

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5121/P	Professor Mary Wood	262H Finchley Road London NW3 7AA	03/10/2016 12:01:35	OBJEMPER	<p>I write to ask that this opportunistic application be refused. The building is going up fast &amp; will probably at the new height by the time you consider this.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The original application claimed that the parapet prevented overlooking. The larger, higher roof terraces applied for will result in increased loss of privacy for 274, also for 262 G &amp; H, &amp; for 38 Heath Drive. The 38 Heath Dr villa, featuring in the 2014 application, was demolished in 2015 &amp; the development of 23, high spec flats will be completed in 2017.</li> <li>2. Top floor occupants with access to roof terraces result in noise pollution to the above neighbours. Occupants will also be able to peer into the minute exterior terrace of ground floor neighbours who have no other amenity space.</li> <li>3. I'm concerned about loss of light to my flat (262H). The new building is built boundary to boundary, &amp; c 4" from a wall, ie c 10" from 262. 262 will be majorly overshadowed, as will 274. 262's afternoon light comes in from the direction of this development.</li> <li>4. The claim that this variation of permission is to "coordinate with design developments" is a nebulous and spurious one. A joke, in fact. The building is ugly, with a huge footprint. It's visual impact is unsympathetic, and will not be improved in the slightest degree by plastic see-through balustrades, out of keeping with buildings surrounding it.</li> <li>5. I suspect the variation is applied for to justify the title of "penthouse" to the top flats. Like all the other flats in the 2014 plans, the main (small) living room includes small spaces for chairs, dining area and kitchen. This is not luxury accommodation! There's no reason to extend the building's height.</li> <li>6. As the other comment on this application suggests, enough is enough. Already there are huge spaces for fixed, non-opening windows. They look straight into the windows of the 38 Heath Drive development, as well as the living areas of 274. These sealed windows claim to have "mechanical heat recovery". Not only does this result in higher energy use, but the presence of kitchens in the living room behind these windows is surely a fire hazard.</li> <li>7. There is no evidence given for exactly how "thermal performances" might be achieved. The application is overall very vague, ill thought through and opportunistic.</li> </ol> <p>In short, this is a late application, probably calculated for the work to have already been completed by the time Camden considers it. I received it 4 days ago. Please refuse it.</p>

---

**Total: 8**