

[REDACTED]

From: Lesley1lesley [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 August 2015 23:28
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 2015/3137/P flat 2. 2 Albert Terrace NW1

Dear Sir/Madam,

We would like to object to the Planning Application referenced above.
We live at 3 Albert Terrace Mews and share a garden boundary wall with 2 Albert Terrace.

Main reasons for objection include -
Misleading information on application with constant use of the word "restore".
Over development.
Disregard for Camden Council's guideline to protect gardens CP11.

DESIGN STATEMENT - Description of Property page 1 includes the following:

"all with a rendered finish which defines the street's aesthetics". The proposed wood cladding does not define the building's rear aesthetics which should be considered, and certainly will be by those of us who would have to look at it on a daily basis.

The final paragraph here states that there is a "mews street behind" the garden. There are in fact mews houses, with one in particular situated very near to the proposed works, and then a mews street.

LAYOUT - refers to "missing block". There is no missing block. The house was built with the intention of the space forming part of the garden.

Final paragraph here states "this once dark internal space can now be opened up and enjoyed for the new owners". However, there will be a number of neighbours whose light and sense of open space enjoyment will be diminished by the proposed changes.

AMOUNT - refers again to "missing block". There is no missing block. It's a garden as intended when built back in the 1800's and, as per Camden Council guidelines, should be protected.

3rd paragraph here refers to "the rear elevation all will be rationalised with similar dimensioned panels which will restore" repeated use of "restore" which is misleading. Nothing is being restored.

HERITAGE - final page - reference is made to proportions matching the rest of the rear. The proposed alteration might make it more symmetrical but this was not the original intention and it will certainly not proportionally enhance the building. It will detract proportionally from the already small garden for a house of this size.

APPLICATION FORM - description again refers to "restoring". Nothing is being restored.

Mentions additional light which will benefit new owner. Three neighbouring houses at least that will suffer from a feeling of being hemmed in and therefore to some extent loss of light.

MATERIALS - timber cladding to be used as this will "feel less imposing". Owner and architect clearly seem to be aware that their plans, if approved, will result in an imposing structure. It certainly would be.

Yours faithfully,
Lesley Stewart
Neil Harris