

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2015/3036/P	cynthia rand kukielski	2 langland gardens	13/11/2015 15:33:39	OBJ	Please see my email letter sent to Planning Officer, Obote Hope at 15:30 on 13.11.15

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3036/P	Peter Kukielski	2 Langland Gardens London NW3 6PY	13/11/2015 14:59:28	OBJ	<p>The following points form the basis of my objection to the proposals for 4 Langland Gardens.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Missing information: the name of the applicant is missing from the application</li> <li>2. The owner proposes to build a massive 3-storey rear extension (a basement, a ground floor extension, and a first floor extension. The number of bedrooms would increase from six to eleven. The number of bathrooms would increase from six to eleven. The interior floor space would increase from 301 square metres to 542 square metres – an increase of 80 percent. And the first floor extension would be the first such extension in the neighbourhood. The massive scale of this expansion is unprecedented in the area and should not be permitted.</li> <li>3. The description of works to be done is misleading. The current building contains six one-bedroom apartments (two units on each of three floors). The description refers to excavating the basement so the existing 2x2 bedrooms at ground floor can expand to 2x3 bedroom units. There are no existing 2x2 bedrooms at ground floor level. Furthermore, the plans approved under application 0315 did not approve any basement, and there is no basement habitation existing.</li> <li>5. The supporting documents submitted with application 0315 contained erroneous and misleading drawings, especially with regard to a non-existent full length basement.</li> <li>5. When in 2007 the developer of our home built our single-storey extension at 2 Langland Gardens, he had been told by the Council that a first floor extension would not be approved. Consequently the developer scaled the application back to a ground floor extension, and he left a setback so as to not have our extension looming over our neighbours' property. Now we are potentially faced with an extension without a setback looming over our patio and living room as well as a second storey overlooking our living rooms. The proposed full-width ground floor extension will result in enclosing the outdoor patio area of 2 Langland Gardens. The extension of the party wall into the garden will result in the loss of amenity of openness, leaving a view of a brick wall towering over the original boundary fencing. It will also negatively impact the value of our home.</li> <li>6. The rear extensions – a full-width ground floor plus a half-width first floor with terrace - are entirely without precedent in the immediate neighbourhood and are out of character with the neighbouring properties.</li> <li>7. The Planning Practice Guide provides that good design should add to the overall quality of the area. The full-width extension at ground floor looming over the neighbouring patio and living room, while allowing residents to peer into the neighbours' private bedroom, plus the first-floor rear extension with a terrace towering over the neighbours does not add to the overall quality of the area – it detracts from the quality of the area. Hence it is not good design and therefore should be refused.</li> <li>8. The potential for noise and disturbance to which the accessible flat roof of the ground floor extension will give rise is intolerable. Also people walking out onto the flat roof will be able to look into our master bedroom windows. This is not only wrong; it presents a substantial security risk of</li> </ol>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

burglary.

9. Number 4 Langland Gardens is in a conservation area and should warrant a biodiversity report, since a significant amount of existing mature shrubbery and some trees will be lost with the proposed plan.

10. In the Design and Access statement, the arboricultural report incorrectly refers to an already permitted basement development. This is incorrect.

11. The Soiltechnics report has not adequately addressed the potential for subsidence at neighbouring buildings caused by the massive contemplated additions. There has been subsidence at 6 Langland Gardens, which suggests that much deeper diligence should be conducted. Furthermore, the Soiltechnics Summary refers to a 'single storey extension at ground level', this is not what is proposed in the planning application, which envisages a two-storey extension at ground level plus a basement. This begs a question regarding the adequacy of Soiltechnics' engineering calculations. The Council should take care to ensure that it does not permit an extension that gives rise to substantial potential loss by neighbours.

12. There has been no structural assessment of neighbouring properties. Given that there is subsidence at no 6, it would appear that structural assessment of neighbouring properties is essential.

13. The National Planning Portal guideline defines 'original' footprint as what existed when a building was first built or as existed in 1947. Conservation area guidelines require that basement development should be within the original footprint; therefore the basement development, if permitted, should be restricted to the original footprint, which does not include the above ground rear extension in 0315.

14. The proposed basement is not only larger than the original footprint, it is larger than the proposed ground floor footprint. This is unacceptable and, at most it should follow the proposed ground floor.

15. The two applications would increase the number of bathrooms from six to eleven, thereby placing a substantial increased burden on water supply and disposal.

16. The change from 6 to 11 bedrooms is very dense and should be very carefully assessed with a view to optimising density and respecting the character of neighbouring properties, none of which have full-width rear extensions, and all of which a half width rear extension at ground at the outer half, leaving the interior boundary walls and fences original.

17. The history of this development to date is not encouraging. The interior demolition work was conducted without any environmental or personal protection controls. We were painting the exterior of our home when the demolition crew started their work. The crew worked without respiratory protection, and allowed dust to billow over our fresh paint. Rubble was piled in the front yard without the use of skips. In general, it was a highly unprofessional, hazardous, unplanned effort. To make things worse, contractors at the property do not seek parking permits while working and continually block our driveways.

**Application No:**   **Consultees Name:**   **Consultees Addr:**   **Received:**   **Comment:**   **Response:**

To be clear, I fully support the refurbishment of 4 Langland Gardens and its expansion/extension in a manner that is sympathetic to the neighbourhood and the environment. The proposed changes go far beyond this and are so massive in scale that they will negatively impact on the neighbours' utility and on the values of their respective properties. The intent appears to enrich the developers, who will not live in what they build, at the expense of the neighbours.

---