

20/12/2016

Dear Mr Tulloch,

I have tried to call you several times and also wished to leave a message. Your phone simply rings out and there is no ability to leave a message. There is also no one else to pick up your phone line.

Can you please confirm when the application was posted on the planning portal. I was awaiting this application to be made in order to object to it and had not seen it when I last looked in early December. Its timing is unfortunate/convenient—given that most solicitors are away (or leaving) for the Christmas holiday. It just be remembered that the original application was also circulated at this time of year. I know that there is frequently a number of weeks between when the application is received and when it is placed within the portal for viewing. Given that Camden no longer send letters to affected parties, it is critical that enough time is given for objections.

For me, the “minor amendment” means a loss of light equivalent to 50% of that which would be available under the plans--which were approved (to which I did not object)—and, therefore, a change of scheme. The height of the brickwork is 40% higher (generating a absolute light reduction) and the height of the wall is circa 20 inches higher than approved. This issue was confirmed by Anstey Horne Surveyors (see attached—which also suggests that the height of the 1A deck is incorrect i.e. too high. Apart from the the light loss, the ambience is severely reduced as the overall wall is now nearly 3 meters in height.

The revised plans also refer to the use of the boundary wall instead of a separate wall—as indicated in the original plans. This places the wall screen closer to my terrace—further enclosing my terrace space and reducing light.

It appears very convenient to argue that an experienced architect (TG Studios) can state that all the dimensions of the new build are correct but they made substantive measurement errors in the measurements of adjacent (and connected) buildings ie. even I can count the number of bricks from a datum point to the my terrace deck! Given that the architect and neighbour were given access to our property and made measurements, these ‘measurement errors’ have misled Camden Planning and myself regarding the impact on the light reductions (accepted in the original plans) and the overall ambience of the rear of my house and its amenities. In the interest of being neighbourly, I agreed to a reduction in light amenity; however, this planning request is a substantive change to light availability at the rear of my property i.e. terrace, dining area, hallway and kitchen.

Given that there is so limited time and my lawyers and surveyors are not available around the holiday period, may I please request an extension in the period of consultation so that the experts can have their input—until the middle of January.

Finally, it is important to note that Anstey Horne suggest that the deck height in 1A is higher than plan. Instead of simply changing the measurements of surrounding properties (to be lower than contained in plan) and seek retrospective approval, perhaps the build was higher

than plan and measurements need to be taken throughout. TG Studio got it 'wrong' once already. It is in their interest to "get it wrong" again.

In the end, I am the affected party.

I request that the consultation period be extended to 'mid January 2017 so that a proper process can be undertaken.

I will send a photo of the wall/screen in another email.

Kind regards,

Michael Jankowski  
2A Well Road

Our ref: NG/BSC1024

Your ref:

Mr M Jankowski  
2a Well Road  
Hampstead  
London  
NW3 1LJ

13<sup>th</sup> May 2016

Dear Mr Jankowski

**Re: Boundary Terrace Wall Between 1a and 2a Well Road, Hampstead**

Further to your instructions and my inspection on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2016, I can provide an overview of the issues associated with the wall construction to the side of your terrace forming the boundary with 1a Well Road as follows:

- 1.) Drawing EL-110, Revision B, approved as part of the planning application reference 2013/7179/P, required the entire wall and glass balustrade to be raised so that it was no more than 1,800mm high above the terrace of 1A Well Road.
- 2.) The raised wall is approved in the drawings to be 800mm of brickwork with a further 1000mm of glass above with the top of the wall no higher than the lintel of your doors at the rear of 2a Well Road.
- 3.) The wall has been constructed differently with in the order of 1100mm of brickwork above the likely terrace level. But the top of the brickwork is now at the aforementioned lintel level suggesting the roof of the basement has been constructed higher than detailed in the original planning application drawings. By raising the level of the roof, and thus the datum point for measuring the height of the wall, the level of the top of the terrace wall is higher when viewed from your side if it is constructed to the maximum 1800mm specified in the drawings.
- 4.) Whilst we have not measured the loss of light to the terrace, the change in the amount of brickwork and the apparent raising of the basement roof at 1a Well Road raises the level of the wall and has significantly impacted light entering the terrace.

From our measurements of the wall as currently constructed, the wall has not been constructed in accordance with the approved planning drawings.

I trust this clarifies the position and should you require any further details, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Nigel Green