

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5724/P	Stephen Williams for and on behalf of Netherhall Neighbourhood Association	Little House A 16A Maresfield Gardens London NW3 5SU	22/10/2014 19:30:45	OBJ	<p>Maresfield Gardens is in a Conservation area with a strong Victorian and Edwardian character. The buildings are mostly large detached mansions with a clear delineation between each property allowing through views to mature trees in the rear gardens contributing to its leafy character. Developments in the second half of the 20C have diluted this. The extension of the building to the side will result in this street façade rhythm being further weakened and the creation of a terrace of buildings alien to Maresfield Gardens. A proposed gap at first and second floor of approximately ½ meter will in effect visually link No 43 and 45 especially as the front of the extension has been pushed out to almost be on the line of the general frontage of the existing building. It will have a serious and harmful affect on the street facade in Maresfield Gardens and should be strongly apposed.</p> <p>The alteration and extension of the upper floors on the south side of the building will cause serious blockage of light into the side windows of No 43.</p> <p>The proposed elevation is very weak in design and cannot be supported as it fails utterly to enhance the character of the Conservation Area. This poor design is bland and falls far short of the high quality design of the 19th and early 20C buildings in the road.</p> <p>The proposals to construct a basement below no 45 are not acceptable. The application is for the adjustment of Ground Floor and the deepening of the existing lower floor at the rear, which was level with the existing garden at the rear. It was not a basement. It also proposed to excavate a basement under the western end of the house where the land rises to the road. This is not an extension of an existing basement. It is the creation of a new deep basement for the whole area of the building. Furthermore the proposals appear to propose pushing the basement out beyond the frontage line of the building and will be visible from the road. This extension of the building beyond the established street building line is not acceptable.</p> <p>The submission includes drawing reference 3472223 Section AA dated 28 February 2014 which states that it is an approved drawing. It is not and no application for a basement has been approved before this application. The whole application is therefore incorrectly submitted and should on this account alone be rejected.</p> <p>This work has been carried out without planning permission. Though not perhaps directly a planning issue, no party wall agreement has been entered into with No 43 which the constructed basement abuts and the site works have been carried out without full Health and Safety measures in place. Note workers have not worn helmets and a serious accident occurred where a worker, we understand, lost a leg. This all demonstrates a cavalier approach to Planning and Building Control, which is not acceptable and places our neighbourhood at risk.</p> <p>No investigatory works were taken to assess watercourses and ground conditions and ensure that there was no risk of structural failure, damage to adjacent properties and the other flats in No 45 and disturbance to underground existing watercourses, which are frequent in this area. The BIA does not provide evidence nor provide a good argument for the basement work.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

The lower floor level and deeper foundations together with the extension into the rear garden will affect the roots of mature trees in the garden. The basement work will be at risk from the existing mature trees in the garden and require their felling (two) and heavy pruning (one) See subsequent Application to fell trees where applicant admits that future structural damage will occur to the new construction from the trees.

Would you please refer to other 3 applications 2014/1956/P, 2014/5725/P and 2014/6612/T together with this application 2014/5724/P, and place before full Development Control Committee for consideration? Please refuse these 4 applications and apply an Enforcement Notice on the works.

During 2013 and 2014 this building has been the subject of 7 applications plus resubmitted drawings. The applicant is submitting his proposals piecemeal and often after he has carried out work in a way that results in confusion and a loss of Planning Control's ability to take a full and comprehensive assessment of the proposals as a whole. The poor uncoordinated design, certainly not worthy of this Conservation area, is the result. In putting in multiple applications it again causes confusion with local residents as to what has and what has not been approved. It means you have to wade through 7 or 8 sets of documents and drawings to establish what is approved and what not. It provides a convenient cover for carrying out works without approval. Councillors may not be aware of what is going on because applications which seem small in themselves, but which mount up to extensive alterations to the original permissions, are considered under delegated powers and not by the full Development Control Committee. In commencing under the guise of having planning permission, the owner has proceeded without planning approval to implement a different scheme unbeknown to Camden and neighbours until a substantial amount of work has been carried out by which time it is too late to rectify the situation. We request a strong and robust response from Camden both in assessing the multi applications but also stopping unapproved work commencing further on site until the Development Control Committee has been able to consider the application and its circumstances comprehensively in the whole and not piecemeal.

Please reject the proposals

Stephen Williams
For and on behalf of
Netherhall Neighbourhood Association

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5724/P	Ian Green	Apartment E 45 Maresfield Gardens London NW3 5TE	14/10/2014 16:42:13	OBJEMPER	I have submitted my grounds of objection directly to Mr Oliver Nelson by email.
