

From: **Dr Jill Singer** [REDACTED]
Subject: 2016/1012/P FAO: Carlos Martin (Planning Officer) - Objection letter
Date: 7 April 2016 at 17:09
To: Planning DCMail@camden.gov.uk



Dear Mr. Martin,

PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE : 2016/1012/P dated 18.03.2016

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY : 116 Heath Street, Hampstead, London NW3 1DR

FROM : Dr. J. Singer
4 Hampstead Square, Hampstead, London NW3 1AB

This letter should be read in full.

I am writing in response to a general email from Camden that an application at the above address has been submitted to your authority.

If I hadn't been browsing on my return from my Easter holidays this application, which has a direct effect on my happiness, wellbeing and the nature of this unique area would have gone unnoticed because there have been none of the usual posters or letters to neighbours which traditionally go out to anyone who might be adversely affected by a planning application.

The proposals should be refused in whole as it will compound the undesirable outcomes of the numerous alterations and additions that are already made at 116 Heath Street. These have resulted in incrementally eroding the quality of this building and the quality of the environment and conditions in my house and its garden.

Extensive alterations and additions have already been carried-out over a series of years. Some of these were with permission, and some not.

Unfortunately, 116 Heath Street has not evolved into a desirable example within our Conservation Area; any further development there will worsen this situation.

You will see the planning situation of this building is very chequered and conflicting matters have arisen.

Here, I refer to some of the past planning history, namely:

2010/6091/P - Retention of wooden structure - Refusal and Enforcement Notice

Note that the application related to the 3rd floor level as above the ground level at Stamford Place, and not as stated in that application. The application concerns a level three floors above the ground level of my house and its garden.

2010/5924/P - Retrospective Amendment to 2004/5366/P - Granted

Date Ref. 16.11.2010

Note that this retrospective amendment was approved after a period of six years has elapsed; the former should have been considered elapsed.

2004/5366/P - Replacement of a conservatory – Granted

Note that this did not relate to the 1st Floor as stated, but to the 4th Floor above ground level at the rear.

906016 - Demolishing to boundary walls at basement level – Refused
Date Ref. 12.10.1994

This basement level is the same level as Stamford Place and is the ground level at the rear.

It clearly demonstrates that 116 Heath Street had a rear open yard. The subsequent approvals granted have resulted in the total loss of open space.

With the substantial rear extensions the site is over built as it is. A fair distance that existed between the neighbouring properties has been totally lost.

This does not include the illegal work carried out in about 2011 and the ugly trellis that was put up on a flat roof with an air extractor to the then restaurant that blew cooking smells straight into my garden.

Regarding the present application **2016/1012/P**

1. I consider this to be over-development that will further adversely affect me.
2. Its location and bulk is inappropriate.
3. Its location and bulk will further diminish the character of the Conservation Area.
4. The alterations made are not in keeping with this Conservation area.
5. **The proposal creates additional and increased overlooking into my property and particularly my garden. I will have no privacy at all.**
6. **The part obscured windows are inappropriate; the proposed east-facing windows are situated on the boundary line and will look straight into my private garden and the parts of my house from a closer distance.**
7. **Any solid walls are also not acceptable due to the proposed location, and the effect of further blocking out sunlight and daylight from my already shady garden**
8. As the proposed necessitates construction on the property line to my property, it will undoubtedly create nuisance, disruption, noise & dirt to be inflicted; my free enjoyment of my property will be severely restricted.
9. It is proposed to build on to the boundary line of my property. I am concerned about the rain and surface water disposal provisions: they are not clarified and are not likely to be

rain and surface water disposal provisions, they are not drained and are not likely to be resolved without harm to my property.

I am attaching some photographs for your reference and convenience where you will see the adverse conditions that have already been created so far.

Please note that I totally object to any further alterations to 116 Heath Street.

Given the extensive and detrimental potential, I sincerely request from you that this application should be refused.

Yours sincerely

Dr. J. Singer

4 Hampstead Square, Hampstead, London NW3 1AB

Please see attached photographs





