

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2471/P	Ronny Feiereisen	FITZJOHNS AVENUE 72 Nw35ls Nw35ls	11/06/2017 11:19:53	OBJ	<p>Dear All,</p> <p>We would like to take the opportunity to object to the planning application principally based on three arguments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Over-development: The proposed plans will cover just under 70% of the entire lot. This to our understanding goes against Camden's own requirements of limiting the excavation area to a max of 50%.</li><li>2. Green areas: Subject to the development, the remaining area for the greenery is assumed to be 15% of the total area, once the excavation and parking areas are taking into consideration. This to our mind is too minimal given that green spaces are supposed to be maintained and if possible enhanced in the Camden area.</li><li>3. Protected tree: We understand from the arbo report that a protected, highly sought-after tree is likely to be negatively affected by the extraction. This is surely not in the interest of Camden and should for that reason not be disallowed from happening.</li></ol> <p>Based on the above we would urge Camden to reject the excavation.</p> <p>Regards</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2471/P	Sir Nicholas Serota	9 Wharton Street London WC1X 9PX	13/06/2017 11:29:27	COMMNT	<p>I wish to register a strong objection to the size and volume of the proposal. My parents lived in the present house from 1976 until 2004 and enjoyed the scale and elegance of Ted Levy's design which had replaced a small original Coach House with a building that was modest and allowed for small gardens at back and front, both of which my mother planted with great care. In recent years, the owners have destroyed the front garden in order to accommodate an additional car and have neglected the house itself to create a sense that it is run down and almost derelict.</p> <p>The present proposals create a basement that extends to about 80% of the site. This will mean that the front and rear gardens are significantly reduced in size and will further threaten to mature horse chestnut tree at no 17. The plan of the proposed house shows an east elevation that is much closer to the road than the present building line, causing the building to project beyond the building line of the neighbouring house at no 13 and making it visible from some way down Lyndhurst Terrace, in contrast to the present house which is tucked in behind the building line</p> <p>In their statement the architects describe the scale and massing of the present house as 'diminutive and overly discreet' (3.2) but it is just this discretion that helps to preserve the original character of the street. The photographs of the model, numbered 3 and 4, in section 3.2 show just how much more volume they are cramming onto the small site and make it clear that this is an example of overdevelopment, presumably at the insistence of the client. I find it hard to believe that architects of this quality would seek to fill the site so fully without such encouragement.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2471/P	David Immanuel	13 Lyndhurst Terrace London NW35QA	09/06/2017 15:45:38	OBJ	<p>We are the immediate neighbours at 13 Lyndhurst Terrace</p> <p>We object to the development as proposed on the following grounds</p> <p>1) The basement as planned is far too large-70% of the whole site is excessive , &amp; exceeds Camden"s own guidelines</p> <p>2) The hydrological report does not take into account previous flooding of our Victorian semi-basement, nor flooding in the past of 19, Thurlow Rd. Both these problems have been professionally resolved for years, but we fear the huge displacement of water from the proposed tanked out basement will cause new water ingress problems for neighbouring properties. Nearby there are many natural springs (hence Spring Walk &amp; Spring Path)</p> <p>3) We object to the permanent loss of bio diversity/ green planting as in addition to the basement using 70% of the site an additional 15% is to be hard surfaced for parking (contravening Camden"s policy on off-street parking) thus leaving only 15% of the entire site for all planting, making it impossible to replace the five mature trees illegally felled by the previous owner.</p> <p>4) The proposed house is gross over development trebling the size of the existing house</p> <p>5) The rear of the proposed house is even closer to the the fence dividing our properties than the existing house &amp; the large floor to ceiling windows &amp; terrace proposed for the ground &amp; first floor are angled to overlook our entire back garden. I object to the proposed house acquiring additional rights of light over our property</p> <p>6) The required works for the construction of the enormous basement will create enormous noise &amp; vibrations which will disrupt the operation of our school, possibly obliging us to close the school for a period The D&amp;A statement requires 3 major HGV deliveries per day, which will add further to the disruption, particularly as the huge basement will leave no space for lorry parking on the site itself.</p> <p>7) The bulk of the proposed house at first floor level, built from boundary to boundary would block the gap between number 15 &amp; 17 Lyndhurst Terrace, blocking the street view of mature trees in the back garden of number 17.</p> <p>8) In summary, this proposal is a gross over development, is very aggressive towards immediate neighbours &amp; contravenes Camden"s new planning regulations on basements</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2471/P	Sir Nicholas Serota	9 Wharton Street London WC1X 9PX	13/06/2017 11:29:36	COMMNT	<p>I wish to register a strong objection to the size and volume of the proposal. My parents lived in the present house from 1976 until 2004 and enjoyed the scale and elegance of Ted Levy's design which had replaced a small original Coach House with a building that was modest and allowed for small gardens at back and front, both of which my mother planted with great care. In recent years, the owners have destroyed the front garden in order to accommodate an additional car and have neglected the house itself to create a sense that it is run down and almost derelict.</p> <p>The present proposals create a basement that extends to about 80% of the site. This will mean that the front and rear gardens are significantly reduced in size and will further threaten to mature horse chestnut tree at no 17. The plan of the proposed house shows an east elevation that is much closer to the road than the present building line, causing the building to project beyond the building line of the neighbouring house at no 13 and making it visible from some way down Lyndhurst Terrace, in contrast to the present house which is tucked in behind the building line</p> <p>In their statement the architects describe the scale and massing of the present house as 'diminutive and overly discreet' (3.2) but it is just this discretion that helps to preserve the original character of the street. The photographs of the model, numbered 3 and 4, in section 3.2 show just how much more volume they are cramming onto the small site and make it clear that this is an example of overdevelopment, presumably at the insistence of the client. I find it hard to believe that architects of this quality would seek to fill the site so fully without such encouragement.</p>

---