

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5859/P	Emily Lui	Flat C 41 Buckland Cresc London NW3 5DJ	17/11/2016 19:09:19	OBJ	<p>I am the owner of the first floor flat at 41 Buckland Crescent and I object to the application relating to the garden structure for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since the space will be heated it will have power and lighting and is intended to be used as a “study”, it is a habitable room which would be usable at any time as opposed to a simple summerhouse (which was the use of the smaller garden house erected by the previous owners as the council did not allow it to have electricity under the 1999 planning application PW9903048). 2. As a habitable room, the structure it will significantly affect my privacy as it would look into the rear of my flat which has large almost floor to ceiling windows which are all bedrooms, currently there are no blinds or net curtains as the outlook to the garden is green and private so these are unnecessary. The structure would mean my curtains would need to be closed throughout the day to avoid overlooking 3. I believe the room does not comply with Camden design standards and even though the drawing notes the proposed structure at a distance of 17m, this is not measured to the ground floor bay window, if it measured as such, then the distance is 16m, a distance which being below normal planning standards for window to window distances between habitable rooms which I am told is 18m, and this would unreasonably affect my privacy. 4. This proposal will significantly alter the quality of my outlooks which will now be dominated by a large metal roof where we currently see green tree tops and grass. 5. Whilst the principle of a small garden shed or summer house is reasonable, there is scope for this large structure to be used in a manner that would cause noise and distraction and an intention for it to be used consistently through the year rather sporadically in the summer months. Furthermore, there is a real possibility of the building becoming a separate dwelling at some point in the future the use would be detrimental to the enjoyment and use of our flats and there is a high chance of the use of the room causing disturbance and nuisance in the future 6. the proposed garden structure would benefit the use and value of the basement flat while lessening the value and use of my and the ground and second floor flats due to the privacy intrusion and change in green garden outlook.
2016/5859/P	Joe Friedman	41 Buckland Crescent NW3 5DJ	17/11/2016 14:43:25	OBJ	<p>I object to this proposal as it does not comply with Camden design standards. The building is at a distance of 16m from the ground floor bay window where the standard is minimum 18m. The garden outlook of my flat is largely green and not built upon. This proposal will significantly alter the quality of my outlook which will now be dominated by a metal roof. Whilst the principle of a garden shed or summer house is reasonable, there is scope for this building to become a separate dwelling. I object to this as it would benefit the basement flat while lessening the value of the ground and first floor flats. For this reason, I would also object to services being provided to this flat. The earlier (1999) planning application for a summerhouse (PW9903048) specifically stated there would be no services.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5859/P	41 buckland crescent Management Limited	41 buckland crescent London nw3 5dj	17/11/2016 19:16:49	OBJ	<p>I write as a director of of 41 buckland crescent management limited the freeholder of the building. the majority shareholders of the company have rejected the application by the owner of Flat A for a Licence for Alterations for the garden structure for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since the space will be heated it will have power and lighting and is intended to be used as a “study”, it is a habitable room which would be usable at any time as opposed to a simple summerhouse (which was the use of the smaller garden house erected by the previous owners as the council did not allow it to have electricity). As a habitable room, the structure it will significantly affect our sense of privacy and, in addition, it does not comply with Camden design standards. We are advised that the proposed mitigation by the use of a hedge in practice would actually only benefit the basement floor. The structure would look directly into the ground floor living room window at a distance of 16m from the bay window where the standard is a minimum of 18m and would look up to the first floor windows – which are directly into bedrooms. We are advised that as the windows are directly facing even with a slight change in level of a storey, this does not materially improve the overlooking position. 2. Even though the drawing notes the proposed structure at a distance of 17m, this is not measured to the ground floor bay window, if it measured as such, then the distance is 16m, a distance which being below normal planning standards for window to window distances between habitable rooms, and this would unreasonably affect our privacy. 3. The outlook of the other flats is largely green and not built upon. This proposal will significantly alter the quality of our outlooks which will now be dominated by a metal roof where we currently see green. 4. Whilst the principle of a garden shed or summer house is reasonable, there is scope for this building to be used in a manner that would cause noise and distraction and an intention for it to be used consistently through the year rather sporadically in the summer months. Furthermore, there is a real possibility of the building becoming a separate dwelling at some point in the future and the use would be detrimental to the enjoyment and use of our flats and there is a high chance of the use of the structure causing disturbance and nuisance in the future
