship for me personally. Moreover, there are trees in the garden of the flat beneath mine which would be affected by this structure—something the Council should be aware of protecting. Every effort is being made to preserve the greenery in our neighbourhood. This project would threaten certain trees which have survived. The Council has rejected similar proposals and approving this one would allow others to follow. What is the point of a Conservation area if people simply change the existent milieu of a neighbourhood making it seem more like a suburban backyard than a city garden? Most of the additions are made by people who now see the convenience of the neighbourhood but who want more room, room afforded easily in Hampstead itself or in the nearing suburbs.

But, more important, structurally, I worry that the additional weight on land that is already affected by subsidence, would be damaging to the neighbourhood as a whole. Somewhere (though I don't know quite where) there was an unexploded bomb left from World War II and should the excavation necessary to provide a

firm foundation for such a building come near that bomb, there is no telling what damage could be done. There has been so much building in Canfield Gardens—and I've written on other occasions from CRASH—without proper examination of the proposals involved—and, as recent objections have shown—without follow-up from the Council about whether plans approved are constructed precisely as the approval grants. Such follow-up, if properly done, is costly and takes money away from needed public projects, schools, etc: all for the sake of the wealthy who have no regard for the areas of Camden that are not “gentrified.” Can the area maintain such additional building? When will the Council say “no” to people who only regard their own enjoyment and take no notice of the people next door?

I would expect, at the very least, the architects involved provide the neighbours with detailed plans of how they will safe-guard the structure and prevent it from furthering the subsidence. Will the weight of the structure cause the next door building to experience collapse? Since the buildings are attached, this is a vital question.

There has been water ingress in the basements of several buildings in the neighbourhood and, while there are no plans here to dig to make a new room below ground, the terrace will need to be built on a strong foundation to hold the weight of what will, indeed, be a heavy and ungainly project. The Council seems to approve of projects of people with money moving into the neighbourhood and willy-nilly destroying the character of it, a character built up over the years by long-term residents who have made every attempt to preserve the Conservation area. One reason why Canfield Gardens is such a desirable street is because we have been so caring and careful.

The December 23rd 2013 storm, which caused water ingress all over Canfield Gardens, is merely one example of the increasing effect of global warming on all of London. The recent floods in areas of South London ought to give the Council pause. Canfield Gardens is at the bottom of a hill. Spillage from Hampstead village could cause untold damage and any new building will cause major upheaval.

I hope you will take into account the objections of the neighbours in this instance, respect our concerns both aesthetically and structurally, and refuse permission

for this project to go forward. I repeat that there are precedents for *not* approving similar structures. To grant approval now for this project would go against previous wise Council decisions and set a new precedent, which will open figurative floodgates that are both structural and aesthetic. Please honour your present constituents and vote "no" on this project.

With thanks for your consideration and good wishes.

Sincerely,

Professor Barbara L. Estrin, Ph.d.