

[REDACTED]

From: Karin <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 06 November 2014 22:50
To: Nelson, Olivier
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Flat 1 , 45 Maresfield garden Support of the above proposed development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Olivier Nelson,

2014/5724IP Side extension at first floor level. 2014/5725IP Basement Extension

I wish to write in support of the above-proposed development.

The proposed side extension would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation area. The existing design was poor and not in high quality and look detached from the host building. The propose replacement is sympathetic and will therefore enhance character and appearance of the street.

Basement Extension should be approved as it not exceed the footprint of the current building and do not include any window in the front meaning no work would be visible.

The neighborhood should welcome larger family with kids to be able to settle in and make a home for their family,

It is a shame that neighbors in the attached building are making false stories and miss leading Camden. I have full trust in planning department that will avoid all the comments that have nothing to do with planning issues, and will allow this project to be finished and enhance the area!

Kind regards
Karin Betesh
59 Netherhall Garden NW3 5RE

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Ilan Rochman <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 06 November 2014 19:05
To: Nelson, Olivier
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: supporting letters

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Olivier Nelson,

2014/5724IP Side extension at first floor level.
2014/5725IP Basement Extension

I wish to write in support of the above proposed development.

There are a confusing number of different applications for this site. We welcome the fact that these two applications simplify things and will sort things out once and for all.

The side extension is now almost finished. It seems to be quite modest and not very different from the original. It is a much simpler design and helps to bring some calmness next to the bold design of the original building with the big roof sticking out. This simpler and calmer approach seems entirely appropriate and is to be welcomed.

We cannot see how the new basement will alter the appearance from the street in any way whatsoever. This is to be welcomed.

After some confusion, we understand that none of the mature trees in the back garden will be affected. This is to be welcomed.

We have heard various local reports about disruption from the construction that has occurred. From our perspective, apart from the hoardings and various lorries and contractor vehicles coming and going, there has been no effect on the neighbourhood whatsoever and the site seems to be well-run.

The works seem to be almost done and surely best way forward is to get the applications approved and the works finished as soon as possible.

Regards,

Ilan Rochman

45 Netherhall Gardens
NW3 5RL

[REDACTED]

From: Michal Geyer [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 November 2014 19:00
To: Nelson, Olivier
Cc: Liron Chervinsky; Kfir Chervinski

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Olivier Nelson,

2014/5724IP Side extension at first floor level.

2014/5725IP Basement Extension

I wish to write in support of the above proposed development.

There are a confusing number of different applications for this site. We welcome the fact that these two applications simplify things and will sort things out once and for all.

The side extension is now almost finished. It seems to be quite modest and not very different from the original. It is a much simpler design and helps to bring some calmness next to the bold design of the original building with the big roof sticking out. This simpler and calmer approach seems entirely appropriate and is to be welcomed.

We cannot see how the new basement will alter the appearance from the street in any way whatsoever. This is to be welcomed.

After some confusion, we understand that none of the mature trees in the back garden will be affected. This is to be welcomed.

We have heard various local reports about disruption from the construction that has occurred. From our perspective, apart from the hoardings and various lorries and contractor vehicles coming and going, there has been no effect on the neighbourhood whatsoever and the site seems to be well-run.

The works seem to be almost done and surely best way forward is to get the applications approved and the works finished as soon as possible.

Kind Regards,

Michal Rochman

45 Netherhall Gardens
NW3 5RL

[REDACTED]

From: Nelson, Olivier
Sent: 07 November 2014 16:52
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 45 Maresfield Gardens
Attachments: A3 - Oliver Nelson (14.10.14).pdf

Objection to 2014/5724/P & 2014/5725/P

Olivier Nelson
Planning Officer

Telephone: 5142

From: Roger Birtles [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 07 November 2014 16:44
To: Nelson, Olivier
Subject: 45 Maresfield Gardens

Dear Olivier

Thank you for returning my call just now. Attached is the letter we submitted back in mid October objecting to the two applications in respect of this site. If you don't have the hard copy original which included a coloured extract please let me know and we can resend it.

Please acknowledge receipt and would you be kind enough to keep me informed of progress on both applications.

Many thanks,

Yours

Roger
Roger Birtles
Director


25 Manchester Square, London, W1U 3PY
Tel. [REDACTED]
M. [REDACTED]

This email and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete the message from your system immediately. Internet communications are not secure and Simply Planning Ltd is not responsible for their abuse by third parties, nor for any alteration or corruption in transmission, nor for any damage or loss caused by any virus or other defect. Simply Planning Ltd is registered in Northern Ireland with number NI610511. The registered office is 49 High Street, Holywood, County Down.

