



Comments Form

Name	
Address	***************************************
Email address	
Telephone number	
Planning application number2014/5103/P	
Planning application address. /A. WELL ROTA NW3 /LH	
I support the application (please state reasons below) I object to the application (please state reasons below)	□ ×
Your comments	

- * The proposed dwelling represents a 44% increase in size over the existing building, on an already disproportionately-filled site.
- * A reduction in the existing diminutive 'garden' space of 44% will result.
- * The latest building drawings show a revised foundation level 290mm lower than in earlier 2014 proposals. Since the existing foundations are entirely satisfactory for the present house we recommend that they should be retained and used to form the foundations of the proposed redevelopment. During reconstruction this would obviate the need for piling with its concomitant risk of damage to neighbouring foundations.
- * The tree proposals recommend the removal of the young London plane from the pavement area outside the site. This is unnecessary and should be refused. The existing house construction caused the removal of a stately, mature chestnut tree from Well Road (approximately where the present garage entrance now stands). Having established and maturing trees in Well Road contributes very significantly to the character of the area.
- *There was a blatant disregard of the requirement to 'Maintain the Building Line' of the existing houses in Well Road when the present house was first built. This application presents an excellent opportunity to correct this transgression by requiring the Victorian building line to be adhered to.
- * The proposed schedule refers to piling for the foundations. If the same chartered engineers and building consultants, Wallace Wheating of Teddington, are to be employed they must adhere to the timely serving of Party Wall notices on neighbouring properties as appropriate (unlike their disregard of protocol in 1999).
- * The new development should have a restriction placed on the installation of any equipment that emits sounds. In particular this should proscribe water features and rotating CCTV cameras, and ambient noise from air conditioning equipment.
- * The proposed development will cause a further loss of privacy in the surrounding gardens.
- * The appearance of the enlarged roof visible from the windows of no.13 Well Road will be unattractive in shape, size and material.
- * The raised roof level will further reduce the light to the side windows of no.13 Well Road.
- * The present owner of no.14 Well Road has previously made significant alterations to the property, including purchasing no.15 Well Road and having a high level walkway built between the two houses. Extensive and very noisy alterations were also made to the garage area, requiring the removal of reinforced concrete. This work was later, noisily, undone, and the two houses separated again.
- * It is regretted that the peace that a largely house-bound elderly Alzheimer's sufferer at no.13 enjoys will be severely compromised by the aggravation of building construction over 51 weeks.

* We have been resident at no. 13 Well Road since 1975. In that time there have been significant building works at the following addresses:

No.1 Cannon Lane for Mr Greenway

No.23 Well Road

The Studios, Well Road

No.21 Well Road for Sir P

No.21 for Mr & Mrs G

No.14 for Mr & Mrs N

No.15 for Mr A Knight

No. 14 Well Road joined to No.15 for Mr Eisenberg

No.22 Well Road for Mr & Mrs S

No.5 Cannon Lane for speculative sale

No.12 Well Road renovation

No.10 Well Road renovation

No.11 Well Road renovation

Foley House Studio construction

Mr & Mrs Michael Joyce

13 Well Road, NW3 1LH

2014/5103/P



11th September 2014

Neil Collins Esq. Planning Officer London Borough of Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 8ND

Dear Mr. Collins,

Application Ref: 2014/5103/P Associated Ref. 2013/3998/P 14 Well Road, London NW3 1LH

My wife and I are really distressed to learn that No. 14 Well Road has applied again for planning permission. Most of us in the immediate area were totally against the infill of the garden of No. 21 Well Walk in 1986/7 and there was an enormous amount of ill-feeling at the time, together with a large petition against it.

When the present building was erected promises were made by the Council that no additional height would ever be allowed.

There were many protests at the time that any permission was given as it was infilling of garden space.

It will take away our privacy. As our Council we look to you to see fair play in our already overcrowded conservation area. Please do not pass this inappropriate application for further planning permission.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Vivien and Nicolas Norton

S J Phillips Ltd 189 New Bond Greet London W1 II 3DQ

Neil, thank you are again from So the Hr. Norton and myself With

compliments

for all you help

Kid regards,