Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5570/P	Russell Richardson	118c Mansfield Road London NW3 2JB	06/01/2017 09:58:21	OBJ	In my capacity as the Leaseholder of the flat at this given address, I hereby most strongly object to, and oppose, this Planning Application. My objections, and the reasons for these, include those outlined below. Regarding the impact of disturbances, disruptions, noise nuisances, and so on from plant and equipment, construction work/s and so on: The current owner/s of the property to which this Planning Application relates has/have already carried out substantial major works to/at this property over the course of several months during 2015. These major works were the cause of severe disturbances, disruptions, nuisances, and so on, to neighbouring residents at the/that time. I note that Camden's web site shows a Building Control application relating to this property, with a commencement date of 21st March 2016, for: "Material change of use from a Single Family House to a HMO". This application is retrospective to the completion of the aforesaid major works at/to this property. I am aware that there was/is no other Building Control application at/around the time of the aforesaid major works, although it would now seem there should have been. Furthermore, I am also aware that there was no Planning Application for any material change of use at/of the property in question, into an HMO or otherwise, although it would now seem there should have been. I believe that the/this current Planning Application would not have been required if the owner/s of this property had made the proper applications, and gone through the appropriate consultation process/es, before going ahead with the aforesaid major works. Taking the foregoing into account, I consider it wholly unreasonable that owners/residents of/in neighbouring properties who are/will be necessarily at home during weekdays should be subjected to any further disturbances, disruptions, nuisances, and so on - which would inevitably arise from any further major works should this current planning application not be declined - so soon after already having been made to suffer substantial disturbances, disruptions, nuisances, and so on due to the previous, aforesaid, major works which have already been carried out at this property. Accordingly, I object to the whole of the current Planning Application and fully support those similar objections made by others. Regarding the impact of the proposed change of uses of the existing loft space by conversion into a self-contained studio apartment: From the plans submitted with this current Planning Application I can see that, as part of the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

aforementioned major work/s already carried out at 120 Mansfield Road NW3 2JB, the owners of this property have already fitted the kitchen facilities which are now shown in said plans as being arranged along the party wall shared with 118 Mansfield Road in what was formerly the second floor front living room - where there were no such kitchen facilities prior to the aforementioned major work/s.

The everyday use of these said kitchen facilities is/are already causing intrusive and objectionable noise nuisance/s to be transmitted through the said party wall, adversely affecting, and preventing, the peaceful enjoyment of what is the only living room of the neighbouring flat.

The current planning application now proposes that the loft space of the building would undergo a change of use to become converted into a wholly self-contained studio flat. I believe that this is not appropriate for such a small area and that such a conversion/change of use would have an unacceptable detrimental impact on neighbouring properties - not least due to intrusive noise penetration through party walls adversely affecting the peaceful enjoyment of the homes of neighbours.

Given the continuing adverse experiencing of the aforesaid noise nuisances which are already being transmitted through the party wall from the everyday use of the kitchen facilities already installed by the property owner/s in the second floor front room, I believe that it is most likely that, if planning permission was not to be declined, the proposed conversion/change of use to the loft space would further aggravate matters by the creation of new/further noise nuisances being generated, and transmitted through the party wall/s, from the use/s of/in the proposed utility area and/or the everyday use of the utilities proximate to the party wall.

Noise/s is/are transmitted even more easily at loft/roof level and the inevitable transmission of the aforesaid noise/s from utilities/facilities, along with those other noises of daily living which would undoubtedly arise in such a small loft area (which I note would be the owners'/tenants' only/sole living area), into what is the only bedroom available in the neighbouring duplex flat would be most distressing, prevent its peaceful enjoyment. This, I believe, would be wholly unreasonable.

I therefore object to the conversion/change of use of this loft space into a self-contained studio apartment, fully support any similar objections which have been/may be made by others, and believe that permission for this aspect of the Planning Application should be declined, in any event.

Regarding the Mansfield Conservation Area:

This property is within the Mansfield Conservation Area.

