

Dani Singer
1a Kidderpore Avenue
London NW3 7SX
[REDACTED]

Nanayaa Ampoma
Camden Planning
Town Hall, Judd Street
London WC1H 8ND

November 3rd 2014

Dear Ms Ampoma

Ref: 2014/547/P; Associated Ref: 2012/5358P
3 Kidderpore Ave., London NW3

Despite meeting with the owner / developer and his architect SIAW who have in the application drawings made some slight amendments to their earlier plans, I remain concerned and am writing to object to the proposal.

It is important to note that the current proposal, although presented separately and only referred to in passing by SIAW with regards to landscaping and underground parking, is part and parcel of an earlier proposal for an enormous double – i.e. two storey - basement that extends under the *entire* property, not just the footprint of the house, which although rejected unanimously by Camden's councillors was granted on appeal (Planning application 2010/3432/P).

- Loss of daylight, sunlight and privacy

I will be overlooked with substantial loss of privacy and light. The proposed wall on my side is considerably bulkier than the present construction. The proposed extension goes beyond the current building line with the consequence that I will be overlooked from the first floor terrace. I am concerned that the opaque terrace siding could easily be changed after construction by either the current or any subsequent owner. Anyone standing on the terrace can easily overlook my garden and terrace the latter of which is currently private. The same wall will overlook my kitchen skylight with a substantial loss of light and possibly privacy.

There are several new windows overlooking the side / back of my property, the upper ones potentially leading to a loss of privacy. On the drawings, they are indicated as being opaque & not openable, which is a welcome if small consolation. Nevertheless, I am worried as to the degree to which this can be ensured as it is a frequent practice for such windows to be changed after the works have been signed off and also in the event of a new owner.

PTO

In SIAW's report, point 15, Window Specification it says: "**All** are easy to open/operate" (my bold).

With regards to the report I fail to see the relevance of the internal set up eg lifts to every floor/ wheelchair accessibility to an application such as this – after all, as far as I'm aware this is not going to be a public building!

- Noise nuisance

The new underground garage is located very close to the main bedroom in my property. I am concerned that the noise from the mechanism could lead to loss of sleep.

- Visual impact and effect on the character of the neighborhood

External appearance: The new design is ultra modern and thus completely out of character of the surrounding 19th / early 20th century, predominantly brick buildings and so detrimental to the character of the area. So while the 20th Century Society may not consider the existing building to be of any architectural value, it does not follow that the current proposal will not have a negative visual impact.

- Design – bulk and massing

The proposed structure is considerably larger than the existing one, particularly on (my) side and back. My property which is adjacent to #3 is a small, semi-detached two bedroom house. The photograph presented in the application of the adjoining 'large' properties is misleading in that it fails to acknowledge this fact and combines the much larger #1 with my own small #1a to create an impression that it is a single large building.

- Adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

The architect's report recognizes that Kidderpore is part of '*a well preserved example of an Edwardian 19th century residential suburb*' within which are varying styles of that era. The proposed re-build is 21st century ie not in keeping with such a suburb.

However these plans are apparently (as told to me by both the owner/developer and the architect) with the agreement even encouragement of Camden's own planning department. So while I could not, for example, change my front windows because we are in a Conservation area, such a huge development is seemingly deemed acceptable, something I struggle to comprehend.

My family has lived in this property before the present No3 was built. There have been no major changes to the exterior of it for many years. I have no objection to the present owner redeveloping it, but feel that any such development should be:

- a) No bigger than the present very large house
- b) Extend no further back than the existing building
- c) Be visually in keeping with the surrounding buildings.

Sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

D Singer.