

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4136/P	Stephen Williams (for and on behalf of netherhall Neighbourhood Association)	Little House A 16A Maresfield Gardens London NW3 5SU	29/08/2016 10:30:59	OBJ	<p>No 9 has an individual listing within the Conservation Area. Recently No 2 and No 45 have been given planning permission for extensive changes to their massing and facades. The alteration to the massing and façade of No 9 should be rejected if the individual listing of buildings in the street has any relevance or meaning. The protection of these listed and locally listed buildings should be a prime objective of planning control to maintain the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The proposed works indicate extensive structural work, both to internal and external walls, altering and extending the existing ground floor and creating a new basement whilst the top two floors remain occupied. The house facing no 9, at 2 Maresfield Gardens was granted planning permission in September 2008 (2008/2288P) for similar major construction works whilst the top flat in separate ownership remained in occupation. In August 2016, 8 years after this approval, the building remains in an unfinished derelict condition and the owners of the top flat, who had originally to move out temporarily, were forced to sell the property and relocate due to its unsafe and uninhabitable condition. Granting permission will risk a second building enduring these serious consequences, which affected the personal lives of individuals and has left an eyesore in the Conservation area for 8 years. Camden was formally informed of this derelict building and could not or would not take action. The NNA urges the Council to consider at a policy level the serious implications of granting a similar application for major building works to be carried out beneath occupied homes.</p> <p>The submission suggests there is an existing basement floor. There is not. The plans clearly indicate at the front external stores and passageway at lower level. This proposal is for a new basement where there was none before. The proposals indicate extending a new basement outside of the original footprint of the building and therefore it should be rejected</p> <p>The proportion of window to brick proposed to the new basement is excessively high and is significantly above that of the existing building and will, as a result, unacceptably change the character of the building to the detriment of this locally listed building and the Conservation Area. We question the structural stability of the façade where there is very little masonry to support this traditionally constructed building above.</p> <p>There is a substantial increase in windows on both the north and south elevations, which will increase to 19 where there were 9 on the north façade and 20 where there were 7 on the south façade. This will cause major overlooking issues to both No 11 and No 7 Maresfield Gardens and will severely reduce their amenity.</p> <p>The elevations on the north and south which are proposed to be completely re-fenestrated are of a very poor quality and do not add to the quality of the building and the Conservation Area in which it sits.</p> <p>The rear elevation is of a poor quality and does not add to the quality of the building and the Conservation Area in which it sits.</p> <p>The existing rear garden is of a small size relative to the size of the existing house. The proposal to extend to the rear will severely reduce further the extent of the garden and the loss of open green land.</p>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

Any extension to the rear should be rejected to protect the green space.

New balconies are proposed on the rear elevations, which will cause overlooking problems to the adjacent properties at no 7 and 11 Maresfield Gardens. New balconies should be resisted.

The proposed use of cheap railings of a utilitarian appearance out of keeping with this Victorian/Edwardian house both at the front and rear detract from the quality of the building and should be resisted.

The proposals will require the lowering of the external ground level along the southern boundary to allow light into the proposed new basement windows. This will require a new boundary wall and its foundations, which will risk damage to the foundations and structure of No 7. The width of the light well will provide very poor inadequate natural light into the new basement habitable rooms.

The proposals will require the lowering of the external ground level along the northern boundary to allow light into the proposed new basement windows. It will be of a limited width due to the need to maintain a side passage access to the rear. The width of the light well will provide very poor inadequate natural light into the new basement habitable rooms.

The proposals require the removal of two trees on the boundary of No 11. There is no good reason to remove these trees, which will be to the detriment of the streetscape along Maresfield Gardens.

There is no information on the treatment of the external floors and walls. The relatively recently constructed front boundary walls are of a very poor standard of design and finish totally out of keeping with this Conservation Area. Any proposals should be accompanied by detailed description of external works and landscaping.

In short this is a thoroughly bad, ill thought out proposal which will, if approved be to the severe detriment of the Conservation Area and will cause serious personal hardship and reduction of amenity to both to the neighbours in No 7 and No 11 but most certainly the occupiers of the flats on the 1st and 2nd floor of No 9 and the Netherhall Neighbourhood Association strongly request the Council reject it.

for and on behalf of  
Netherhall Neighbourhood Association

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4136/P	Mr Spitz	Flat C 9 Maresfield Gardens	26/08/2016 17:28:43	OBJ	<p>I object to the application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There has been little if any consultation with existing unit owners, residents or neighbours and little information has been provided;</li> <li>- The application was issued during the summer holiday making it difficult for meaningful consideration and comment, or to obtain expert planning advice;</li> <li>- the contemplated development is significant adding four units to the existing seven units;</li> <li>- the construction period of 42 weeks is lengthy and the disruption to existing owners, residents and neighbours from the construction impact will be substantial (particularly for those in the two floors above the work);</li> <li>- noise from demolitions, excavations, traffic etc.;</li> <li>- noise, dust, fumes;</li> <li>- no proposals to mitigate disruption;</li> <li>- no indications of how individual unit owners and residents and neighbours will be affected or how their interests will be protected;</li> <li>- no indication of how it is envisaged that residents will be able to remain in the building during construction work or of how they will be compensated for the nuisance that will be created;</li> <li>- loss of garden amenity;</li> <li>- expansion of building and overdevelopment of footprint;</li> <li>- impact on neighbouring dwellings, schools and churches;</li> <li>- impact on trees and hedges;</li> <li>- harm to surrounding land including garden;</li> <li>- sky visibility criteria on rooms do not satisfy requirements for daylight and sunlight;</li> <li>- conservation area and building makes positive contribution to the area: planning proposals will not enhance this contribution;</li> <li>- impact on large rear garden;</li> <li>- impact on schools and churches;</li> <li>- privacy of neighbours will be affected;</li> <li>- parking, ingress and egress will be affected during construction;</li> <li>- accumulation of building materials, waste and refuse;</li> <li>- potential change to neighbourhood from additional units;</li> <li>- reduced parking availability.</li> </ul>

---