

From: Jenny White [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 April 2017 17:49
To: Planning; Peres Da Costa, David
Subject: Objections to Application No 2017/0579/P 26 Netherhall Gardens NW3

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

With reference to my telephone call yesterday about the extension of time in which to respond, I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposals for this site. The new application does not address the substantive concerns raised by the previous applications. In particular:

1. The proposal would involve the demolition of the existing building, although there is no application for this. Knocking down the building would be wholly unjustified. This is a conservation area and Camden's own appraisal noted that No 26 makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and referred to the general presumption of retaining such buildings.
2. The proposed design of the new building is completely out of character with the Victorian houses on that side of the road. The dimensions and scale - including the proportions between height and width - are vastly different from the existing building and the neighbouring properties and would break up the coherence between them.
3. The plans would also block the view of the trees in the rear gardens of Netherhall Gardens and Maresfield Gardens. The visual link between the street and the rear gardens is a feature of the conservation area.
4. They would also result in the garden at the back of No 26 (already small in proportion to the size of the house) being almost obliterated. That would run counter to the planning guidelines to protect green open space in a conservation area.
5. Although billed as a double basement, the new design would effectively mean three basement stories at the back of the house. It is totally inappropriate to use a steep sloping garden in this way, quite apart from the unsuitable accommodation it will create.
6. The proposal will involve massive excavation of almost the entire site occupied by the current building up to the boundary at the back. The Basement Impact Assessment refers to 'the potential to cause some movements in the surrounding ground'. The bland statement that this can be managed through 'the proper design and construction of mitigation measures', without specifying what those are, is of no assurance whatever. There must be a real risk of structural damage to the neighbouring properties at either side of No 26 and to the garages at the rear boundary.
7. The Basement Impact Assessment also indicates that the basement development could significantly affect the groundwater of No 26 and neighbouring properties.
8. Finally, the plans incorporate sizeable roof terraces overlooking the property and garden at No 24a which will encroach on their privacy.

For these reasons I would urge Camden to refuse planning permission for this development.

Kind regards

Jenny White

3/22 Netherhall Gardens NW3 5TH

