

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2896/P	babara brown	34 ravenshaw st nw6 1nw	01/07/2016 12:35:56	OBJLETTE R	Objection to Plans for 1a Glastonbury St NW6 from Barbara Brown 34 Ravenshaw Street NW6 1NW

Before I go into the grounds for my objection I should like to point out that this application has been submitted twice before. In my view it is important that this current application is freshly assessed, that it is viewed entirely as its stands now. Each case should be judged on its merits

I object to the current proposal on the following grounds:

#### FACADE-ISM

My main objection is that the design is based on a false premise. And the repercussions of following this premise affects both future inhabitants and neighbours. Moreover, the design is of poor quality and will have an unreasonable impact upon neighbours.

The false premise is based on what we might term 'facade-ism'. That is, believing that the facade of 1a should match the facade of 1, and the other houses in Glastonbury Street.

There are many examples of left-over sites, rump sites, odd-shaped sites previously thought of as not worth developing but now under pressure because of accommodation requirements in London. There are many examples in Camden of elegant modern solutions to sites such as these. Indeed, Camden has been champion of modern and innovative design long before other boroughs.

#### PLANNING ISSUES

The design continues to be of poor quality.

And the issue of impingement upon neighbours is still key.

(Ref: 3d image in Design and Access statement. Page 20 Fig. 6. )

This is an unhelpful bird's eye view. It shows the development, but hides more than it shows. As far as I am concerned, the view from my rear window is still being heavily obliterated.

(Ref: App. 3. Daylight and sunlight report. Malcolm Hollis. Page 22 of PDF drawing 549 – CTXT.)

This is a view from the south and shows a lot more from our perspective. It shows an overbearing sense of enclosure. And – it still doesn't tell the whole story. It only hints at the perspective from my window.

To summarise: The proposed rear elevation shows only a sliver of what's proposed. (drawing no: glast e 202). The Malcolm Hollis drawing hints at the end result a little more, but has still been understated.

We will suffer from an unreasonable sense of enclosure

The most sensitive element – that is, impact on neighbours – is not being revealed in the architect's drawings.

The architect's drawings show the utterly pointless pitched roof which encompasses empty space in order to create a pastiche of the terrace. We take the hit for this unnecessary equation; this false premise.

#### REAR WINDOWS

There is a possibility that these could be changed to clear glass at a later date. the close proximity will mean we are being overlooked.

WALL BETWEEN 1A and No 36

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

The wall that exists preserves the status, history and privacy of the line between one property and another. If a re-build is needed it should replicate the historical structure. A fence would offer a flimsy pretence at definition or privacy.

YES PLEASE BUILD A HOUSE BUT WHY NOT SOMETHING EVERYONE WILL APPRECIATE AND ENJOY

This could work:

Basement as bedroom and bathroom with bigger sunken garden.

Occupy as much of the ground as possible. Take the building up to the pavement, as the boundary exists now.

Valuable extra ground floor space for kitchen, dining room, living room

Raise the ceiling of this ground floor to create spacious environment.

More space, better space. Low impact on neighbours.

Loss of a bedroom but still a viable economic investment

Barbara Brown

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2896/P	Benjamin Judah	13 Ellerton 30 Mill Lane London NW6 1LX	03/07/2016 11:54:02	OBJ	Date: 03/07/2016 For attention: Mr. Raymond Yeung From: Mr Benjamin Judah Re: Proposed change of use and redevelopment of 1A Glastonbury Street London NW6 1QJ application reference No: 2016/2896/P

As the owner, since 2003, of 38 Ravenshaw Street London NW6 1NW which abuts the site to the rear, I am well familiar with the specifics of the site and thus well qualified to assess the proposed development's impact a) on the surrounding area in general, and b) on neighbour amenity for Nos. 34-42 Ravenshaw Street specifically.

I write to OBJECT to this proposal.

While I appreciate applicant's efforts to downscale, unfortunately the primary objection in my letter of 26/01/2015 re his previous proposal (application reference No: 2014/7654/P) still stands, namely the detrimental effect to neighbour amenity. The key point here is the nature of the plot of 1A Glastonbury Street: it forms the apex of a triangle shape formed by the meeting of the terrace of Glastonbury Street with the terrace of Ravenshaw Street. Consequently the rear of the proposed development is at one garden's remove (i.e. a mere 5.5m), rather than the usual two gardens' remove from the rear of my property. With the current garage on the plot, I have a windowless 15-foot wall at the rear of my garden; should the development go ahead as proposed, this wall will triple in height, with all the detrimental consequences that will have in terms of privacy and overlooking; overshadowing and outlook; sunlight and daylight levels. As such, from my perspective the current proposal is no less contrary to Planning Policy DP26 than the previous one was, and I cannot possibly support it. If the current structure must be replaced by a two-storey structure, the most I could possibly support would be a flat-roofed structure with a second story that slopes away from my property. Also I would have to insist on a guarantee (now and into the future) of no windows overlooking my garden.

The new proposal also alarms me on the grounds of security: currently the rear of numbers 34-42 Ravenshaw Street are well protected from unwanted intrusion. This would no longer be the case if the proposal to replace the current 15' high brick wall to the rear of 36 Ravenshaw Street with a shoulder-height fence were to go ahead.

While I understand that with the proper precautions and guarantees in place (as they appear to be here), the proposed basement is not a planning issue, I would nevertheless like to remind you of a point I raised in my previous letter: namely that three of the five houses on Glastonbury Street have required underpinning works over the last ten years. This would suggest that any excavation works at 1A Glastonbury Street might pose a significant risk to the surrounding properties.

Please confirm receipt of this correspondence. I would be grateful if you could keep me advised on the progress of this matter.

Benjamin P. Judah

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

---