

25 March 2013

Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
LB Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
WC1H 8ND

LB Camden
FINANCE
26 MAR 2013

Dear Sir or Madam

37 & 39 Rudall Crescent, NW3 1RR

Planning Ref: 2013/0824/P – OBJECTION to Planning Application

On 12 October 2011 I wrote to object to the first application re 37 & 39 Rudall Crescent. On 6 February 2012 I also wrote to object to the second application re 37 & 39 Rudall Crescent. Further to your letter of 19 January 2012 re the above, I am writing to object to various aspects of the new Application.

I am the owner of 6 Gayton Crescent and my house is nearly directly behind 37 Rudall Crescent and indeed the gardens of the two houses abut. Since the first application my neighbour at 7 Gayton Crescent has some sold some land (part of his garden which abuts mine) to 37 Rudall Crescent.

Rudall Crescent is in a Conservation area.

37 & 39 Rudall are part of a terrace of 5 houses which was constructed in the 1950s. They complement each other and the other terraces of different ages in Rudall Crescent. I noticed from details of the 2nd application that a statement was made (by the developers' architects) that, following requirements of Camden Planning, the new application will not result in significant changes to the street elevation aspects of both houses thus maintaining the integrity of the 5 house terrace.

However, the new application provides no such reassurance to the rear elevation aspects of the 5 house terrace. It is proposed to alter substantially the rear elevations of both houses thus losing the integrity of the 5 house terrace (as 3 would be unaltered). I do not believe that the proposed changes to the rear elevations should be permitted in a Conservation area.

I can see the whole 5 house terrace from rear of my house (they are also visible from all other houses between 3-9 Gayton Crescent – ie 6 houses in all) from the garden level to upper floors. The proposed changes to the Rear Elevation will alter very significantly the view of the 5 house terrace.

Specifically, I object to the proposed "glass extension with aluminium framed glazed sliding doors" to both houses. These would be out of character with the rest of the terrace as the other 3 houses in the terrace would appear to be completely different.

I also object to the rear glazed extension proposed at Ground Floor level to 37 Rudall Crescent. The extension will come very close to where my garden abuts the current garden of No 37. Such an extension would interfere with the enjoyment of my garden. It also represents over-development of the site.

Also I am very concerned that in the "12 Feb 2013 ARBORICULTURAL REPORT" insufficient account has been taken of the trees (there are a number) in the rear of my garden close to 37 Rudall Crescent; the associated plan only shows one of the trees close to the boundary; it only takes due account of the sycamore tree in the garden of 8 Gayton Crescent. I object to the deficiency in this report as my trees may well be affected (and see paragraph below).

I continue to object to the site office and associated structures abutting my fence and garden (how can this be permissible?). There will be a loss of the amenity of my garden to me (for at least a year) and also potential damage to my trees. I object on both these grounds.

I object to the basement as I am concerned also that it will affect the water table and drainage near my house and garden. I also object to the basement excavation and the nuisance it will cause to me and other neighbours during construction.

I also object to the loss of two garages in a road near where I park as any loss of garage space will increase what is already severe pressure on local Resident's Parking.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of R.J. Dowsett.

R.J. Dowsett