					Printed on: 12/05/2015	09:05:18
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	
2015/1926/P	Steven M Bruck	21A Carlingford Road Hampstead London NW3 1RY	07/05/2015 22:50:52	COMMNT	I ENCLOSE, IN THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS ON ALL CURRENT APPLICATIONS RE 29 COMPAYNE GARDENS OF WHICH WE HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED, INCLUDING APPLICATION 2015/1926/P) WHICH FOR COMPLETENESS ARE REPEATED AS COMMENTS ON EACH APPLICATION. Dear Sirs	
					Planning Applications re 29 Compayne Gardens; 2015/1926/P, 2015/1927/P; 2015/1888/P;2015/1889/P;2015/2364/T	
					I am writing to you in my capacity as a joint leaseholder of the second floor flat 5 at 31 Compayne Gardens, and more particularly as authorised representative of the jointly owned freehold company, Thirty One Compayne Gardens Limited, which is owned by all of the leaseholders.	
					I refer to various planning applications made in respect of the immediately adjoining semi- detached property 29 Compayne Gardens, which has a common wall, with our own. We had no prior notice of this application and have had no approach from the owners or their agents in order to consider the effects on our property. This and the nature of the applications lead us to believe that the plans have been made without any regard to the potentially detrimental effect on immediately neighbouring properties including particularly our own.	f
					Our objections to the plans are as follows.	
					1. A first floor terrace is proposed to be constructed on the entire roof of a ground floor extension 29, which is to be raised to enable access from the first floor. This will overlook the neighbouring gardens of our property and will represent a serious infringement of privacy to the gardens and the property of 31. (Application 1926/P and 1927P)	at
					2. This detrimental effect of the first floor terrace is further exacerbated by the parallel proposal tremove two trees adjacent to our property which, particularly in the summer months provide shade our gardens and privacy from being overlooked. The proposed removal of the two trees further fails take accountant of their importance to the local environment. The streets and gardens of the district benefit from an abundance of tree cover and their unnecessary removal is, or should surely be, control to Council policy, as such trees comprise an important communal amenity. (Application 2364/T)	for to
					3. A dormer and terrace is proposed for the loft of number 29. This too will overlook our gardens and, being immediately adjacent to our property, will create intrusive sight lines with consequential adverse effects on the privacy of our property. The leaseholder of the top floor flat in our property, and the state of the consequential adverse effects on the privacy of our property.	y

4. A further proposal has been included to remove a cherry tree in the garden of 29 Compayne

well as those using the gardens, will be particularly affected. As indicated above, the adjoining developer has made no attempt to discuss with us ways in which this effect of a roof top development

of their property could be minimised. (Application 1888/P and 1889P)

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 12/05/2015 09:05:18 Response:
					Gardens. We believe that such removal should only be undertaken if there is good reason, as this tree like others, adds to the general rural aspect of the local environment which is appreciated by all local residents using or overlooking the local gardens. (Application 12364/T)
					In addition to our specific objections set out above, we would ask that Camden Council planning authorities take particular care to ensure that any and all internal and external works undertaken at 29 Compayne Gardens are undertaken in full compliance with local regulations regarding the avoidance of nuisance to neighbours and having proper regard to the need to minimise the detrimental effect of such works upon all of the residents of our and other neighbouring properties.
					Yours faithfully
					Steven Bruck
					For and on behalf of Thirty One Compayne Gardens Limited .
2015/1926/P	Emma Cuthbertson	Flat 6 31 Compayne Gardens	01/05/2015 09:24:09	ОВЈ	This will directly impinge on the privacy of the Flats 1 and 2 in 31 Compayne Gardens and the noise and upheaval will make living at the property very diffcult.
2015/1926/P	Emma Cuthbertson	Flat 6 31 Compayne Gardens	01/05/2015 09:23:48	ОВЈ	
2015/1926/P	Emma Cuthbertson	31 Compayne Gardens	07/05/2015 10:10:33	OBJEMPER	The erection of a terrace at the back of the property on the first floor will cause significant noise and disturbance, and the end result will impinge of the privacy of the lower flats in 31.
2015/1926/P	Dr. Alessandro Giardini	Flat 1 31 Compayne Gardens	05/05/2015 17:06:15	OBJEMPER	Dear Mr Clark I am the owner of flat 1 31 Compayne gardens and therefore my garden is right next to the proposed terrace. My wife and I feel that creation of the terrace will significantly affect our privacy as the terrace will be elevated and near the edge of our garden. With the exception of one other, there are no visible such terraces in the area. I also note that the same developer has proposed severeal different changes to Caompayne Gardens 29 but submuitted the applications in pieces and I think that the impact of the whole development on our privacy should be given full consideration, particularly as my young children spend a considerable amount of time in the garden.
2015/1926/P	Emma Cuthbertson	31 Compayne Gardens	07/05/2015 10:10:05	OBJEMPER	The erection of a terrace at the back of the property on the first floor will cause significant noise and disturbance, and the end result will impinge of the privacy of the lower flats in 31.