

Gentet, Matthias

From: Smith, Kristina
Sent: 02 October 2017 18:24
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Planning application 2017/2899/P 4 Boscastle Road, London NW51EG

Another objection for 4 Boscastle Road.

Thanks,
Kristina

From: Gun Neurath [mailto:gunthor1@mac.com]
Sent: 01 October 2017 20:43
To: Smith, Kristina <Kristina.Smith@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning application 2017/2899/P 4 Boscastle Road, London NW51EG

Dear Ms Smith

My husband and I are writing to you in connection with the above planning application.

We have both been living in 2 Boscastle Road, one of the houses in the 3-house terrace, of which number 4 is part and adjacent to ours, since January 1971.

We know you have already received responses objecting to the proposed erection of a new mansard floor or mansard extension. These sometimes briefly quote the principles of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement as the reasons for objecting to the Application. Others such as that from number 6 Boscastle Road go into the background to the situation in respect of the terrace composed of 2, 4, and 6, in far greater detail, referring also to the English Heritage report and precedents from previous appeals at different Councils which seem to have some bearing on the application to which we are responding.

We would also like to mention that we ourselves were refused permission for a roof-extension at our own property some years ago, upon which we had to abandon our plans.

For all of these reasons, including all the specific points contained in the responses you have already received which we refer to above, we too object most strongly to the application.

And furthermore on account of the additional loading such a mansard extension would put on our own dwelling which we know is generally in an unstable condition.

Beyond that we would like to take the opportunity, pending further detail from the Applicant, to lodge with you our extreme disquiet about the possibility of excavation works being undertaken in connection with the conservatory. We understand that it is excavation which is meant by the final sentence in point 3 (Description of Proposed Works) which reads: "The existing basement will be modified to serve as ancillary space for the house." This statement has been further amplified by emails sent to us in copy by the Applicant in which he has written on 7th September: "We are planning on replacing the conservatory at the back, which is leaking and rotten in places. In doing that, we might look to extend the existing full-height part of the basement (which runs front-to-back at the centre of the house) backwards underneath part of the replacement conservatory."

On 12th September the Applicant emailed: "The thought I describe in the previous email concerning the conservatory is that when it is replaced, a space might be included below."

Given the fact that our dwelling has already suffered from serious subsidence we would feel compelled to object most strongly to any excavation works, even if limited to directly under the current conservatory, given it abuts our dwelling.

Therefore we would be most grateful if those considering this application on behalf of the Council could take note of the fact that the Applicant's Design and Access Statement in section **A2 AMOUNT Rear facade single story extension** describing "specifically" the permission being sought, makes no mention of excavation and/or increasing the basement and/or creating extra space under the conservatory.

Indeed our minds would be put at rest if the Council's response to this application could also specifically request clarification of these apparent contradictions.

Yours sincerely

Gun Thor-Neurath and Thomas Neurath