

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4932/P	Jack Grimston	Flat 2 (first floor) 48 Compayne Gardens	17/10/2017 13:34:24	COMMNT	<p>I have a number of serious concerns about this application and I very much hope it will be rejected as it would damage the whole character of the area and intrude on the privacy of the people who live here.</p> <p>Apart from some reduction in size from the first time the application was submitted, the proposed building remains the same.</p> <p>There is no mention of the fact that this is part of a larger development that also includes the building of a bigger extension on the back of the house.</p> <p>Most of the reasons for my objection to the original rejected application remain unchanged.</p> <p>1..Damage to the character of the area.</p> <p>The proposed building would result in the loss of valuable green space. Like much of the conservation area, the space behind this part of Compayne Gardens is an open expanse of grass and trees thanks to all the private and communal gardens. This green space is one of the main things that make it a quiet and enjoyable place to live. The gardens and uncultivated corners are a haven for birds and other wildlife. These characteristics benefit the environment and all of us who live here, not just residents of the houses the gardens belong to.</p> <p>New buildings, particularly a dwelling such as the one proposed, would change the whole character of the area and gradually eat away at the open space—regardless of whether or not they have a “green roof”.</p> <p>Allowing this to go ahead would inevitably be used as a precedent by those local owners who view open space as just a waste of profitable development land.</p> <p>Before long the whole character of the gardens and conservation area would be ruined and it would be a far less attractive place to live.</p> <p>The design statement says the area the applicant wants to build over is “somewhat overgrown with shrubs and does not form a part of the main open space of the existing garden”. The fact that this plot is not cultivated in no way reduces its importance. The open space behind this part of the street is a mixture of cultivated gardens and unkempt corners that can only enhance the value for wildlife.</p> <p>The building is described as “contemporary in character” with its grey-framed aluminium windows. The sketch needs some imagination to work out what it would look like in practice. It is a matter of taste whether the contemporary style described is attractive or not, but it is certainly out of keeping with the architecture of the conservation area.</p> <p>2..Applicant understates the amount of green space to be built over.</p> <p>The design statement is misleading about the amount of green space that would be lost. Taken together with the new, bigger extension for which permission has already been granted, more than one third of the undeveloped green space of the garden would be lost, not the 10% claimed by the applicant.</p> <p>According to the design statement, the garden extends 31m from the rear wall of the house to the bottom end wall. But as far as I can tell from the plans (which show few measurements except a scale, so I had to estimate using a ruler), this 31m includes the</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>paved patio and even the existing extension and bay window. This is a strange definition of the word "garden".</p> <p>More relevant is the amount of green space that would be lost. In the document "Section AA as existing," this green space extends about 24.2m from the edge of the paved area to the bottom end of the garden.</p> <p>The application claims the new outbuilding would project 5.5m from the bottom-end wall of the garden. This appears to exclude the canopy, which adds a further 1m.</p> <p>Altogether, the building and canopy reduce the length of the green space by 6.5m down to 17.7m, a reduction of 27% once the built and paved area is excluded.</p> <p>This does not take into account the new extension. Under that plan, the paved area will project a further 2.5m into the garden.</p> <p>Adding the two proposals together, the applicant wants to reduce the length of the garden (green space excluding the concrete paving and extension) by well over a third –by 9m out of 24.2m, which is 37%.</p> <p>This is a significant loss of open space and far greater than the design statement claims.</p> <p>3..Loss of privacy and light pollution</p> <p>The glass front of the proposed building would look up into the kitchen and main bedroom at the back of my flat (first floor of Number 48) and these rooms would lose a great deal of their much-valued privacy. Other neighbouring houses would be similarly affected and the residents of the upstairs flats in Number 50 even more so.</p> <p>We will also be subject to extra light, noise and comings and goings on what should be the quiet side of the house away from the street.</p> <p>The privacy I enjoy thanks to the green space is one of the main reasons I choose to live here. At the moment, the nearest windows that face directly towards mine are roughly 70-80m away, the other side of the Broadhurst communal garden. This proposal would bring the nearest building and windows much closer – to around 20m.