I totally agree with the comments already posted by Steven Adams/the Mansfield Conservation Area Advisory Committee in regard to this Planning Application and strongly support his/their objection/s that: "The rear dormer is too large to be acceptable and the front dormer is unacceptable in principle."

There are extant requirements/obligations to ensure that the Mansfield Conservation Area keeps its historic character and appearance and remains an attractive and desirable place to live into the future.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

It appears that aspects of this application - particularly in regard to the proposed new front and rear dormer windows, which are both excessively large and offensive to the eye in any event - are not in keeping with the generality of these aforesaid requirements and that, furthermore:

- They would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building; and/or
- The property forms part of a group or terrace which remains largely, but not necessarily completely, unimpaired; and/or
- The property forms part of a symmetrical composition, the balance of which would be upset; and/or
- The roof is prominent, particularly in long views; and/or
- The building is higher than many of its surrounding neighbours. Any further roof extensions are therefore likely to be unacceptably prominent.

Taking all of the foregoing into account, I object to any/all aspect/s of this planning application which is/are not in keeping with the maintenance of the historical character of the Mansfield Conservation Area, fully support similar objections made by others and consider/submit that permission for the erection of each/both of the proposed front and rear dormer windows should, in any event, be declined.

Regarding structural risks to party walls/foundations:

I am concerned that the proposed dormers/dormer windows are both excessively large and too proximate to the party wall/s shared with 118 Mansfield Road, and one other neighbouring property/building.

I consider that they would most likely give rise to unacceptable/unreasonable risk/s to the structural integrity of said party wall/s if planning permission for the erection of either/both of the proposed dormers/dormer windows was/were not declined.

I am also concerned that the proposed rear and side infill extension would impact on the party wall/s shared with 118 Mansfield Road, and one other neighbouring property/building, and the associated/proximate foundations.

I consider that the proposed extension/s would most likely give rise to unacceptable/unreasonable risk/s to the structural integrity of said party wall/s and/or foundations if the current planning application were not to be declined.

I therefore object to all of these aforementioned aspects of the planning application, fully support all similar objections made by others, and believe that permission for these aforementioned aspects of the Planning Application should, in any event, be declined.

Regarding loss of daylight, sunlight and privacy of neighbours:

I am concerned that the proposed development/s would cause loss of daylight, sunlight and privacy

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:

to/of neighbours, not least to the private roof-terrace and the garden areas at the rear of neighbouring properties, which would become overlooked and overshadowed if the application aspects in regard to either/both of the proposed new dormers and/or the rear/side extension, respectively, were not to be declined.

I therefore object to these aforementioned aspects of the application, fully support similar objections made by others, and believe that permission for these aspects of the Planning Application should, in any event, be declined.

Regarding the impact of development on traffic parking and road safety, including disabled access:

The number of independent/unrelated adult people/individuals who would be occupying/living at 120 Mansfield Road, should this planning application be granted as it is presented, would be excessive, in any event, and would lead to increased pressure on the already limited and insufficient number/s of residents' parking spaces available in this area from/due to the increased occupancy of, and visitors to, the building/site to which this application relates.

I consider it unreasonable, and unacceptable, that access to parking, including disabled access, will become even further restricted if this application was not to be declined.

Taking all of the foregoing into account, I therefore object to the application for these reasons, fully support similar objections made by others, and believe that the Planning Application, as submitted, should be declined.

Regarding the risk of invasion from household pests:

Construction/conversion work/s debris has already previously - during the aforementioned substantial major works to/at this property over the course of several months during 2015 - been piled high and left unattended for considerable/long periods of time, up to window level, outside the front of the building to which this application relates, thereby causing risks of invasion from household pests into both this and the other neighbouring building.

I consider that it is unreasonable and unacceptable that neighbouring property owners/residents would once again, most likely, be subjected to further such risks if this application was not to be declined.

I therefore object to the Planning Application for these reasons and fully support similar objections made by others.