


Cherest



Dear Mr Thuaire,

**29 New End – Application Number 2012/3089 P  
Comment on the Amendments**

I am writing following the latest revisions on 29 New End.

The wrote previously objecting to three things, the size of the proposal, the basement excavation and the disruption from site traffic and construction. The recent changes to the proposal do nothing to address any of these concerns. In fact they highlighted the mamouth scale of the building within the site by emphasising the close proximity to neighbouring buildings.

The development is too large. It is much larger than the existing building particularly at the Carnegie House side and the back of the site. The end result is an over bearing building which is out of keeping with its surroundings. The windows that will overlook Carnegie House represent a major invasion of privacy. This is over development. The existing building is already too large for the site.

I see from the drawings that the developer has suggested using opaque frosted glass. This will make the building even uglier. If so many windows need to be opaque then that suggests that the building is too close. This means that the developer is trying to push to the very limits of the site with no regard for the lives of local residents. The occupiers of the new build will almost certainly seek to change opaque glass as the windows are large. Even if this was made a planning condition it would be in the real world impossible to enforce. The end result is to create windows that invade our privacy. We would be forced to live behind curtains for no other reason than the pure greed of the developer.



LB Camden  
FINANCE  
- 4 JUL 2013  
CENTRAL MAILROOM  
Registry Support Office - 02

Chavres



Dear Mr Thuairé,

**Objection to the Proposed Development of 29 New End (the nurses home) – Application number 2012/3089/P**

I live at number 4 Carnegie House, immediately adjacent to the proposed development site. I am writing again to express my strong objection to the proposed plans for 29 New End.

It is very disappointing that the developers continue to ignore the objections of scale and basement excavation expressed very vocally by residents for the last 2 years ! The amendments put forward appear to be entirely for the benefit of the developer and address none of the concerns of local residents. The end result is a building totally unsuitable for a conservation area which will blight the landscape and will invade the privacy of Carnegie House. In fact I have added over looking & invasion of privacy to my list of objections.

Once again I will specify key objections as follows:

- Size of the development – the proposal is over 70% larger than the existing building. The rationale for this is greed. It is not in keeping with the area.
- The bulk and mass are wrong for the site. The proximity to Carnegie House on the East side is overbearing and will lead to windows looking directly into one another. The idea of using opaque glass is at best a poor unenforceable condition and at worst a complete admission that the new building is coming too close.
- The suggestion that a large number of windows facing Carnegie are opaque, the balconies narrow and the use of a substantial number of privacy screens will be a very ugly. There is no architectural merit this is just a crude attempt to create square footage at the complete expense of the lives of local residents.
- The basement proposal is unchanged. The developer claims that the basement only extends one level below the street. As the site is on a slope, the basement for most of the site extends 3 floors below ground level. This presentation is very misleading.
- Dangerous excavation - the basement remains unchanged. It is in close proximity to neighbouring houses, the ground is sand and likely to move in an area of subsidence. Digging below the water table is dangerous. New End already is prone to flooding. Carnegie house is lower down than 29 New End. It is very vulnerable to damage from a project such as this.
- Loss of trees and open space is unacceptable.
- Disruption to schools, businesses and residents – the larger the development the more traffic, noise and longer the build time. The consequence of this huge over development is up to 2 years of total upheaval for local residents, schools and businesses.
- Affordable housing – there seems to be no provision for affordable housing which is wrong give the size of the proposal.

These amendments do not address the key issues.

Yours sincerely



Dear Mr Thuaire,

**Comments on the Amendments and Continued Objection to the Proposed Development of 29 New End- Application number 2012/3089/P**

I live at number 23 Carnegie House, adjacent to the proposed development. I wrote a year ago to express my strong objection to the plans submitted in the above application. I am writing now to comment on the amendments.

I am extremely disappointed that the developer has made little to no changes to the scheme. The size, design and 3 storey basement are all unchanged. The oversized building remains unsuitable for a conservation area and will loom over and dominate New End ruining the entire street. The dangerous basement excavation, with inadequate information on the likely damage caused, remains wholly unsatisfactory. Residents will still face years of disruption, noise and dust and construction traffic. This could drive local businesses out of business and disrupt 5 local primary schools.

It is clear that in the last year the developer has only paid consideration to the aim of making this project as profitable for them as possible and has completely and utterly ignored the concerns of local residents and businesses. The developer has spent the last year completely ignoring the important issues. They have returned in the summer in the hope that most residents are away on holiday and will not have time to comment let alone campaign against this grotesque project.

It has also come to my attention that the developer is admitting that by increasing the footprint of the building so substantially (increasing the sq footage by over 70%), the building will be very close to Carnegie House. This encroachment would result in the new building looking directly onto Carnegie House window to window. This is unacceptable. My understanding is that there are rules within the planning guidance of Camden that do not permit overlooking/invasion of privacy and that this is why the developer has proposed frosted glass. This is a nonsense as a resident of the new building may simply open the window or replace the glass. Even if this were not allowed it is unenforceable. If such extreme measures such as non opening opaque windows with substantial privacy screens are required does this not suggest that the design of the building is wrong? Camden should stand by its own planning guidance and insist that this proposal is made smaller. The only reason for the proposed design extending from wall to wall across the site is greed. It is unacceptable that local residents should have their homes ruined by overlooking for the profit of a property developer located abroad.

**Please reject this application.**

LB Camden  
FINANCE

- 4 JUL 2013

CENTRAL MAILROOM  
Registry Support Office - 02