

30/01/2017

> Dear Mr Tulloch,

> Given that the submitted documents in respect of the above have all been of a technical nature, I felt compelled to add a human element that appears to be lost. I hope you will submit this letter to those on the planning committee to assist them in their deliberations.

>

> I have lived in 2A Well Road for more than 15 years. It has been my 16 year-old daughter's only home.

>

> The owners of 1A Well Road originally sought permission to construct a basement in the area which has given rise to this planning problem. Having witnessed two floods in the original basement area of 1A Well Road, I objected to the application and it was withdrawn (2013/7181/P). It was, however, very clear that the owners of 1A Well Road wanted the infill area to have substantive internal height—unlike the the one I have in 2A Well Road.

>

> The owners of 1A Well Road submitted a new scheme (2013/7179/P) containing drawings which I (and presumably all affected parties) relied upon—as those plans presented how the new development would interact with my home and the Mews house behind. No doubt the planning committee also relied upon those drawings in determining issues relating to impact of light, ambience and encroachment in neighbouring affected areas. I did not object to those plans.

>

> An award-winning RIBA architect (T and G Griem) drew and submitted the plans using the measurements provided by a well-known and highly-respected construction and engineering firm (Glanville) . The ground datum point has never changed and was always visible; therefore, I feel that it is inconceivable that two experts cannot measure the heights of buildings nor the number of visible bricks that are interlaced (given that 1A and 2A Well Road are terraced).

>

> After 18 months of construction, in January 2016 it became obvious that the height of the terrace was not in keeping with the approved plan. I contacted all relevant parties involved in the 1A Well Road development. They ignored my concerns and continued. Furthermore, the owners of 1A Well Road decided to relocate the dividing terrace wall/screen from a separate wall to the party wall—producing an encroachment that was not envisaged nor contained in the original approved plan nor is even contained in this new application. This Party Wall Award was then used as an argument to justify the wall's structure and dimensions by the owners of 1A Well Road—regardless of the fact that its construction (height, location, structure) was not approved by Camden Planning. They didn't care and put the entire burden on me and put the wall up.

>

> Despite numerous attempts to get the issue sorted, the owners of 1A Well Road continued to complete their development—in the full knowledge that it was not as drawn or approved in the plans. I made contact with the Camden Council in April which, apparently resulted in the current application to have new drawings accepted.

>

> The screen/wall as built is different from what is presented in the new application—yet another error—as it is in a different location than where it is drawn. It is misleading and does not indicate the further encroachment on my terrace.

>

> The biggest issue is the massive loss of light—both direct sunlight and indirect—due to the wall being much higher than that approved and a full meter higher than that which existed prior to the development. The proposed increase in height (relative to the surrounding buildings) has a huge impact on light coming into my house and on the terrace. It must be remembered that all direct sunlight comes from the south and the wall blocks access to receiving that light. It is very depressing.

>

> Given the loss of ambience, my wife and I have been considering renting our home. Already, a relocation agent advised their client to “look elsewhere” as the terrace will get no sunlight given the height (3 meters) of the wall. Not only does this affect our use but affects the property’s value in the future.

>

> In the past, the terrace used to be a sun trap—and would filter through the dining and kitchen areas. Now it will receive probably 60% less light and 80% less direct sunlight.

>

> I firmly believe that if the owners of 1A Well Road had submitted proper drawings that reflect what they intended to build in the first place, this issue would have come light and my family will not have suffered in the way we have. Anstey Horne (Surveyors) viewed the site and stated that “the roof of the basement (of 1A Well Road) has been constructed higher than detailed in the original planning documents....” Whatever the reason, the impact on the living environment on 2A Well Road should be considered carefully when reviewing this application as, up to now, my family feels that we have been let down,

>

> May I strongly suggest that this application be rejected.

>

>

> Kind regards

>

>

> Michael Jankowski

> 2A Well Road

>

>