</p> <p>The application says the shrubs along the garden walls between Number 50 and the neighbouring houses would shield the new building. They would only do the job partially – even less for the second floor flats than for the first floor and of course the shrubs would not help the residents of Number 50 itself. Also, many of these trees and shrubs are deciduous, so would not provide much of a screen in winter. Several of them are anyway too high already and need reducing in height as they darken our garden excessively.</p> <p>The alternative, of planting a barrier of fast-growing coniferous shrubs such as leylandii to provide a high year-round screen would overshadow the garden unacceptably and damage the sense of openness.</p> <p>4..Potential for use as a self-contained flat</p> <p>At one point the design statement says the "proposed garden room would provide ancillary residential accommodation for the existing ground floor flat" and elsewhere calls it an "extension".</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>These descriptions are misleading and do not reflect the actual content of the design. Any normal understanding of these words would imply this is simply an informal extra room intended for occasional use by people living in the ground floor flat, perhaps on warm summer days.</p> <p>In fact, it is a self-contained residential unit that appears designed to be lived in full-time as a studio flat. The interior may have been reduced in size a bit from the first application, but it still contains a kitchen and a shower room. It is not merely "ancillary to the ground floor flat". It is bigger than some of the studio flats in the area currently being offered for rent on Rightmove.</p> <p>To all intents and purposes, this is a new housing development planned for the garden.</p> <p>5..Garden walls</p> <p>Although this proposed building is further from the boundaries with Numbers 48 and 52 than in the original proposal, I am still concerned that the plan does not include provisions to underpin or strengthen the walls, which are around 100 years old and built on shallow foundations. The plan shows the outbuilding positioned right up against the end wall of the garden. Any undermining of this wall would also potentially affect neighbouring properties.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4932/P	Christophe Decaestecker	Flat4 - 50 Compayne Gardens	17/10/2017 22:07:40	OBJ	<p>This new planning application 2017/4932/P is almost a copy paste from the previous application 2017/0089/P, which has been rejected in February this year already. For the very same reasons and previous objections, I strongly oppose to this new tentative to get a studio flat built in the back of the garden listed in a conservation area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) This new building if erected would jeopardise the current view overlooking the gardens from the above flats at 50 Compayne Gardens. I am sure that our direct next doors neighbours would get the same alteration of their current view, especially from their first and second floors. It was a personal choice for having a flat with a garden view, it would not be the case anymore if this project went through. This would alter the value of my property as a consequence. 2) Facing large folding windows of the studio would represent a serious privacy issue. It is obvious that this studio would be rented for short periods with constant moving in and moving out, probably attracting AirBnB customers for the weekends who would have no consideration whatsoever with the long term residents at the property and neighbours. 3) The light and noises coming from the studio flat in the back garden would cause serious disturbances and stress to the current residents living in the back and nearby properties. 4) The applicant who got his first application rejected has still not approached the other directors at the property to explain his real plans. Persisting re-applying a previous rejected planning application tells a lot about his intentions. For that reason alone, to avoid any precedent in this preserved area, this application should be rejected again and such new tentative should be forbidden in the future. 5) The plans of the new studio do not take into consideration the approved planning applications 2017/1946/P and 2017/0081/P, which is already a huge extension and will reduce drastically the remaining space of the garden and will obstruct the overlooking view of the garden. Therefore the representation of the new building is misleading as it would be combined with the extra extension already approved. The rest of the garden would be transformed with terraces with a minimum required maintenance and almost no green area left. 6) The new garden studio flat would be accessible from the side garden door and will become a permanent new second entrance at the property and therefore will represent a security issue for the property in its whole.
2017/4932/P	Senia Rapisarda	52 Compayne Gardens London NW6 3RY	16/10/2017 20:29:52	COMMEM PER	<p>I concur with my neighbors that the proposed design of a "garden house" in the back of a beautiful and rare garden is not in line with the concept of "conservation area" and I oppose it. The higher floors of my house (52 Compayne) look directly into n. 50's garden and beyond and such construction would be not only unsightly and completely out of style but create a dangerous precedent, especially should such space be rented separately or become an "Air B&B" property.</p> <p>The new design, just slightly smaller, feels like mocking the system and taking advantage of our time possibly in the hope of wearing us down by applying repeatedly.</p>