


Please acknowledge receipt. 

Dear Ms Roe,

Reference: 2016/4917/P, Single storey, wrap around extension to ground floor flat (the "Application")

Following our recent conversations and as discussed, I am writing to object to the Application.

1 Factual inaccuracies and misleading statements

At the outset, I want to point out the following:

1.1 the Application submitted by the applicant, Mulberry Developments (London) Ltd ("**Mulberry**") and dated 7 September 2016 certifies in paragraph 25 that the applicant served notice on all of the named individuals on 7 September 2016 pursuant to article 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. This is factually incorrect and consequently the certification in paragraph 25 of the Application should not have been made and the declaration in paragraph 26 is incorrect.

I received the said notice on 5 October 2016 sent by second class posted on 4 October 2016 by WEA Planning. There was an undated cover letter purporting to serve a town and country planning notice under article 13 dated 7 September 2016. Accordingly, the date the notice was actually sent was a date nearly 4 weeks after they made a declaration that they served me and other owners and the freeholder. When I asked WEA Planning why the notices had only just been sent they replied that they had sent the notices but a couple had been returned as Royal Mail could not find the address. I have lived at 1 Fordwych Road for 13 or so years and am not aware of our address not being capable of being found. When I asked them to clarify which notices had been returned, they said a couple. Have all the persons mentioned in the certification been sent the required notices? I cannot understand if notices were indeed returned, which seems unlikely, why it would take nearly 4 weeks to re-send and then to use second class post which thankfully, although somewhat unusually, arrived within 1 day. **Accordingly I should be given until 26 October to respond to this Application.**

1.2 the Application in paragraph 14 (Existing Use) states that the dwelling is not currently vacant. Again this is factually incorrect and I am at a loss to understand why Mulberry/WEA would include this in the Application. The flat is vacant and has been vacant for at least a year and certainly since Mulberry purchased it. This is apparent from various post at the property from utilities/Camden Electoral register addressed to the owner of flat 1 with no named individual registered yet

1.3 in paragraph 4.10 of the planning statement extracted below for your ease of reference it states:

“The proposed rear extension essentially forms a glazed box 3 metres deeper than the existing single storey lean to extension and frames the main timber body of the extension. The extended depth to the boundary with Number [3 Fordwych Road](#) is only 3 metres. The extended 3-metre flank wall to the side boundary is already screened by a timber fence and there would be no overlooking windows in the northern flank wall.”

The reference to the timber fence is misleading. There is a two panel timber fence which was crudely erected recently (i.e mid August) clearly in anticipation of the Application. It looks dreadful and indeed a further panel is strewn across the back garden which is unsightly to look at. I understand from my neighbour that when this was erected, they left tools and a ladder on the roof which she had to request was removed.

1.4 in paragraphs 1.7, 1.9 and 5.4 of the planning statement extracted below for your ease of reference it states:

“The application property consists of a three double bedroom flat occupying the entire ground floor... The current layout of the flat is cumbersome with no access to the garden from the living room area and two bedrooms side by side to the rear. Access to the garden requires having to pass through two bedrooms”

“The third bedroom to the rear is very small and does not provide a sufficient floor area for comfortable living”

“The well designed proposal will create a better living situation for the occupants especially in the context of the existing layout of bedrooms 2 and 3”

This being a three bed property is news to me. Originally, this was a one bedroom property with a dressing room (not two bedrooms side by side). Now it apparently is a 3 bed property (although noting that no one lives in it). Any cumbersome layout has been constructed by Mulberry. There are **two** exits to the garden from the current property and also access by the side gate. The third bedroom was a dressing room and not a bedroom. Paragraph 5.4 of the planning statement is incorrect which states the proposal will “create a better living situation for the occupants especially in the context of the existing layout” – there are no occupants.

Given the above I submit that the Application was not valid and is misleading in a number of respects and should be re - submitted with the correct information included and any timetable for giving a response by the Council should run from this date. It cannot be right that an application may be valid if the notices required to be served by the applicant (giving at least 21 days' notice) have not been validly served.

