



Good morning,

Further to my email from Tuesday which is attached for your information I have further observations to make.

**Boundary Lines - Garden**

The application does not show any boundary lines between no 52 and no 54 (and also the neighbours on the other-side). The existing extension of no 54 is completely built within the curtilage of no 54 and does not straddle the boundary line. The garden wall straddles the boundary line.

Please see photos 5571 and 5565 which show the view from 1<sup>st</sup> floor terrace down to no 52 – (i) on the left, the garden wall straddling the boundary line, (ii) in the middle, the low level wall on no 52's property, and (iii) on the right, the existing extension of no 52 with flashings into no 54's wall.

Photo 5553 is of the rear elevation of no 54 showing that its extension has been fully built within the property boundaries of no 54.

The application should not proceed until accurate drawings showing the relationship with the boundaries are provided.

**Boundary Line – Basement**

The applicant's proposed lower ground floor plans (see for example, plan number DEL\_PR\_G200\_P\_LG, but also the others) doesn't show the relationship with the neighbours.

Again, this is not good enough and the application should not proceed until accurate drawings are produced showing these crucial details.

**Extent of lower ground floor extension**

The applicant's proposed lower ground floor plan (plan number DEL\_PR\_G200\_P\_LG) also does not show how far the kitchen/former study will be extended into the garden. Not all demolition lines are shown nor are any new walls highlighted. This makes the proposal difficult to read and to assess.

As far as I can tell, by overlaying the lower ground floor and the ground floor plan, it looks as if the lower ground floor will be extended further than the existing extension of no 54. by approx. 1.5 meter.

Please see photo 5560, which shows the garden wall from no 54 – at the end of the render the lower ground floor lightwell of no 54 ends.

The application should not proceed until accurate drawings showing the relationship of the size of the extension with the neighbours has been provided.

**Structural Assessment**

The structural assessment submitted with the application does not show the existing walls (extension wall, garden wall straddling the boundary). The underpinning as shown **doesn't work** as the existing garden walls and lightwell walls need to be supported as well (which has been ignored/omitted from their plans).

The sections are inadequate. There is no section across the lower ground floor kitchen extension showing the relationship with the garden wall and the existing neighbouring lightwells.

No relationship is shown with ground level or with the depth of the existing structures (the site or the neighbours).

The applicant must provide more detail including in relation to underpinning before the application can be properly considered.

#### **Earlier Points**

Just a quick reminder for completeness of the earlier points in the attached email: light pollution, over-intensification of use, lack of dimensions generally.

I am happy to discuss this or show you on a site visit.

Yours sincerely

Annette Marchini

Dipl-Ing Annette Marchini ARB RIBA

**Annette Marchini**  
Architecture & Design

T 020 7720 4202  
M 07976 609 406  
[www.marchini-architecture.com](http://www.marchini-architecture.com)

RIBA chartered practice since 2004



Dear Ms Craig,

We are the owner of the ground floor maisonette in 54 Delancey St and the freeholder of the property and only learned yesterday about the planning application via a letter from a partywall consultant touting for business. One of the tenants of the property forwarded it to us.

I have just checked today with all three tenants in the property and none of them received a letter from the Council. When I was at the property on the 20<sup>th</sup> June there was also no site notice displayed on any of the lamp posts or any other railing in the vicinity of the property. We would therefore ask you to take our objection into consideration even though we object after the official cut-off date. Copied into the correspondence is the owner of the top floor flat in 54 Delancey St.

We are equally concerned as the Camden Town CAAC about the 100 % proposed glazed roof for the extension. It really will cause light pollution and a lack of privacy. Could we as well suggest a roof light or something smaller, considering that the elevation of the extension is itself totally glazed.

We are also concerned about the intensification of use of the property.

The third concern is that there are no measurements on the plans and the text on the drawings stipulates that one shouldn't measure from the drawings. This makes it impossible to check if the plans are drawn up correctly or what heights/extent the applicants is actually proposing to build to.

As the proposal shows no information either of any adjoining properties rear elevations it is impossible to see and judge what impact the extension will have on the neighbouring properties when seen from the gardens or from the Albert Street properties. I would ask that the proposal is withdrawn unless more drawn information is shown particularly as all the neighbouring buildings are listed.

The last issue I would ask you to take into consideration (although I don't know if planning has a provision for it) is that the rear garden of 52 Delancey Street has had an infestation of Japanese knotweed. We asked the previous owner's managing agents repeatedly to deal with it but without success. The proposed building works will obviously spread the problem.

Kind regards  
Annette and Renzo Marchini

Dipl-Ing Annette Marchini ARB RIBA

**Annette Marchini**  
Architecture & Design

T 020 7720 4202  
M 07976 609 406  
[www.marchini-architecture.com](http://www.marchini-architecture.com)

RIBA chartered practice since 2004

















