

[REDACTED]

From: Bille Bacall <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 05 August 2015 10:31
To: Planning; Peres Da Costa, David
Subject: Fwd: 2015/3314/P. / please log on these comments to camden website in red/
disregard my past emails thank you- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1. there is land slippage in this area, especialy this stretch of the road. recently, no 27 netherhall gardens needed underpinning and the top flat was sold well below its market value due to this. my gate at no 24a used to fully close and now the gate will barely shut close to the adjoining wall. the pillar at no 26 leans into our gate and some stones have fallen from the wall at no 26 have fallen into the street quite recently.

2. tree positions on the plans are misrepresented. plans show trees at back of no 24 which do not exist. border no 24a and no 26 tree misrepresented amongst others.

3. architects deem loss of light "unavoidable" and "not significant" surely if they amend their plans then it will be "avoidable" for neighbours to loose light?not significant maybe for purposes plans on paper but obviously not the case in practical terms building .

4. building line misrepresented

all buildings from no 26 netherhall gardens are built in a line. original building of no 26 built in lieu. no 24 on the other side and properties down the street built in other line further back. this developments aim to emulate this line but its original line is in lieu with all properties on its side of the line. if they are allowed to build forard they will encroach on its green space at back

5. japanese knotweed recently at no 26 both in front and back gardens.neighbourhood do not want contamination. this needs be verified.

6. border 26 and 24a both back and front gardens there is immense greenery. on plans this is not shown. greenery contributes greatly to character conservation area. we do not want to loose our greenery or privacy. so what are the plans for these areas? not shown on plans or discussed

7. preliminary risk assesment document has identified number unacceptable risks. is this a cause for concern please?

NB/

i would also like to add the following:

reference: window 76/ back bedroom of 24a netherhall gardens

the OUTLOOK from this window will be severely compromised if this application is allowed. this window will have significant daylight blocked and an outlook significantly disturbed which has been present for over the last 30 years.

the view from window 76 will change significantly. my son will be looking out to a blank wall only 2 metres from our boundry and very high.

roof terraces will overlook and encroach on privacy for no 24a and no 26 netherhall gardens

there will be a large balcony overlooking no 24a and no 28

this will cause overlooking issues and lack of privacy

creating a sense of enclosure especially to habitable bedroom with window no 76

daylight report:

window 76

vertical sky component

26.6% to 13.5%

sunlight to windows

omitted from this report for window number 76. why is this the case? i will expect camden council ask for his statistic and send me the information please
clearly even on report paid for by developers there is significant loss of light into window 76.

window 78

hall

19.9% - 13.5%

because of the design of 24a netherhall gardens this hall area is actually used a living space. its not a hall due to the side entrance into the property and it is a large space within the house. we currently use it as a study area. i consider we spend a great deal of time in this space, thus deem it habitable.

point 7.3.3. in report quotes that due to building "will provide enhanced relationship with neighbours"

this is absolutely not the case and the developers are wrong to make such statements

. it is extremely presumptuous and infringes our privacy as individuals to make such false statements.
there is absolutely no positive virtue for designing such an imposing and large building within this site;
the ratio is all wrong, the building too large for the land mass and definitely not in keeping with the
existing properties in this conservation area .it will hugely impact on all neighbours both adjoining and
overlooking for the worse and not the better in any shape or form

sincerely

a. bacal resident no 24a netherhall gardens

i write in reference to planning application above for 26 netherhall gardens NW35TH

i am resident at no 24A

i will be sending further comments in due course

for the moment i would like to STRONGLY OBJECT to DEMOLITION and BUILD of new property

1. i would also like to STRONGLY STATE for the record i have never liased with the developers as stated
point 4.4.4 on their report.

this information is grossly misleading and a slight on my character. i will be sending the architects a
letter informing them they had no right to use my name for their own purposes which is untrue. i do not
appreciate being used in this way. i have never agreed to any plans they may have. their plans show
utmost disrespect for their adjoining neighbours and the whole surrounding area and will impact hugely
on a side window habitable bedroom(window 76)at no 24a re light and privacy.

2. no 26 is locally listed, demonstrates style and description of a queen anne house and is vital for the
character of the conservation area.. this property needs to be respected and cared for. the new plans
will only increase accomodation by 1 flat; somewhat diminishing the purpose of this exercise surely?

3. basement plans to excavate 10-12 metres exceeds 3 metre maximum defined in policy documents. a
stream ran behind no 28 netherhall gardens (documented) this is a bad move for the land in this area.
already have subsidence / sloping on street. gate to no 24a wont shut anymore as sloping from boundry
no 26. basement is not a good idea will cause multiple problems for existing properties.

4. architects plans are not clear.. they have misrepresented roof heights and a depicted a chimney which
sits further back on building and not on the front level for their own purposes to even out roof heights
visually. is this is the case, then the council should demand independent verification of these current
plans, especially concerning the basement depth..past applications have also misrepresented angles of a
window and other features.

5. plans omit border of 24a and 26 where there is greenery adding to character greenery i conservation
area and respecting our boundry. i see no definition about this.

6. building planned at no 26 is too big for the site. not in line with buildings on this side street. too many
ugly windows at front building facade not in keeping character conservation area

7. basement excavations can impact on large mature oak at back garden no 26 which has TPO. owners
at no 26 already cut another large oak recently (preparing for this development?) to detriment of
greenery for area. not prepared to loose another tree so vital for landscape conservation area.

8. development offers 3 parking spaces for 5 flats. potential impact to parking places on street for more cars of residents no 26. not acceptable. there is already not enough spaces on street. parents of numerous local schools take spaces during school drop offs inconveniencing neighbours. not acceptable

i wil send motre comments in due course
sincerely