

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1927/P	Steven M Bruck	21A Carlingford Road Hampstead London NW3 1RY	07/05/2015 22:55:21	COMMEMP ER	I ENCLOSE, IN THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS ON ALL CURRENT APPLICATIONS RE 29 COMPAYNE GARDENS OF WHICH WE HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED, (INCLUDING APPLICATION 2015/1927/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.

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 at 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)
2. This detrimental effect of the first floor terrace is further exacerbated by the parallel proposal to remove two trees adjacent to our property which, particularly in the summer months provide shade for our gardens and privacy from being overlooked. The proposed removal of the two trees further fails to take account 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, contrary to Council policy, as such trees comprise an important communal amenity. (Application 2364/T)
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 consequentially adverse effects on the privacy of our property. The leaseholder of the top floor flat in our property, as 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)
4. A further proposal has been included to remove a cherry tree in the garden of 29 Compayne

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>Steven Bruck</p> <p>For and on behalf of Thirty One Compayne Gardens Limited</p> <p>.</p>
