

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	Keith Lipman	50 Maresfield Gardens	27/07/2015 23:41:33	OBJ	<p>This basement is far too deep. Basements are contentious issues, and this is excessive in depth, and extension beyond the current structure. It is not on.</p> <p>Rear balcony overlooks its neighbours and invades their right to privacy.</p> <p>Enlargement at rear will get too near the tree of number 28. Basement floors are larger than 2nd floor, not shown properly in their diagrams. Please don't let misrepresentation win.</p> <p>Enlargement will block daylight for neighbours, and mean views from some windows of Number 24 and 26 look at brick wall / darkness. 'not significant' and 'unavoidable' are nothing short of misrepresentation and fabrication.</p> <p>This is overdevelopment, reducing green space Loss of gaps between buildings, which threatens the 'leafy' nature of the conservation area, non compliant with DP27.</p> <p>Front garden will become parking [2/3 bays, but space for many more] – against Camden policy to restrict such parking.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	Scott Church	23 Netherhall Gardens nw3 5rl	27/07/2015 21:17:25	OBJLETTE R	<p>These development proposals constitute an excessive over development doubling the area. This is achieved by the unacceptable proposal to create two new basement floors, extending the basic floor plan at ground floor out into the garden unacceptably beyond the rear line of the adjacent houses, extending the footprint significantly into the garden creating disproportionately small rear gardens reducing the green space, and extending the building on the south side at lower floors and ground and substantially at 1st, and 2nd floors where there is currently a single storey later extension at ground floor. This south extension places a substantial mass of building extremely close to the adjacent No 24a blocking rights of light to habitable rooms.</p> <p>The loss of open space to the side of the building also effectively blocks of the gap between the No 26 and 24 which currently visually links the green space at the rear with the front gardens and highway, and threatens the “leafy” character which is an important aspect of this residential Conservation Area. This and the loss of garden space at the rear is non compliant with Policy DP27.</p> <p>Also the front “garden” (can it be called a garden) is almost fully given over to car parking, increasing off street car parking from 2 to 3 spaces. However, it is clear that though not shown as parking bays, the layout will permit 6 cars to be parked. This is not acceptable under your policy to restrict the increase in car use by resisting additional on site parking in Camden. It also almost completely eliminates soft porous surfaces in front of the house.</p> <p>Note the new proposals’ titled Ground Floor is at the datum of the existing lower ground floor and therefore comparisons of floor levels are not accurate by nomenclature. It hides the fact that it is proposed to extend a further two storeys down.</p> <p>It is proposed to create a deep double basement but as the footprint is substantially extended out into the garden at the rear the basement effectively becomes a 3 storey depth because of the slope. The BIA is unacceptable. It fails to assess the risks of damage to and demonstrate the measures for protection of the adjacent buildings as a result of the deep excavations. There is no specific soil survey in non compliance with CPG4.</p> <p>The proposed new design is s significant and unacceptable increase in mass of the building and fails to create a building in character and harmony with the rest of the street. It should be looking to return the building to its original form and massing rather than seeking to knock down a key building in the street which contributes substantially to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>There will be considerable overlooking of neighbours from the new terraces created and the depth of the habitable rooms below ground level will create unacceptable living and sleeping areas at low levels with in the new building.</p> <p>We therefore strongly urge you to refuse this application.</p> <p>We note there is no application for permission to demolish the existing building accompanying this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	Miriam Madar	1 heathwood house 28 netherhall gardens london nw3 5th	27/07/2015 20:35:03	OBJ	<p>I have consulted with a chartered architect Ming Kho regarding the proposed 26 netherhall development and I strongly object to the application.</p> <p>The developers have taken none of the previous significant objections into account in their proposal and their scheme and has disregarded any of their neighbours concerns into account and will lead into an extremely acrimonious relationship with their neighbours-totally opposite to what they have stated in their "planning statement". We have also not been consulted unlike stated in their report which is a lie.</p> <p>1)At the rear the proposed building line is out of its original alignment by 2metres-this will have significant consequences to 28 netherhall gardens as it does not respect building line of 28.</p> <p>window 62 which the main living room window to number 28 and not "secondary "like the proposal says will have a significant light impact and this will significantly affect the value of this property-No one will want to buy a 3000sq ft maisonette and have breakfast ,lunch and dinner in darkness !!!!