2 Objections to the Application

I have a number of objections to this Application;

2.1 In paragraph 4.23 of the Planning Statement, it is submitted that “the outlook to Number 3 will not be significantly compromised and the impact on daylight and sunlight will be limited”

I absolutely disagree with this statement. Currently I look out on the garden and do not have any obstruction to my view i.e there is no roof. I understand that what is being proposed (although this is not stated in words in the application) is an 11.5 m flat roof at a 3 metre height but this will extend further in length from my window as there is also proposal for a new entrance before the extension. **This will significantly affect my outlook and make me feel enclosed.**

I purchased this property based on it not having a flat roof and it having an uninterrupted view to the garden. If this does not significantly affect my outlook what would?. Also what calculations have been done generally re impact on daylight and sunlight for the applicant to be able to state that the impact on them is limited?

Paragraph 24.7 of the CDP is not complied with as the development does not consider the impact on views and vistas. Policy DP26 In terms of the development should be taken into account as this states:

“The Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors we will consider include:

visual privacy and overlooking;

overshadowing and outlook;

sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels

I am concerned by the level of light pollution from the proposed new structure and noise pollution. This will be a timber structure with rooflights and a glass conservatory and new entrance. There is mention of three roof-lights – in line with previous applications (see application for 21A Fordwych Road in October 2013) consent for no more than two rooflights should be granted.

I disagree that the lean to structure with plastic and timber is part of the building – it is merely a roof with narrow timber posts which does not extend the full width of the building line and has not been used as a dwelling. This should not be considered as the end of the building line but rather the brick structure which is the dressing room. Although I can see the end of the brick structure from my flat, I cannot see this lean to structure – it is not part of the building. In line with the application for 25A Fordwych Road, the extension should not extend beyond 2.2 metres from the brick building line.

The height of the roof of 3 metres should be reduced in line with previous applications (see Flat A. 21 Fordwych Road and 25 Fordwych Road) and have a maximum height significantly less than this.

11.5 metres depth is too much and this should be reduced in line with previous applications. This roof will significantly affect my outlook. What is the roof going to look like and how is water to be drained away? The depth of this should not exceed previous applications. I am not aware that any planning permission has been granted for this length of extension.

I would point out that any reference to planning permission for number 9 Fordwych Road is not comparative as this would appear to be a stand alone house and not divided into flats.

2.2 I have serious concerns about the materials being used. I refer to paragraphs 4.9 and 4.16 of the planning statement which refer to the fact that western red cedar wood will be used and “the owner will take part in a self-management programme to maintain the timber with specialist oils on a two-year cycle”.

The timber is not in keeping with the existing structure and the extension structure in brick made to one of the houses on Maygrove Road which backs onto 1 Fordwych Road at the rear and which I can see from my flat.

I have no confidence that this structure will be maintained. The garden at number 1, owned by Mulberry, has been left in a state of disrepair and nothing has been done with it since Mulberry purchased the property. The residents at number 1 have raised this a number of times and nothing has been done about it - the entire Summer we have had to look out at what is truly a disgrace of a garden.

Currently I am looking out on a rotting timber shed in the garden and a panel of the timber fence they have erected immediately before the Application strewn across the garden – not inspiring for maintaining timber going forward! Given their performance to date and lack of consideration I have no confidence that the extension will be maintained. The structure should be made of brick/concrete. An un-maintained timber structure will not be “visually attractive” as per para 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework and does not “respect local character and context” as per Policy CS14 of the Camden Development Policies and does not comply with Policy DP24.

2.3 I am concerned with a new entrance, new windows and presumably sliding doors to the glazed box structure. Number 1 has been broken into before a couple of times and most recently through the ground floor flat through the back in the last two years.

I do not see why a new entrance is necessary, the communal entrance can be used. I am living alone and security is of utmost concern to me. Hence, why I purchased a first floor flat. In addition, there will be additional noise from an entrance at the back. This is unnecessary interruption of amenity for me and fellow residents.

2.4 I refer to Camden Policy CS5 whereby

“The Council will protect the amenity of Camden’s residents and those working in and visiting the borough by:

- making sure that the impact of developments on their occupiers and neighbours is fully considered;*

I regularly work from home and this development will affect my ability to do so, given the noise and length of time for these works. The applicant has shown little concern for residents to date so I have little confidence they would do so during works;

• seeking to ensure development contributes towards strong and successful communities by balancing the needs of development with the needs and characteristics of local areas and communities”

The applicant has not lived at the property and presumably is developing it to onward sell it. How do we know that the timber will be maintained? This proposal does not contribute to successful communities.

I look forward to hearing from you. [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely

Dearbhla Quigley

