Davies, Fiona

From: Sarah Safieddine [redacted]
Sent: 20 October 2014 13:21
To: Nelson, Olivier
Cc: Nicholls, John
Subject: Fwd: Flat 1, 45 Maresfield Gardens, NW3 5TE

Dear Mr Newton

I am the owner of Flat C, 45 Maresfield Gardens, NW3 5TE. I write to object to the following planning applications which were recently submitted:

1) ***2014/5725/P (Application Registered 23 September)*** - "Extension of existing basement level (retrospective)".

2) ***2014/5724/P (Application Registered 29 September)*** – "Erection of a side extension at first-floor level, including rear alterations (retrospective)".

Firstly it must be noted that work has been carrying on at this site since the purchase of the property on 31 January 2014, in spite of the applicants knowledge that they do not have planning permission to carry out these works. Secondly a near fatal accident took place on site on 5th of July, immediately after which I attended the site to assist the injured worker. It was only after this accident that matters came to the attention of Camden council.

Objections to 2014/5725/p

The planning application is vague and misleading. Although it purports to be the same as a previous application granted for a single dwelling, it differs significantly. The work being carried out presently have extended the basement area beyond the floor plate of the building, and possibly beyond that, has been dug out (as I have seen from my window). The present application omits to explain that there has been a substantial deepening of the basement area. I am very concerned about the effect that this extensive excavation work will have on the structure of our adjoining building, and my flat in particular, which shares a wall with the first floor (now second floor). I have no confidence in the construction methods being used and am concerned about both buildings in the future, especially given the accident in which a structure collapsed. HSE has already identify the site as a risk and it is the subject of a current investigation. I note that the same construction team continued to be used following the accident, and a poorly designed and built basement of this magnitude has a real potential to damage adjoining structures. I am not satisfied that the appropriate assessments have been undertaken and that the necessary checks by building control are being adhered to.

With regards to the wall of the extended rear building which has been constructed. This is vastly larger, higher and bulkier than the smaller circular dome like structure which was there before. The wall expands all the way to meet the wall of our building which was not the case before and it extends upward until reaching the bottom of my window cill in the living room. I now have a concrete wall with a flat roof facing my living room window within a boundary of less than 1 meter. We are extremely worried and concerned about the security risk that this poses as it provide a solid stable platform from which someone can stand within reach of our window. We feel that our security is being compromised and our boundaries are being encroached upon impacting our right to peaceful enjoyment of our home as guaranteed by article 1 and 8 of the ECHR.

We note that recently two large holes have been bored through the wall and electric wires have been passed through. This has not been mentioned in the plan. We object to this and are concerned that the applicants plan to put air conditioners or other machinery on this wall.

Objection to 2014/5724/p

We also object to the side extension at first floor level, which is of an unacceptably high density and size in comparison to the extension which previously existed. The proposed extension will have a door with access to a small terrace (which was previously an overhang at the front of the building and was not accessible). From this newly proposed terrace, former overhang, one can look into our bedroom directly, which is less than a meter away. This is a loss of our privacy and again poses security risks as above which is unacceptable.

We believe the 2 extensions proposed are disproportionately large in comparison to the building and the structure around it, and this unreasonable overdevelopment of the site is not in keeping with the character of the neighbouring properties.

We have been deeply disturbed by the applicant's flagrant disregard for planning controls, health and safety and the rights of the owners of adjoining properties. It is important for Camden residents to be able to trust in the planning process and should be grateful if you give serious consideration take to our objections.

Yours sincerely

Sarah Safieddine