

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2958/P	Mrs Y Pole	37 Ground Floor Goldhurst Terrace	07/07/2016 21:56:46	OBJ	<p>The developer has already built at all 4 levels to plans not approved by Camden Council, in direct transgression of planning rules, even though he went through the motions of appearing to get planning permission by Camden Council some months ago. The current plans are now for retrospective planning permission for what has already been rejected by Camden Council a few months ago. And to make matters even worse, the plans for the back elevation that are now been re-submitted for supposed 'retrospective plans' do not actually represent what has actually now been constructed. What has actually been built is much bigger outside dormers and terraces than those that are on the new supposed 'retrospective' plans. The developer appears to be wanting to mislead Camden Council once again with what he has already built, which has already been built with complete disregard to what was originally approved.</p> <p>The specific areas that I have concern about are the top level dormer, and all the terraces at all 3 levels (upper ground, first floor and loft level in the roof) on the back elevation as they all will severely affect the value, privacy and enjoyment I have in my garden, and all the other adjoining gardens which will be overlooked. What has been built will also be in complete contravention of the Camden Planning Conservation area rules for this South Hampstead area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loft conversion Top Floor: The top loft level terrace at the roof level is far bigger, and closer to the edge of the roof than previously approved and will overlook my private garden destroying my privacy in my garden which will be overlooked. There are also outside terrace doors now in place that open outwards, rather than inwards as was approved, and the outside loft dormer terrace is far bigger than was approved. I object on the grounds of privacy, overlooking and noise. 2. First Floor: The roof of the ground floor bay was not approved to be extended to be made into a terrace for the first floor flat occupiers to step onto. The ground floor bay roof has now been made into a terrace at first floor level, with full doors leading to the outside. This will destroy my privacy in my garden which will be overlooked. I object on the grounds of privacy, overlooking and noise. 3. Upper Ground Floor: The upper ground floor now has doors leading on the roof of the basement level extension, meaning the developer intends to use the extension roof as a roof terrace for the ground floor flat. This will destroy my privacy in my garden which will be overlooked. I object on the ground of privacy, overlooking and noise. 4. Garden flat at back of garden: There is also a separate planning application for a 'garden house' at the back of the garden with plumbing which is clearly going to be used as an outside garden flat with access from the side gate. There is plumbing to this, and it is too big so this will clearly be illegally be used as a private residential dwelling. This is in direct contravention of the conservation area rules of our area. This will destroy my privacy in my garden with extra noise of extra residents. The green environment will also be damaged, and the remaining trees will be killed. (The developer has already removed some of the trees). I object on the grounds of privacy, noise, environmental damage, and protection of our Conservation area. <p>The developer has clearly built the entire back building elevation area in direct contravention of what was approved by Camden Council, and is now aiming to retrospectively get this approved. However what is in the new 'retrospective plans' is also clearly an attempt to further mislead Camden Council as the new retrospective plans that have now been resubmitted are also not reflective of the actual larger terraces etc that are already constructed illegally. The developer clearly also has no intention of doing</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>anything about this to remedy matters to the legally approved drawings, as the scaffolding has recently been removed.</p> <p>I would like all terraces at all levels which allow people to step onto the outside back area be removed completely, all back outside terrace doors at upper ground, first and roof level be removed and replaced with windows (as the council originally approved), the bay roof on the upper ground level bay needs to be re-instated, and the roof dormer extension at the top level needs to be made smaller and without the ability to step outside onto an outside terrace.</p> <p>I would like Camden council to consider legal action at this stage as this developer has ignored all Camden Council rulings to date and appears to fully intend to continue to ignore Camden Council rulings. This developer need to be stopped, as he is breaking the Camden Planning laws, and also damaging the environment of the back Conservation garden area for all of the neighbouring gardens in the area, as well as negatively affecting the value and enjoyment of all nearby properties adjoining this development.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2958/P	Geoff Cheek	37 Goldhurst Terrace	07/07/2016 06:39:24	INT	<p>Developer has already transgressed previous planning granted by building to rejected / unapproved drawings. Camden Planning Enforcement is still dealing with this. Main issues include larger roof & terrace extensions; doors installed to back elevation in place of windows; and construction and access to terraces not allowed - causing overlooking, privacy, noise and disruption issues.</p> <p>New submitted drawings are much larger and positioned further forward than the approve planning drawings. However in addition, what has actually been construction even exceeds these new recently submitted "retrospective" drawings and planning application, as even larger and further forward - for example the handrail on the roof terrace has been built right on building edge (the back elevation building line) and not set back, as shown on the current new retrospective drawings and the outside terrace is larger. Also folding doors open outwards and not inwards as per the drawings. The developer appears to be showing disrespect to planning regulations and repeatedly is building beyond what he has submitted, never mind what is approved – will result in an even bigger issue of overlooking, privacy, noise and disruption issues</p> <p>Current new drawings do not meet minimum planning guide lines and requirements, particularly in respect to the size and minimum set back position of the roof dormer extension and terrace; and maintaining the character of the existing properties in this conservation area.</p> <p>Rear elevation double doors from the ground floor flat will give access onto the lower ground floor extension roof (even if claimed / planned as not intended) and will thus create overlooking, privacy, noise and disruption issues. Also doors do not match the other buildings to preserve the character of the conservation area - should be changed to windows with no possible outside access</p> <p>New back elevation outside terrace constructed at the first floor flat will allow outside access, even if not planned / intended, and does not match the character of adjacent buildings - bay construction below should have a sloping roof, as originally approved, to fit into the conservation area character and prevent any possible outside access (for noise and overlooking issues).</p> <p>Current plans and what is constructed will create increased and extensive overlooking, privacy, noise and disruption issues:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - this does not meet the minimum planning rules and requirements - particularly with size, position and extension building line set back positions (e.g. roof terrace) - all doors from ground floor to roof on the back elevation, should as a minimum be replaced with windows and all terrace type construction should be omitted and replaced with full sloping roofs, to match the original