



London Borough of Camden,  
Develop Management,  
Town Hall Extension, Argyle Street,  
London  
WC1H 8EQ

10 November 2018

To whom it may concern,

**Ref. Town and Country Planning Act 1990  
Basement and Upper Ground Floors  
Alterations and Extension**

**30 Upper Park Road, Belsize Park, London, NW3 2UT**

**OBJECTION to Planning Application ref 2018/5104/P**

We confirm that, as adjoining owners, we have not received direct notification of this application from the LPA

No 30 Upper Park Road is half of a pair of semi detached, villa style, properties and form part of a road with matching houses.

These particular houses are nearly 200 years old and have retained their original structure and appearance.

It is proposed to remove the **whole** of the lower ground floor rear wall (almost 7.5 meters), with no precedents to support such extreme and insensitive surgery.

The comment 'All proposed works have been carefully designed to be sympathetic and in keeping with the original house whilst enhancing its quality' is subjective and very questionable.

The photographic illustrations, forming part of the Design and Access Statement, as submitted and supporting the application, indicate just how out of character and unsympathetic the proposals are/would be.

The vast majority of the properties retain their sensitive, and contemporary balconies and balustrade at upper ground level, and we see no reason for this to be altered.

Existing balconies can provide direct access to garden level, with use of matching cast iron staircase (circular?)

The proposed extension will cut out direct sunlight (orientation) and cast shadows on the rear, garden level, wall of no. 32 Upper Park Road.

Timber trellis fencing is not the vernacular of upper floor balconies/terraces and, in this case, will create an ongoing maintenance problem for the abutting/adjoining property.

It goes without saying that the proposed upper level terrace is of sufficient size to support multi person gatherings and increases loss of privacy/over looking and is also a potential for noise disturbance/pollution.

We trust the foregoing is in order and that these objections will be favourably considered.

Yours faithfully,

Marie-Jo Drewitt

Karine Pearson

Ian Simpson