

## Comments Form

Name.....

Address..... 1 Heathwood House, 28 Netherhall Gardens NW3 5TH

Email address..... miniam.madar@me.com

Telephone number..... 07710394 001

Planning application number..... 2014/16224/P

Planning application address..... 28 Netherhall Gardens, NW3 5TH

I support the application (please state reasons below) ☐

I object to the application (please state reasons below) ☒

Your comments

Dear Angela

- I have instructed a professional architect to help me analyse the proposed works <sup>for 26 Netherhall</sup> and as a result strongly object to the proposed plans. The reasons are
- 1) the plans are sub basement & NOT basement (as below lower ground level) as it says <sup>proposed</sup> & carries substantial structural risks to a historic building (No 28).
  - 2) overlooking issue from <sup>proposed</sup> No 26 roof terrace
  - 3) inaccurate & misleading plans to No 28 <sup>submitted</sup> & a loss of amenity to No 28.

Please see attached <sup>in depth</sup> comments from ~~the~~ professional architect for more details under yellow markings.

<sup>No 28</sup> The ~~architect~~ architect is well known to Camden & is sensitive to the building environment

Please continue on extra sheets if you wish

Regards

+ see attached please.

From: '  
Subject: 26 Netherhall Gardens  
Date: 1 November 2014 14:53:38 GMT  
To: '  
Reply-To: '

---

Dear Miriam & Billie

Please see below of my observations.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Ming

#### No. 26 and No. 24A

In No.24A, there is a window of the existing bedroom located at the mid section of No.24a with a 45 degree facing toward to No.26; where is clearly shown on the submitted daylight and sunlight report page 24 - window no.76.

The original building of No.26 Netherhall Garden where is next to 24A is a single storey building living space with views to its front and rear garden. There is no window from this single storey building facing to no.24A. There are only two slot windows next to existing chimney at the first floor are facing No.24A, but both of them are approx 10m away from the site boundary and both of the windows are set back from the first floor habitable window line of no.24A. So there is no overlooking issue. In addition, this first floor habitable window has been enjoying its view and daylight over 20 years.

The proposal is to erect a two storey building with roof garden just a metre away from the site boundary which will butt up with the rear section of No.24A.

- The proposed two storey blank wall will completely cut out the view from the above mentioned window at the first floor habitable room. This is completely not acceptable.
- It also clearly stated from the submitted daylight and sunlight report that the proposed scheme will **reduce the daylight and sunlight of that habitable room significantly**; which shows the proposed scheme has no consideration of this situation.
- On top of the two storey building, the proposed scheme is suggesting to put a roof terrace which will **definitely overlooking into no.24A bedroom and into the whole rear garden**. The proposed scheme shows no consideration the privacy and the amenity of No.24A
- The position of all rear No.24A windows are deliberately not to show on the existing and proposed plans and elevations to avoid telling the truth situation of its surroundings. It shows that the designers are completely incompetent of its own professionalism.
- The outline geometry of ground and first floor plans on No.24A are shown incorrectly and misleading which try to change the angle of the windows to facing into No.24A garden. In fact, the window at 45 degree facing into No.26. The mentioned window is clearly shown on the submitted daylight and sunlight report. Again, it shows that the proposed scheme has no respect to its adjoining sites.

The proposed scheme will cut out the view and daylight from its neighbour's habitable room, and will create overlooking and intrude into neighbour's private amenity.

#### \* No. 26 and No. 28 — Pertinent to No 28

The original building of No.26 is slightly set back from the rear of No.28.

The outline plans of No.28 in the submitted existing and proposed plans are incorrect; two main bay windows at the ground floor are missing, which shows in the submitted daylight report - window number 62.

The top floor of No.28 is within roof space, however, the submitted existing floor plan shows that the rear building line is line up

with the floor below which should be set back into the loft space. The submitted existing drawing is incorrect and misleading.

The rear wall of proposed scheme where next to the No.28 will have a 2-storey with 3 metres <sup>rear extension</sup> extend into the garden area, which means it will have approximate 4 metres in total rear extension from its original position. As a result, it will create an enclosure to the rear garden of No.28 and lead to the loss of its amenity. <sup>reduction in light as well.</sup>

The proposed scheme is also create an open roof terrace at the third floor; in fact, it is second floor of No.28; to overlooking into the rear garden of No.28.

There is another open roof terrace at the same level but near No.24A side, the position of the terrace <sup>is</sup> even further into the garden area. Although it is on the other side of the site, the distance between the proposed terrace to the garden of No.28 is only around 12 to 15 metres; normally acceptable distance should be at least 20 metres. So this open terrace is still within overlooking distance.

The position of all rear No.28 windows are deliberately not <sup>to</sup> show on the existing and proposed plans and elevations to avoid telling the truth situation of its surroundings.

All of above show that the proposed scheme has no consideration of No.28 privacy and amenity space.

The proposed scheme should cut back and line up the rear wall with No. 28 to avoid the creation of enclosure and remove all the rear high level open terraces to avoid any overlooking to its neighbouring sites.

#### Sub-basement level

The proposed scheme shows a basement will be created close to No.28, in fact, it is a sub-basement - two storey down from the street entrance level. The lower ground floor should be called basement instead. It is confusing and misleading. By creating some sort lighwells to provide daylight but no view for the proposed habitable rooms! It seems it is not a quality design at all. In fact, this sub-basement is only used for the storage space. According to London Plan, storage space should be designed within each flat, it shows that the proposed scheme for creating the space for the seek of the creating spaces without consider the end users. It also creates unnecessary structure risks toward the historical building No.28 and all the surrounding buildings.