

17 Rudall Crescent
London NW3 1RR

14th October 2016

For the attention of Kristina Smith
Planning Solutions Team
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

Dear Ms Smith

Planning Application 15 Rudall Crescent – 2016/5122/P

I am writing to object to some aspects of the above application for a property which is my immediate neighbour, 15 and 17 being joined semi-detached houses.

Overall I find these plans inadequately labelled to such an extent that only very experienced readers of plans can grasp what is being proposed.

The lack of appropriate labelling is crafty, partial and disguises what is really intended. There are also several inaccuracies. For example the ground floor existing plan shows a boiler and hot water system which is in fact currently installed on the top floor and attached (inappropriately) to the party wall between Numbers 15 and 17, and the cause of a current noise nuisance dispute. The plant room indicated in the cellar contains no existing plant of any kind.

It is also intolerable that the architect indicates on the plans that 'all levels and dimensions indicated cannot be regarded as accurate until 'construction is due to begin'. This is unacceptable. The plans MUST be accurately drawn so as not to allow alterations to the dimensions to be made after planning permission is granted. It is essential that the Planning Dept insists that what is applied for is accurately measured before permission can be contemplated.

Contrary to the claim made in the Planning Statement, aspects of the plans do certainly have a detrimental effect on the amenity of adjoining residential properties. As far as I am concerned the most objectionable is the proposed mezzanine floor balcony leading out from the room described as 'Study/Kitchenette'. This room currently has a conventional sash window but the proposal is for this to be converted into French doors thus allowing access to a section of roof which, though not labelled as such, is clearly intended to be a flat area ie a balcony/terrace. The label on the rest of the roof is indicated as 'sedum planted' but the label has been carefully placed so as to make it more difficult to spot that a balcony/terrace is intended. Such a balcony/terrace at that level would seriously and intolerably compromise my privacy. It would mean that

anyone standing on the balcony could easily look straight into my kitchen/conservatory, into the study/bedroom on my mezzanine floor and overlook my rear garden. The only way to effectively combat this part of the proposal is to insist that the sedum planting covers the entire area and to refuse permission for the conversion of this upper floor sash window into French doors. If the French doors were allowed there can be no guarantee that the roof area cannot be used as a terrace.

The proposal for the current so called plant room/cellar appears to suggest an excavated extension of the area under No 15. If that is what is intended, full technical details must be provided concerning the method of excavation and support for this area along with a Basement Impact Assessment. Only then can the impact of such an extension be assessed by technical experts. As it is my cellar which is adjacent has already been flooded in the past by water from the cellar at No 15. This proposal, without the requisite technical data, is downright dangerous as well as being unnecessary.

Finally the applicant needs to be reminded that if and when plans are eventually agreed by Camden, a Party Wall Agreement must be drawn up before any work can be started, and a surveyor of my choice appointed and paid for by the owner of No 15.

I urge you to arrange to make a site visit so that you can clearly see the deleterious impact such a change would make to my amenities ie an intolerable and unacceptable invasion of my privacy.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Jenny Stevens.

Jenny Stevens