

Eileen & Sally Ann Bird
33 Goldhurst Terrace
St. Pancras
London NW6 3HB
Tel [REDACTED]

Ms Charlotte Meynell
Planning Officer
Development Management
2nd Floor
5 Pancras Sq
London NIC 4AG

6th March 2017

Dear Ms Meynell,

Re: 2017/0170/P
Flat 1, 31 Goldhurst Tee, NW6 3HB

We wish to make a number of objections & comments on the above planning application.

1. Height of proposed Outbuilding/Office/Summerhouse

A height of 2.7 metres is too great & will mean that the roof and French doors will be above the current fence height of 1.7 metres - 1.72 metres by approx one whole metre.

P.T.O.

Page 1 of 3

2. Privacy Issues

The French doors of the proposed South Elevation are pointing at + are very close to the only private area of our garden, where both our tenants at no 33A and we habitually sit. Anyone in this proposed Office/Summerhouse will be looking right at us.

Also this Outbuilding/Office/Summerhouse will be raised by foundations, joists + a floor and so, feet will not be at ground level, implying that our neighbours will be looking at us from a higher level.

All this is an invasion of our privacy.

3. The French doors of the proposed West + South Elevations are also pointing towards our main windows at the back of our house at no. 33. They are looking at our bedrooms on the First & Second Floors and at our kitchen/diner on the Upper Ground Floor, in which we spend most of our time.

This is also an invasion of our privacy.

4. Mass & Bulk of proposed Outbuilding/Office Summerhouse

The mass & bulk of the proposed building

Eileen & Sally Ann Bird
Re: 2017/0170/P
Flat 1, 31 Goldhurst Tee

are too great for such a small garden. These gardens are disappearing under hard landscaping which is a loss of a precious asset to all of us.

5. Style of Outbuilding/Office/Summerhouse

The style of the proposed building is completely out of keeping with the South Hampstead Conservation Area which is Victorian in character.

We do not know what the 'Painted Cement Door Cladding' on the North & East Elevations looks like, but it sounds awful, & is likely to be inappropriate to the Conservation Area.

6. Fences

Ms Greenaway is proposing to remove all the fences around her property without having approached us or any of the other neighbours concerned. As we understand it, it is her duty to consult us and reach an agreement with us.

7. Style of Fences

The style of the fences is ultra-modern, to us too harsh & completely out of keeping with the Conservation Area.

8. Working-side of fences

Ms Greenaway is also not obeying the convention of putting the working-side of the fences on her own side & giving the smart side to the neighbours, which we certainly did when we put up our fence between us at no. 33 & Ms Greenaway & her fellow lessees at no. 31.

9. The fence which lies between no. 33 & no. 31

This is our fence which marks the border between us & no. 31. Ms Greenaway knows & accepts this.

All householders/occupiers in this row are responsible for the left-hand fences (as they look down their garden from their home). The reason is that there is a left-hand fence at the top of the row but no right-hand fence at the bottom of rows of houses.

We cannot see how Camden Council can give Ms Greenaway permission to remove our fence and we certainly do not give her permission to do so.

Apart from it being our fence, if Ms Greenaway replaced that part of it which only extends

Eileen & Sally Ann Bird
Re: 2017/0170/P
Flat 1, 31 Goldhurst Terrace

along her border with us, as she has applied to Camden to do, we would end up with our own traditional-looking fence down half our long, left-hand borders and an ultra modern fence down the remaining half.

We enjoy our garden & put a lot of time & work into it every year. This ugly, modern fence will spoil it for us.

We respectfully request that you take these objections & comments into account when making your decision,

Yours sincerely,



Mrs EILEEN BIRD

Owner/Occupiers of 33 & 33A Goldhurst Terrace,
London NW6 3HB.

Ms SALLY ANN BIRD

