



Dear Ms Craig

Re Planning application 2016/4136/P

I write with my objections to this application for a basement extension at 9 Maresfield Gardens, NW3.

1 The proposed development is a basement which would extend well beyond the current footprint of the building.

Please note that there is no existing basement at 9 Maresfield Gardens, simply a small store at basement level. It has no internal access and is not in any way a habitable room.

Please also note that the proposal demands the removal of two trees on the boundary of 11 Maresfield Gardens to the north of the property.

The development would lead to loss of open space and trees, harm the setting and appearance of the building, and the character of the surrounding area, and is therefore contrary to Camden Development Policies DP27 on Basements and Lightwells.

Landslip may also result from the development. When 120 Finchley Road was developed, excavations there led to significant landslip to the rear of Mourne House, at 11 Maresfield Gardens.

I also have concerns about **noise and vibration** issues, which might contravene Camden DP 28.

The neighbouring properties are very nearby, so this is real issue. On the North side of 9 Maresfield, Mourne House is several metres away, but much nearer there is a much-used concreted access which could be subject to vibration. Hence the development would also be contrary to Camden DP 26 on **impact on neighbours**.

In this connection, I will mention that 2 Maresfield Gardens has been left derelict and an eyesore for several years now, and the prospect of further disruption in the way of extensive development at number 9 would be expected to have a serious impact on the local streetscape, and on neighbours, as well of course on the inhabitants of number 9 while the work is being carried out.

I am also aware of Local Plan policy A5 on basements, which when adopted will also demand avoiding the loss of garden space, among other requirements.

2 Design and quality of the proposed development

Core Strategy CS 14 demands that developments promote **high quality spaces and conserve heritage**.

The proposed design is poor and out of keeping with the nature of the Conservation Area, especially with its rear balconies. It is certainly contrary to the principle of high amenity design, as enshrined in DP 24 and 25.

There is to be a high proportion of window to brick wall, most unlike the existing building, which is listed in the Conservation Area statement. In addition to these aesthetic considerations, I also suspect that the high proportion of windows might adversely impact structural stability.

With regard to the internal arrangement, I note that three of the proposed flats would be only one-bedroomed, so the additional dwellings would not provide any family accommodation, and I would therefore question the quality.

3 Overlooking

The additional windows to north and south elevations, and the new balconies, are likely to cause increased overlooking of other properties, and therefore against Camden DP 26.

4 Access

I note there is to be no disabled access to the new accommodation. Camden Planning has already rejected other applications in this street, such as 2012/6617/P, where the applicant “has failed to demonstrate that the development would comply with Criterion 5(b) of the Lifetime Homes standards contrary to policy CS6 Providing quality homes and DP6 **Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Homes** of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Policies.”

5 Transport issues

The cycle store proposed is in line with Camden DP, but I would draw your attention to the fact that this will **not be accessible by bicycle**. The only access to the rear garden is by a narrow passageway *with stairs* (shown as retained in the proposed development) to the north of the property. I can tell you it would be extremely difficult and dangerous, if not impossible, to bring a bicycle down those stairs.

The development would also have **wider transport implications** which must be taken into account DP 16), and according to Local Plan Policy A5 any construction management plan would need to take into account other developments nearby (like 2 Maresfield Gardens and Thomas More Church) as well as the 'school run'. I can assure you this is already very difficult in the area. One reason is that Maresfield Gardens is not the "wide tree-lined avenue" that this planning application claims it is. It has trees (as per the Conservation Area statement, these are mostly inside private gardens), but it is not wide. When cars are parked inside the permitted areas, two cars cannot pass, and larger vehicles such as construction traffic, have extreme difficulty, as recent experience has shown.

6 Reliability of information given in the submission

Following on from my section 5 above, where I mention certain misleading aspects, I would ask you, purely for the sake of avoiding problems such as irreparable damage to the Conservation Area and the local amenity, to look very closely at anything that is presented in the submission as material fact.

In summary, I urge Camden Council to reject this ill-considered proposal.

Kind regards

Dr Linda Carol Cooper

11 Mourn House
11 Maresfield Gdns
London NW3 5SL

