Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 20/01/2017 09:05:03 Response:
2016/2457/P	Emer Glynn	2 Collard Place NW18DU NW18DU	19/01/2017 20:59:01	OBJBOBXI	We bought 2 Collard Place 18 months ago and one of the key attractions was the privacy and openness of the back garden. Even with the proposed amendments we still have concerns about the site A.development. The height and close proximity are major concerns. We chose the house as our family home and up to now have really enjoyed the privacy and the tranquility it enjoys in such an otherwise busy area. With the proposed building so close and so high our home will feel overlooked and claustrophobic The plans show that we would be overlooked with windows directly having views over our home. At the moment,, we particularly value the quietness at the back of the house as this is where our young grandchildren sleep when they visit. We very strongly object to this planning application.
2016/2457/P	Emer Glynn	2 Collard Place NW18DU NW18DU	19/01/2017 20:58:46	OBJBOBXI	

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received: Comment: Response: 2016/2457/P G Parker-Whitten 18/01/2017 22:49:39 COMMEM 4 Collard Place 4 Collard Place Camden AIL Camden London London NW1 8DU NW1 8DU 18TH January 2017

REF Planning Application No. 2016/2457/P

Dear Mr Tulloch

We thank you for your letter dated 5th January 2017 with regards to the re-submission of the plans for the Leverton's proposed development of 1-3 and 4-8 Ferdinand Place.

With regards to the new submitted plans we wish to raise our strongest objections to these proposals as the resubmission of the plans have not taken any of our previous objections (dated 21st June 2016) into account.

Our objections are we feel this proposed development is grossly overbearing on our property especially as the current building at site A is a single storey garage, which is proposed as a basement and four storey development while site B is currently a 2 storey building, proposed to be a now 4 storey building. This would result in a great sense of enclosure, loss of light and full use of our garden as they would tower over and enclose our small 3 storey house and garden.

The two developments would still cause us to be overlooked from a few metres away with the resulting loss of privacy, sunlight and daylight to all 3 floors of our windows, and garden, especially as the sun travels from Harmood Street and around to Ferdinand Street on plan in an East - South to West direction. The building proposed obscuring the sun and light path to our property as it travels around its normal path and we having to view a large expanse of wall instead of our current view of the skyline beyond the single storey garage.

The proposed development of 4-8 Ferdinand Place would appear to be of a dark blue brick panels and not in keeping with the surrounding buildings, emphasising the building and making it more intrusive in the neighbourhood.

We are still concerned with regards to the vent showing on the first floor level whether this is a extract vent discharging near and or over us or an intake vent. Both would potentially have noise issues adjacent to our boundary.

With regards to the terraces on the first floor level we are concerned about who would have access to the flat roof area outside of the terraced areas and how is this to be maintained. We were originally told at a "consultation" with the developers that no-one would have access to this area, this appears to be untrue as it looks as if "privacy screens" are planned, these would not block potential noise and litter from an area just above our garden fence.

Although Site B (1-3 Ferdinand Place) appears to show four storeys in height it would still make the rear of our property seem smaller than it already is.

We respectfully request that the council investigate our concerns and refuse planning permission for this overdevelopment and to reduce the size of any future proposed development on this site to the size and footprint of the current buildings, and to make proper provision for the continued privacy and wellbeing of our neighbours and ourselves.

We seriously question whether this location is appropriate for this type and scale of development with

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					regards to our concerns. We also have major concerns regarding how these works are to be carried out if approved by Camden Council with regards to the traffic ,noise, environmental issues within a small access route and adjoining main roads with demolition, piling, excavation works, crane working etc. Should you wish to look at the current situation and views this could be easily arranged via our neighbours or us, whichever is the more convenient for you. Regards, Gordon and Dianne Parker-Whitten

