

**From:** Nelson, Olivier  
**Sent:** 24 October 2014 16:53  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Works at April House, 45 Maresfield Gardens, NW3

Another objection this time to all 3 applications.

Olivier Nelson  
Planning Officer

Telephone: 5142

---

**From:** Linda Williams [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 October 2014 16:51  
**To:** Nelson, Olivier  
**Cc:** Spinella, Gio; 'Siobhan Baillie'  
**Subject:** Works at April House, 45 Maresfield Gardens, NW3

Dear Mr Nelson

I am writing to object to the various retrospective planning applications listed below on the above property as well as to a new one to cut down trees.

Building work on this property has deviated considerably from the original scope of works and nothing appears to have been done to stop it despite many complaints by the adjoining neighbours regarding disturbance, encroachment and party wall issues. The owner has shown scant regard for planning laws in a conservation area and is now hoping to get away with it by applying for retrospective planning approval. This situation has been allowed to escalate and local residents are extremely unhappy about this breach of conduct and Camden's lack of enforcement so far.

[2014/6612/T](#)

The new extension now sits almost up against No. 43 Maresfield Gardens and the integral gap between houses which is a feature of our conservation area has been closed without planning approval. This will have a serious effect on the street facade in Maresfield Gardens and should be strongly opposed. The alteration and extension at first and second floors on the south side of the building will also cause serious blockage of light into the side windows of No. 43.

[2014/5724/P](#) and [2014/5725/P](#)

The proposals to construct a basement below no. 45 are not acceptable. The application is for the adjustment of the 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. The proposal is also to excavate a basement under the western end of the house where the land rises to the road. This is the creation of a new deep basement for the whole area of the building. The proposals also appear to push the basement out beyond the existing front line of the building and will be visible from the road. This is not acceptable. Moreover this basement has already been built without planning approval and without an in-depth basement assessment report.

All this without site investigation and acceptable BIA. Again this proposes an unacceptable side extension at upper level to block any view through to the rear garden. Overall the design is very poor and no argument can be put forward that it is an enhancement to our Conservation Area. Quite the opposite.

2014/1956/P

Regarding the tree application and the tree officer's view that no one can see the trees in question from the street, this is because the integral gap between houses has been illegally closed (see above). I object to the removal of these trees on these grounds. Removal of these trees will place at risk this rear garden area opening it up for future development. No plans have been submitted showing the trees and the location and specification of future replacement trees.

I hope that the inspectorate will go back to the original planning documents and see how the building now deviates from these.

I hope that the Planning Department will refuse these 4 applications and take some drastic enforcement action on the works to return it to its original condition. If not the residents in our area will have much to fear.

Yours sincerely

Linda Williams  
16A Maresfield Gardens