</p> <p>-window 61 will see a loss of sunlight from 29% to 2% and window 62 from 39% to 13% and there is an additional window which has been missed .how they can say this is not significant in their report is beyond insensitive .The vertical sky effect on window 61 and 62 is also significant from 24% to 9%</p> <p>-this will significantly affect our quiet enjoyment and the lack of light and outlook will create a sense of enclosure .2)the balcony that the proposal is erecting at the rear will overlook into no 28 -this is unacceptable and we have had no overlooking for over 20 years.</p> <p>3)the rear proposal will block window 76 sunlight completely from 24a and -window 76 will also have a blocked outlook of a blank wall and create a sense of enclosure -this is avoidable unlike what they say reconfigure your proposal and don't build out at the rear !-think of your neighbours ! The outlook has totally not been addressed and there is 0 improvement.</p> <p>4)the proposal will mean a potential destruction of the oak tree at the rear which belongs to 28 netherhall -look at the canopy of the oak which represents the diameter of the tree root and you will see the canopy close proximity to rear of 26! Additionally the tree constraint drawing does not match the architectural plan -the size of the tree is much bigger than what is shown on the plan.page 31 of the agricultural impact assessment plan shows 26 netherhall 2nd floor plan overlayed onto the oak tree as it is smaller than the basement plan thus misrepresenting how close the 26 new proposal will be to the oak tree -the basement plan should be shown instead as the tree roots goes underground and if this was shown it would show how the building will overlap and damage the tree roots -this has been omitted . So 26 netherhall proposal will infringe the tree roots at the rear and there is no justification for proposal -the tree is listed with camden.</p> <p>5) the plan to build a sub basement 10-12 is totally dangerous,beyond what is "normal" and has been ignored despite several objections by neighbours.28 netherhall was the house of King George V doctor and has won several awards for its gardens and structure -why would approve a scheme which would jeopardise that?</p> <p>57 Maresfield has applied for subbasement over several years which camden has rejected so why approve this one which is far more ambitious?</p> <p>6)demolishing the property is unjustified .</p> <p>7) the developers keep making representations at end of december and the end of july in the hope that people are away and therefore they will get less objections -this leaves a very bad taste -be honest ,truthful and upfront if you want the enhanced relationships you talk about but clearly don't care about.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	Daniel Schulman	23 Netherhall Gardens nw3 5rl	27/07/2015 21:19:40	OBJLETTE R	<p>As the home owner living opposite to the planned demolition and construction,I am concerned about the plans to dig down below the level of the current house to create a two-tier basement system with sunken garden. Such aggressive development is unnecessary and only serves to increase the financial rewards of the developer, but leaves little regard to the instability created and potential damage to other houses that have stood on this road for over one hundred years. A deeper dig than the current depth of building at number 26 Netherhall should be strongly rejected by the governing body.</p> <p>I share the other views of my neighbour as number 21 Netherhall Gardens listed below:</p> <p>In recent years we have noticed some land movement at the front of our homes which is of concern. This type of land movement appears to have affected many houses on our side of Netherhall Gardens and is apparent in the forward leaning into the street of many of the brick gate posts including that of our house. Some of the gate posts have been rebuilt recently as a result. I believe that plans to excavate down into the terraces of the Netherhall Gardens area should be regarded with extreme caution and should be generally rigourously discouraged by Camden Council.</p> <p>I have read the heritage statement but feel that the front aspect of the house is not in keeping with the surrounding houses, the style is wrong and there are too many windows. The proposed house is also too big and too wide. In particular, the gap between no 24A and no 26 is not in keeping with the feel of the buildings on that side of the road which in themselves are of individual character. That sense of individuality requires a preservation of space between the properties. On our side of the road the architecture is very different, the houses were built to have a terrace feel. Any re-development of no 26 should retain the sense of proportion of that side of the road in line with its evolution since the 1800s.</p> <p>The sun rises opposite the front of our house and in the early morning the sun shines directly through our windows. I feel that the proposed building will reduce our sunlight by more than the 0.2% outlined in the application.</p> <p>I would also like to comment on the proposed changes to the parking bays. Camden Council must ensure that we lose no length in our parking bays and that changes be re-instated to the exact length removed. Parking is difficult due to the density of flats on our side of the road.</p> <p>I am also concerned about how the proposed excavations will affect the third party mature Oak and that this development will mean the loss of the other mature oak in the garden of no 26, another beautiful tree in the area. Even if the other mature Oak needs to be removed due to decay at least with the current garden proportions this tree could be replaced. Notably, last year, another tree in the garden of number 26 was recently cut down but not replaced as far as I am aware.</p>