Printed on:	20/01/2017	09:05:03
-------------	------------	----------

					Printed on: 20/01/2017 09:
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2457/P	Sarah and Oliver Tobias	3 collard place London	19/01/2017 20:13:48	OBJ	Dear Mr Tulloch,
		NW1 8DU			In light of the fact that the "revised" plans for this development have in fact made no attempt to address the issues and concerns raised in our initial response, we faithfully republish our original comments below:
					Planning reference 2016/2457/P 1, 3 and 4, 6, 8 Ferdinand Place
					As the owners of the property situated at 3, Collard Place, we wish to object to the above planning application on the following grounds:-
					Overlooking Our house is in very close proximity to the proposed development at Site A (4, 6 and 8 Ferdinand Place) and we believe that we will suffer an unacceptable degree of overlooking and loss of privacy. In the Design and Access Statement, which has been submitted as part of the Planning Application, Section 3.0 Proposed Scheme - 3.1 'Amount' shows the proposed elevations and shape of the building. Although the building has a 'saw tooth' design along the boundary with properties on Harmood Street to mitigate the impact of overlooking, this will actually exacerbate the loss of privacy at our property, since the windows will be angled towards Collard Place, particularly our home at number 3 and our neighbour's house at number 4 Collard Place. In addition, the corner of the proposed building, which is closest to our home, has a flat wall with two windows in it at third floor level, which will virtually be at the end of our garden. This would result in significant overlooking and a complete loss of privacy in our home and garden. Section 3.3 'Scale' demonstrates the sight lines and the angle of the windows along the boundary with the homes in Harmood Street, and it can clearly be seen how the views will be in the direction of the properties in Collard Place, in particular numbers 3 and 4. This is also shown in section 3.4 'Privacy and Neighbourliness' which states that 'Although there is a substantial separation of more than 18 metres between adjacent habitable rooms of the new development and the rear windows of terraced houses on Harmood Street, particular concern for overlooking of existing rear gardens was addressed by directing views obliquely to the northeast by means of a folded 'saw tooth' profile rear wall.' In actual fact, whilst the residents of Harmood Street enjoy the benefit of some trees to screen them from Site A, we do not have any foliage screen between us the site whatsoever. Another aspect of possible overlooking which concerns us is the number of flat roofed areas at various levels in the
					Page 5 of 9

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received: Comment:	Response:
				 pollution which would be caused by any demolition and subsequent re-building. Question 13 of the Construction Management Plan states 'Please confirm when as asbestos survey was carried out at the site and include the key findings'. The response to this question is 'T.B.C.' and we would very much like to know whether there is actually any asbestos present in the building. Having attended both of the public consultation meetings, we appreciate that the design of the proposed building has been modified and reduced by one residential unit, but we believe that the degree of overlooking of our property is still unacceptable and in contravention of the Council's policy and approach to assessing outlook, namely CPG6, which we understand from the Planning Statement means, 'not building too close to neighbouring buildings or creating oppressive or overbearing relationships'. In summary, we would like to say that we are very worried about the various aspects of the proposal outlined above and hope that the Council will investigate our concerns and act accordingly. We understand that this is an excellent opportunity for the Leverton family to upgrade and improve their business facilities, but we do not think any development should be at the expense of the residents of surrounding properties.
				We continue to strongly object to these plans and respectfully request that officers refuse planning permission for this development. Yours faithfully
2016/2457/P	Emer Glynn	2 Collard Place NW18DU NW18DU	19/01/2017 20:59:02 OBJBOBX	Sarah and Oliver Tobias We bought 2 Collard Place 18 months ago and one of the key attractions was the privacy and openness of the back garden. Even with the proposed amendments we still have concerns about the site A.development. The height and close proximity are major concerns. We chose the house as our family home and up to now have really enjoyed the privacy and the tranquility it enjoys in such an otherwise busy area. With the proposed building so close and so high our home will feel overlooked and claustrophobic The plans show that we would be overlooked with windows directly having views over our home. At the moment,, we particularly value the quietness at the back of the house as this is where our young grandchildren sleep when they visit. We very strongly object to this planning application.
2016/2457/P	Emer Glynn	2 Collard Place NW18DU NW18DU	19/01/2017 20:58:30 OBJBOBXI	

Printed on: 20/01/2017

09:05:03