

P Woodward

As owner of Flat 2, 97 Torriano Avenue, I object to the inclusion in this application of, potentially, a 'writer's cabin' at the end of the garden, presumably with windows facing back towards the main building, which would adversely impact upon the existing privacy of my property, and others. I would furthermore wish to exclude the possibility of any potential extension to the area of the existing roof terrace

Birgit Heyer

144 Freshfield Road

Brighton

BN29YD

To whom it may concern:

1) Main concern is the Writers Cabin that is to be build at the end of the garden of 95 Torriano - complete with services. At present there is no structure at the end of the garden - not even a garden shed. None of the adjoining properties have permanent structures in the rear garden.

At present there are no buildings that have a window facing the rear of properties 93, 95, 97 and 99. The mews development at the rear of these properties does NOT have any windows facing these properties - only a very small opening with frosted glass. Building a writers cabin at the end of the garden will open a new window and therefore loss of privacy to certainly the above mentioned properties - if not others - which should be avoided under all circumstances.

A writers cabin complete with services would indicate more permanent use - at the moment the rear gardens - of the properties in the vicinity are quiet green havens - building a permanent structure in the rear of 95 would take away from this effect.

2) One further bedroom would increase the traffic most certainly to the property - however adding a bedroom AND a writers cabin would more then double the living space/sleeping space and the traffic associated with this.

3) From the plans it is not quite clear if the new roof of the rear extension can also be accessed and used as a roof terrace. This should not be allowed as if used as a roof terrace would cause a massive loss of privacy to the adjoining gardens and terraces.

4) From the plans it is not quite clear if the new rear extension is higher than the adjoining to 97 Torriano - if it is higher this would entail loss of light and is not acceptable as it would block the southerly sun into the garden of 97. From the plans it would appear that the new rear extension is the same length which would be acceptable — however if longer again there again would be the issue of loss of light from the southerly aspect to 97. If same length and height as the adjoining extension of 97 Torriano then it would be acceptable.

5) The proposed new bedroom that is created due to the extension — does not appear to have any windows — would this really be a suitable bedroom?

Dr VGA Goss

93a Torriano Avenue NW5 2RX

We live in 93a Torriano Ave - levels ground and lower ground. We share a garden partition with 95 Torriano Ave consisting of a regular 6' garden fence.

We are concerned that the appearance of our garden may be adversely affected by the proposed extension. However, the information provided is insufficient for us to be sure of exactly how the proposed works will change the partition. Consequently, we can not support the planning application without knowing the impact on our property (in particular our garden).

1) There do not appear to be any side elevation drawings that illustrate either the existing or the proposed garden partition between 95 and 93.

2) We need to see both existing and proposed side elevations for 93/95 i.e., similar to Drawings No 604 and No 202 (the latter, incidentally, is incorrect because the existing fence is not 1930 mm high.)

3) Our main concern is in relation to the proposed partition between 93 and 95 Torriano Ave (which forms one side of our garden). We require details of the heights and lengths of the proposed fence(s) and/or wall(s) and the proposed materials to be used.

4) Note that Drawing 001 shows a square in our garden. That is incorrect. There is no building in our garden.

5) Can you verify that the roof of the new extension will not be used by the occupants and that the roof terrace of 95b will not be extended? If the current plans permit either of those then we are opposed to the plans because it would reduce the privacy we currently enjoy in our garden.

To add to our previous comments the 3D Axo of Existing Rear drawing is inaccurate in regards to the fencing around our garden. Our garden is in fact much shorter than the garden of 95 and enclosed by wooden fence. There is not an extended L shape as shown in drawings.

Dr VGA Goss

93a Torriano Avenue NW5 2RX

To add to our previous comments the 3D Axo of Existing Rear drawing is inaccurate in regards to the fencing around our garden. Our garden is in fact much shorter than the garden of 95 and enclosed by wooden fence. There is not an extended L shape as shown in drawings.

Dr VGA Goss

93a Torriano Avenue NW5 2RX

To add to our previous comments the 3D Axo of Existing Rear drawing is inaccurate in regards to the fencing around our garden. Our garden is in fact much shorter than the garden of 95 and enclosed by wooden fence. There is not an extended L shape as shown in drawings.

Adam Hewitt

Flat 3

97 Torriano Avenue

London

NW5 2RX

As the owner of the first floor flat in the adjacent property 97 Torriano Avenue, I am writing to express my concerns at the application submitted for 95A Torriano Avenue.

My concerns include:

- 1) That the roof of the proposed new extension should not be used at any time as a roof terrace, as this would allow views directly into the rear of my flat, and would so adversely affect privacy.
- 2) That the proposed "Writers Cabin" to the rear garden of the property has not been detailed in any of the drawings and is only shown in outline terms with no specification as to materials etc. Views from this this new building could jeopardise privacy in my flat and also create a precedent for 'outhouse' developments in other adjacent properties. The large rear gardens to the houses in this part of Torriano avenue are a characteristic and attractive aspect and add to the appeal of the area. I feel that adding an additional building as well as an extension to the main house would be an

overdevelopment of the open space at the rear of the house and detract from the feeling of openness created by the large gardens. Depending on the use of this additional building, there may also be issues concerning noise and disturbance. Additionally, the use to which the building is put could not be controlled by future occupants.

I would therefore urge that a condition is placed on the granting of the application stating that the new roof cannot be used as a terrace at any time in the future, and that the additional "Writers Cabin" is removed from the application.

Jo Hordern

Flat 4

97 Torriano Avenue

London

NW5 2RX

I object to the 'Writers Cabin' part of the proposed development.

I have spoken to the case officer, Katrine Dean, and, as there is no way of attaching photos to comments made through this website, I have agreed with her that I send my objections and supporting photos directly to her at katrine.dean@camden.gov.uk.

Please refer to my email to Katrine Dean, sent today, 10 Dec 2014, for full details of my objection.
Thank you.

Jo Hordern

Flat 4

97 Torriano Avenue

London

NW5 2RX

I object to the 'Writers Cabin' part of the proposed development.

I have spoken to the case officer, Katrine Dean, and, as there is no way of attaching photos to comments made through this website, I have agreed with her that I send my objections and supporting photos directly to her at katrine.dean@camden.gov.uk.

Please refer to my email to Katrine Dean, sent today, 10 Dec 2014, for full details of my objection.
Thank you.