

8323/08-1502pk01

10<sup>th</sup> February 2015

Planning Officer  
Regeneration and Planning  
Culture and Environment  
London Borough of Camden  
2nd floor 5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

BY EMAIL ONLY

**23 DOWNSIDE CRESCENT, NW3; RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON APPLICATION REF: 2014/7587/P**

Dear Rachel,

Further to comments received within the consultation period for application Ref: 2014/7587/P we are happy to provide the following in response to concerns raised.

Structural, geological or hydrological comments received

A number of queries were raised regarding some of the content of the Basement Impact Assessment included with the application. We have attached a copy of our structural engineer's response to comments received relating to structural, geological and hydrological items to help allay any concerns you may have in these areas.

Impact of proposal on trees situated within adjoining properties

Concerns were raised regarding the future health of trees situated within adjoining properties. As set out within the tree survey undertaken by Landmark Trees the proposals will not have any significant impact on either the retained trees or wider landscape.

Basement plant and noise

The potential for plant within the basement to create noise was raised. No plant or machinery are proposed within the basement that will generate noise that will impact on the amenity of adjoining properties. No air condition units are proposed.

Size of living accommodation proposed

The need for providing the extent of accommodation proposed was queried. This is not a material consideration and should not be taken into account when deciding on the above application.

121 Salisbury Road  
London NW6 6RG  
T 020 7625 4411  
F 020 7625 0250  
mail@bickerdikeallen.com  
www.bickerdikeallen.com

Partners  
Philippa Gavey, Giles Greenhalgh, Peter Henson, Roger Jowett, John Miller  
Senior Associates Ron Casson, Peter Fung  
Associates David Charles, Rod Jenkins, David Trew, Paul Wiseman  
Consultants Jeff Charles, Barry Josey, Brian Loudon, John Streeter, Roger Walters  
Practice Secretary Brenda Ward-Millar



Size of Rooflight to Proposed Rear Extension

Privacy and light issues were commented on in relation to the size of the proposed rooflight to the rear extension. The size of rooflight, and therefore the extent of glazing, is smaller than that approved under application Ref: 2013/7333/P.

Proposed height of ridge to rear extension

The height of the ridge Height of ridge no higher than that approved under application ref: 2013/7333/P.

I trust the above will be of assistance in determining the above application. Any other queries please give me a call.

Kind regards



PHILIP KAVANAGH  
Project Architect  
Enc.