

16, Lower Merton Rise,
London NW33SP

Tuesday 3rd February 2015

Ms. Tania Skelli-Yaoz
Planning Officer, R&DPM
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND

Dear Ms. Skelli-Yaoz,

Reference: Objection to Planning Application 2014/7720/P

We are writing this letter to STRONGLY OBJECT against this application which includes our property 16 Lower Merton Rise (LMR). The applicants know they do NOT have our APPROVAL! As we understand it our neighbours namely the South African Embassy at 20 LMR and Mr. Shoefield at 18 LMR have not given the applicants their approval and they have no interest in building an extra storey either. As residents for over 20 years we are extremely concerned that most of the comments being sent to Camden regarding this application are from the applicants themselves or from people who are unaware of the underlying nature of this application and the devastating impact it would have on 16-28 LMR and our surrounding community.

1. Our Objection, Non Compliance with Camden's Planning Guidelines and a Lack of Transparency

We understand that the applicants have already been advised by Camden in their pre application (reference 2014/1890/PRE) for 28-26 LMR that they would not be granted approval unless a 'complete group' of buildings agree to build together as per Camden's Policy reference paragraphs 5.6, 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9 of Camden Planning Guidance 1.

Despite the applicants knowing they do not have our approval they have included 16-20 LMR in this application, omitting the fact that they do not have our approval, in an attempt to adhere to Camden's Policies. Perhaps their strategy is to avoid the scrutiny of the Camden Planning Department at this stage hoping that 16-20 LMR do not make their objection public. This would have given them the opportunity to 'appeal' and request for a so-called phased building schedule '2+2+3'. WE OBJECT TO THIS! This application in principle appears to be a request to build just 4 roof extensions (22-28 LMR), in other words '2+2'. This application seems to lack the transparency of the applicants' intention and we urge Camden, at this stage, to consider the ADVERSE IMPACT on:

- **The Symmetry Of The Original Block**
- **The Skyline**
- **The Block And The Surrounding Street Scene**
- **The 'Saw Tooth' Look Of Elliott Square Sector And The Chalcot's Estate**
- **The Distracting And Architectural Offensiveness of Proposed Phased Building Plans**

2. The Daylight and Sunlight Analysis And Non Compliance With Chalcot's Architect's Forum (CAF) Guidelines.

- During the Elliott Square Special General Meeting (SGM) that was set up to discuss the CAF guidelines, the SGM minutes clearly says, "that group of terraces should be the same size, and all set back or all flush, to avoid a saw-tooth look." Therefore, maintaining the symmetrical integrity of the original building, which would be in line with Camden's Planning Guidelines. The Daylight and Sunlight Analysis refers to a so-called provision for a phased development '2+2+3'. This application does NOT COMPLY with what was agreed by Elliot Square residents when discussing the CAF Guidelines. There is no provision for building a rooftop

extension other than for an entire uninterrupted building group. Regarding the extra floor on the three storey houses the feedback on the Design Guidelines was for a minimum of an entire block, to be carried at the same time otherwise not at all.

- 16-20 LMR have already made it known to the applicants that we will not be building an extra storey yet here is no data submitted on what the impact would be on us of the so-called provision of '2+2+3'.
- This report lacks first hand data. N/A completed in most parts of the APSH column Appendix B. We understand that not all these properties (1-7 Elliott Square) were visited. Therefore, it is questionable how accurate the data in the analysis is.

3. Additional Adverse Impact Specific To 16-20 LMR

The original building features include 3 skylights, which are also used for light and ventilation purposes, 2 of which are overlooking our 2 top floor bathrooms and one our stairwell. The proposed designs include a set back feature in the front and rear of the roof extension. This would further exacerbate the issues mentioned below should only 22-28 LMR ever build an extra storey. As well as the highlighted issues already mentioned in our objection 16-20 LMR will experience a significant ADVERSE IMPACT on our:

- **Privacy**
- **Security**
- **Civil Right To Light**

The set back feature would further compromise the security, privacy and light which is not comparable to other rooftop extensions that have been granted on the two-storey houses as they are not set back at all. Making an exception to the rule to this or any other such application would have a devastating impact on our entire Estate. It would undermine the integrity of the original building, the uniformity, aesthetic and symmetry building turning our neighbourhood into an eyesore.

4. No Precedence

There is no precedence for a three-storey house on the Chalcot's Estate other than where entire blocks have agreed to build together. The examples given by the applications are not relevant to their proposal for the following reasons:

- 11-15 LMR Belong to a different sector and all 3 houses agreed to build together.
- 5-7 LMR Belong to a different sector. They are 2 storey houses obscure from street view and not set back at all.

5. Our Rights

The applicants have approached us suggesting that we should not object otherwise, we quote, we would "jeopardise" their application, which we felt was not proper. This application affects our home and our quality of life. We are making our objection regardless as we know that no one can infringe on our rights and would like you to be privy to the background of our objection when making your decision.

If you require any further information please contact us on [REDACTED].

We thank your kind attention,

Mrs. Maya Aswani and Ms. Natasha Aswani

Original Sent By Recorded Delivery
Copy To The South African Embassy And Mr. P. Shoefield