

Comments Form

Name MR SAUHELL AND MRS ANAIS NASSAR	
Address 4 ELLIOTT SQUARE, LONDON, NW3 354	******
Email address	******
Telephone number	******
Planning application number 2014 / 1720/P	
Planning application address. 16, 18, 20, 91, 94, 96 98 house Misc	R
London NW3 35P I object to the application (please state reasons below)	
Your comments	Gr.
PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER WHICH WAS SENT ELECTRONICALLY AND BY POST.	
OF 4 ELLIOTT SQUARE.	The state of the s
THANKS.	

Please continue on extra sheets if you wish

Planning Application number 2014/7720/P

OBJECTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR SAUHEIL AND MRS ANAIS NASSAR 29 January 2015

We thank Camden for consulting us on this application. We are the joint owners of 4 Elliott Square, London NW3 3SU and wish to object to this application based on the documents posted on Camden's website. We wish to make clear at the outset that we speak for ourselves but our comments may apply to the other houses along our row or block which are 1.2.3.5.6.7 Elliott Square. We would also like to add that 4 Elliott Square is part of a sector which includes 1 to 39 odd and even Elliott Square (ES), 8 to 28 even Lower Merton Rise(LMR) and 14 to 22 even Elsworthy Rise (ER). A total of 55 houses which for convenience it is commonly referred to as 'Elliott Square'.

Here is a list of our objections with direct references:

1. COVERING LETTER SIGNED BY KASIA WHITFIELD DATED 16 DEC 2014.

Kasia Whitfield says this is a "joint application for 7 terraced houses" which include 16,18,20,22,24,26,28 Lower Merton Rise. She goes on to say that "the application is made on behalf of 4 building owners":

22 Lower Merton Rise, Mr and Mrs Neumann 24 Lower Merton Rise, Mr and Mrs Chapman 26 Lower Merton Rise, Mr and Mrs Max 28 Lower Merton Rise, Mrs Tania Askar-Amin

We understand from Camden's website that approval is granted only if an UNINTERRUPTED ROW or BLOCK OF HOUSES agree to have rooftop extensions. In the case of LMR the block consists of 7 houses of which only 4 agree. Therefore, this application not only lacks transparency but it misleads making us believe that this application is made for a block of 7 houses when not everyone agrees to have rooftop extensions. Please see the opposing comments posted on Camden's website by the remaining houses of this block which are 16,18,20 LMR.

Therefore, we trust Camden will take into account the ASYMMETRY and the PROMINENCE the 4 roof top extensions would create if they granted permission. It would also create a precedence for other owners of this sector i.e. 1-39 ES and 14-22 ER thus compromising the harmony of the sector. Further afield, other owners from other sectors of the Chalcots Estate would want to do the same. Perhaps it is for this reason that individuals from outside of our sector have supported this application (please see section 3 below).

Con't 2014/7720/P page 3

Following an extraordinary Annual General Meeting organised by the Elliott Square Residents Association, attending owners agreed that roof- top extensions would have to be done all at once for a block of houses. There was no discussion of a phased development such as the one mentioned in the surveyor's report. It is also our understanding that Camden will grant permission only if everyone in a block agrees to have such extensions. The applicants seem to have a plan which we know nothing about nor is it posted on Camden's website for this consultation. We can assume that the intention is to develop 28 and 26 LMR as a block of two, 24 and 22 LMR as another block of two and finally 20, \$1,000.

We would therefore like to express our concerns for this lack of transparency, the non-compliance with Camden's guidelines and the eye sore this would create if permission was granted for 2+2+3 as some owners might still not want to have rooftop extensions. We contacted the surveyor directly in order to have a better understanding of what he meant by 2+2+3 but to-date he has not replied.

3. COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS IN SUPPORT OF THE APPLICATION.

We read on Camden's website comments sent by individuals in support of this application. Judging from their address we noticed that none of them live in our sector nor do they live within sight of our sector. They may have been driven by the vigorous lobbying that said rooftop extensions would increase the value of their properties. It is unfortunate that they seem to have put material values before human values.

We trust Camden will hear the opposing comments of those who have lived in Elliott Square for many years peacefully and harmoniously.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr Sauheil Nassar

Mrs Anais Nassar