Head of Planning
London Borough of Camden
6th Floor, Camden Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London
WC1H 8EQ

14th October 2014

FAO: Mr Oliver Nelson

Dear Sir,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Applications in respect of Flat 1, April House, 45 Maresfield Gardens, London, NW3 5TE
Application References 2014/5724/P and 2014/5725/P

We are instructed by Forty Five Maresfield Gardens Limited, the freehold owners of no. 45 Maresfield Gardens which is a residential block of flats immediately abutting the above site. On behalf of our client, we are instructed to object to the above planning applications, both of which seek retrospective planning consent for works either already undertaken or currently being undertaken at the site.

This site, as you will be aware, has been subject of significant controversy and has been the subject of enforcement investigations by your colleagues in the Enforcement Department. Works have proceeded on site in breach of planning legislation and without obtaining the necessary planning consents. As you will be further aware, those works resulted in a serious injury to one of the on-site construction workers and this in turn has led to an investigation into the on-site works by the Health & Safety Executive (HSE).

Whilst the history of works on site may not go to the planning merits of the application proposals, they do suggest to us and our client that your Council should take the upmost care in considering these proposals and only grant consent to them should you be fully satisfied that the proposals are acceptable in every respect. If there is any doubt whatsoever about the appropriateness of the works consent should be refused. Given the site's history, a very cautious approach to these applications is justified.

On behalf of our client we have already previously written to you requesting your Council seeks a cessation of the currently unauthorised works that have taken place on site and which continue to the present day. It remains our view that the current works should stop until the planning position for the site it resolved.

Our client objects to both of the above applications and, notwithstanding the planning history to the site, would urge that consent is refused to the proposals. The proposals, in our client's opinion, will result in an over-intensive use of the site which was not contemplated when the original consent in 2013 was granted which, at that point, envisage the property being brought back into use as a single dwellinghouse. That earlier proposal also did not involve the substantial basement works which are now contemplated in the second of the above applications.

Against this background, and having particular regard to the potential intensity of use of the property and therein its impact on the amenities of the adjoining neighbouring properties, it is right and proper that these individual applications are considered on their own permits irrespective of any previous decisions that may have been reached by your Council on the earlier proposals.

Against this overarching background, we set out below our objections to each of the two applications.

(a) Application Reference 2014/5724/P

This application seeks consent for the ground and lower ground floor extension to the property similar but not identical to that granted consent under reference 2013/1071/P. That earlier proposal would have been in conjunction with the use of the property reverting to a single family dwellinghouse. That change of use will now not be the case and therefore the proposal will be solely in conjunction with the occupation of the ground and lower ground floors as a separate flat.

Our clients object to the proposed extension because of its impact on their properties and in particular, the impact of the proposed extension at lower ground floor level on the outlook from the rear bay windows in our client's property and in particular the ground floor flat, Flat A.

Contrary to the suggestion given with the present planning application (for example, paragraph 2.15 of the applicant's Planning Statement) the rear extension at lower ground and ground floor is not identical to that granted consent under permission 2013/1071/P. It is larger, and materially so in a way that will unacceptably impact on the adjoining residents and specifically the occupier of Flat A.

We attach two drawings with this letter. The first is the consented section (5835-16) under permission 2013/1071/P. The second is the applicant's proposed section (2045 (LAY-GA) 300). On the approved section the overall height of the rearward extension terminates some distance below cill level of the first floor windows. On the current application the overall height comes to actual cill level. This is a significant change which:-

- Is not explained or referenced anywhere in the applicant's submission.
- Would increase the overall height of the height of the rear extension by approximately 0.6m.
- Would further decrease light and increase the sense of enclosure to the ground floor bay window of Flat A which is just a few feet from this proposed extension.

This increased height of the extension, which as we say, is not explained in the application is wholly unacceptable and is reason in itself for refusing consent to the proposal. In particular, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DP24 which seeks to achieve a high quality in design which respects the context and form of its neighbours.

Whilst it is accepted the proposed extension would extend no further back than the previous, now demolished, conservatory building, that previous building, as illustrated on the submitted plans, had a circular or pyramid pitched roof which sloped away from our client's property and in particular away from the dividing boundary wall. The extension as proposed will now be constructed immediately on the boundary wall to a height of 7m. As such, it unacceptably impacts on the amenity and outlook from the ground floor windows in Flat A, Maresfield Gardens. Its unacceptable dominance is compounded by the increased height referred to above.

The applicant's Planning Statement (paragraph 6.20) suggests that:-

"To the lower ground floor rear, the existing three storey conservatory extension with hipped, glazed roof will be altered and reduced in scale and extent..."

This Statement is wholly misleading. The existing rear conservatory extension is not three storeys in height and the proposed extension, because of its rectangular form, is considerably more bulky and dominant than the existing hipped roof structure. That increased bulk directly impacts the adjoining neighbours in an unacceptable way.

The proximity and height of the proposed extension, notwithstanding your Council's previous decision, is unacceptably close to our client's property and, as such, would be contrary to Policy 24 of your Development Management policies which indicates new development should be of a high standard of design and respect the amenities of the adjacent properties.

