

6 Gayton Crescent
London NW3 1TT

Mobile [REDACTED]

19th January 2016

Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
LB Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
WC1H 8ND

Dear Sir or Madam

37 & 39 Rudall Crescent, NW3 1RR

Planning Ref: 2015/6896/P – OBJECTION to Planning Application

I am writing to object to a number of aspects to the above Application.

I am the owner of 6 Gayton Crescent and the rear of my house faces the rears of 37 & 39 Rudall Crescent.

Rudall Crescent is in a Conservation area. 37 & 39 Rudall Crescent are part of a terrace of 5 houses which was constructed around 1960. These houses complement each other.

This Application makes no realistic assessment of the rear elevation aspects of the 5 house terrace. I can see this aspect from every floor of my house as can all others in 4-10 Gayton Crescent (7 houses as the houses are numbered sequentially).

I note that the so-called Design Statement re above Application has the following statement:-

"The property does form part of a group or terrace, but it is not a symmetrical composition and 37 and 39 Rudall Crescent are lower than the adjoining terrace."

The terrace is at least to the rear elevation of a symmetrical composition. The "reason" given is appears to be that the houses are "lower". This does NOT affect its symmetry and the "reason" stated is at best self-serving if not untrue. Many terraces in London rise (and fall); they need to be when built on hills. This proposition should not be taken into account.

The so-called Design Statement also states:-

It is therefore proposed that the windows will be an improvement to the visual appearance of the properties and therefore a benefit to the Conservation Area.

This is clearly also self-serving and in this case absurd. It cannot possibly be true that the destruction of a symmetrical design to a 5 house terrace of which 2 would not then match can be an "improvement" and a "benefit to the Conservation Area". This argument should be rejected and ignored.

This application so far as the rear aspects are concerned this Application bears a striking resemblance to a previous Application No 2015/1168/P to which I objected. This repeat Application should be rejected for the following reasons:-

1) At the top level (roof level) rears of 37 & 39 Rudall Crescent, it is proposed to add 2 new rooflights/ velux windows in each house. The number of roof lights would increase from 3 to 5. All the other houses in this terrace have three rooflights. The appearance will thus lose the integrity of the 5 house terrace to the rear elevation. I object to this aspect of the Application. I do not believe that this proposed change to the rear elevations should be permitted in a Conservation area.

2) I also object to the significant increase in window sizes at both houses at the first floor rear level. The proposed changes to the lower rear elevation are described as:-

"The enlarged window to the bedroom will not effectively increase overlooking as the buildings to the rear"

My objections to this are:-

1. The rest of the terrace does not have such significantly larger rear first floor windows and would be severely detrimental to the appearance of the 5 house terrace; and
2. Notwithstanding the extract from the Design Statement that the increase in size *"will not effectively increase overlooking"* it most certainly would greatly increase overlooking to the rear of my house (and neighbours' houses) as well as my (and their) gardens. The architect's contention is clearly false.

3) I also object to the proposed use of aluminium framed windows to the rear elevations. Windows should be made from wood as it is in keeping with rest of the terrace and indeed the rest of Rudall Crescent and Gayton Crescent.

You should note that my neighbours at 7 Gayton Crescent, James and Dolly Knapp, are abroad and have been for some months. I am convinced that they too would object to this Application in similar terms. I may add that the rear of their house faces both 37 & 39 Rudall Crescent directly. They will be affected significantly also. They would object.

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

R.J./Dowsett

**6 Gayton Crescent
London NW3 1TT**

Mobile

19th January 2016

**Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
LB Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
WC1H 8ND**

Dear Sir or Madam

37 & 39 Rudall Crescent, NW3 1RR

Planning Ref: 2015/6903/P – OBJECTION to Planning Application

I am writing to object to a number of aspects to the above Application.

This Application relates to the above properties and also Planning Ref: 2015/6896/P. So far as 6896 is concerned, I have written a letter of objection of today's date; the text is as follows as its substance applies equally to this Application. I have coloured this in BLUE. I make further comments on this Application at the end in BLACK.

I am the owner of 6 Gayton Crescent and the rear of my house faces the rears of 37 & 39 Rudall Crescent.

Rudall Crescent is in a Conservation area. 37 & 39 Rudall Crescent are part of a terrace of 5 houses which was constructed around 1960. These houses complement each other.

This Application makes no realistic assessment of the rear elevation aspects of the 5 house terrace. I can see this aspect from every floor of my house as can all others in 4-10 Gayton Crescent (7 houses as the houses are numbered sequentially).

I note that the so-called Design Statement re above Application has the following statement:-

"The property does form part of a group or terrace, but it is not a symmetrical composition and 37 and 39 Rudall Crescent are lower than the adjoining terrace."

The terrace is at least to the rear elevation of a symmetrical composition. The "reason" given appears to be that the houses are "lower". This does NOT affect its symmetry and the "reason" stated is at best self-serving if not untrue. Many terraces in London rise (and fall); they need to be when built on hills. This proposition should not be taken into account.

The so-called Design Statement also states:-

It is therefore proposed that the windows will be an improvement to the visual appearance of the properties and therefore a benefit to the Conservation Area.

This is clearly also self-serving and in this case absurd. It cannot possibly be true that the destruction of a symmetrical design to a 5 house terrace of which 2 would not then match can be an "improvement" and a "benefit to the Conservation Area". This argument should be rejected and ignored.

This application so far as the rear aspects are concerned this Application bears a striking resemblance to a previous Application No 2015/1168/P to which I objected. This repeat Application should be rejected for the following reasons:-

1) At the top level (roof level) rears of 37 & 39 Rudall Crescent, it is proposed to add 2 new rooflights/ velux windows in each house. The number of roof lights would increase from 3 to 5. All the other houses in this terrace have three rooflights. The appearance will thus lose the integrity of the 5 house terrace to the rear elevation. I object to this aspect of the Application. I do not believe that this proposed change to the rear elevations should be permitted in a Conservation area.

2) I also object to the significant increase in window sizes at both houses at the first floor rear level. The proposed changes to the lower rear elevation are described as:-

"The enlarged window to the bedroom will not effectively increase overlooking as the buildings to the rear"

My objections to this are:-

1. The rest of the terrace does not have such significantly larger rear first floor windows and would be severely detrimental to the appearance of the 5 house terrace; and
2. Notwithstanding the extract from the Design Statement that the increase in size *"will not effectively increase overlooking"* it most certainly would greatly increase overlooking to the rear of my house (and neighbours' houses) as well as my (and their) gardens. The architect's contention is clearly false.

3) I also object to the proposed use of aluminium framed windows to the rear elevations. Windows should be made from wood as it is in keeping with rest of the terrace and indeed the rest of Rudall Crescent and Gayton Crescent

You should note that my neighbours at 7 Gayton Crescent, James and Dolly Knapp, are abroad and have been for some months. I am convinced that they too would object to this Application in similar terms. I may add that the rear of their house faces both 37 & 39 Rudall Crescent directly. They will be affected significantly also. They would object.

Application 6903 will make matters worse in these 2 respects:-

1. The window and size and proportions are proposed to be a) even larger than Application 6896 and also b) of a completely different style as to the dormer aspects from the rest of the terrace (they are not even the same in both houses). This will make the symmetry far far worse. I object on these grounds.
2. The overlooking on my and neighbours houses and gardens will be much worse a) because of their greater size and b) as a dormer window allows far more sight out than a velux. I object on these grounds.

Yours faithfully



R.J. Dowsett