

From: Chris and Judith Blencowe [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 July 2016 11:09
To: Planning
Subject: Hugh Miller re Planning application: 2016/3006/P: 40 Camden Square

Dear Hugh Miller

We write to object to this application on two grounds:

1. As owner-occupiers of **21 Murray Mews**, which backs onto 40 Camden Square: Our house, and our neighbour, 21A Murray Mews, were built in the 1880s as the coach house to 40 CS. Consequently our sewer connection was laid under 40 CS garden and connects to the main Thames Water sewer in Camden Square. There is an existing shared manhole in the south-west corner of 40 CS rear garden, to which Thames Water require quick access in the event of a blockage. Until now this has been via the side passage through a garden gate.

From the **proposed lower ground floor plan** it is evident that this access will be permanently blocked by the 'Log and Refuse Store' with 'timber and steel reinforced gates'. Furthermore, the foundations to the proposed new extension will be virtually on top of the shared sewer connection; the existing manhole is not shown on the plan. I spoke to Jenny Richards of Thames Water Developer Services this morning and she told me that TW had not been informed of these proposed works and will be contacting L B Camden about them. It goes without saying that any interruption to drainage of two family homes is unacceptable.

2. The proposed lower ground floor plan and South West Elevation indicate solid brick walls surmounted by what appears to be timber screening surrounding both sides and rear of the property. No materials or heights are specified. In the main part of the back garden the wall/screen scales 2.5 metres high, which is excessive.

In 1992, in consultation with the then owner of 40 CS, the sculptor William Turnbull, we had a new garden wall built from recycled London stock bricks approx 2.0 metres high to 40 CS side (please see attached photo - incidentally this wall is now totally overgrown with ivy on the 40 CS side). This is an important consideration to us as our courtyard garden is only 2.7 metres deep and any increase to the height of the wall would cause unacceptable over-shadowing.

We suggest this should be the **maximum height** of the new boundary wall/screen - ie 'no higher than 2.0 metres', and would expect that dimension to be indicated on the proposed elevations. A brick wall of that height inevitably involves disruptive foundation excavations, and negotiations with adjoining owners.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require any further information.

Regards

Chris and Judith Blencowe
AADipl(Hons) SADG RIBA / BA(Hons)
21 Murray Mews
London
NW1 9RH



1997 photo of 40 CS rear garden wall to - 21 Murray Mews studio extension beyond:

