

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

completely removing our noise and sight protection from the school opposite). Certainly the freeholder/neighbours did not receive any plans or details. The statement that the applicant is in discussion with its immediate neighbours is incorrect. There were no discussions at the time of the application. In fact, a meeting with the applicant only took place on 23 Nov at the initiative of the neighbours. The neighbours kindly asked the applicant to provide a meeting with their architect and structural engineer - an understandable request given the extreme structural element of this application. Unfortunately, the applicant could not provide access to their architect and admitted that they have not even consulted a structural engineer.

Flat 1 was recently (in 2009) extended into the garden by previous owners with a beautiful extension that provides a clear break from the historic building and is pleasant to the eye from all sides/neighbours' views. Most importantly, it does not destroy the fabric of this 150 year old building and is a good size compromise vs the garden and host building while giving ample additional living space. It blends in with nature from the top. The current application is clearly only to the benefit of the applicant while being to the detriment of the conservation area (in fact destroying building features that are typical of Belsize Park and reducing garden space) as well as severely impacting the structural integrity of this 130year old building and gravely impacting the privacy and views of the neighbours. We feel it would be very unfair for the Council to approve this application that is so one-sidedly only benefiting the owners of Flat 1 to the grave detriment of all other affected parties.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/4949/P	Mihai Florian	09/12/2018 20:47:49	OBJ	<p>[REDACTED] In addition to my comments provided some days ago I would like to respond to the rebuttal letter the applicant sent to the Council on Nov 22 trying to mitigate some of the neighbours' concerns.</p> <p>-) To re-iterate - the applicant did not consult with the neighbours before the application and all neighbours were completely taken by surprise by the invasiveness and size of this application. A meeting only took place at the initiative of the neighbours after we had noticed the Council's notification poster hanging on the parking bay outside the house. It is bad form to misrepresent the situation.</p> <p>-) It is presumptuous for the applicant to judge in what way or angle the neighbours enjoy the view of the conservation area from their windows and balconies. The sight line drawing that was recently added to the documents clearly does not take into consideration the views from Flat 3. The drawing also cleverly omits the sight line the neighbours on all floors have to the beautiful conifer trees at the back of the property that the applicant plans to chop down thus also removing vital noise and sight protection to the school beyond.</p> <p>-) The applicant states that they will likely sell the property if planning permission is not granted. This raises our concern that the applicant will sell the property if he does gain planning permission but subsequently fails to gain freeholder permission (in the current form the plans are unlikely to gain freeholder approval). It cannot be in the interest of the Council and the people living in the conservation area to have properties marketed at inflated prices justified by planning permissions for vast extensions that have failed to gain freeholder approval. This seems to be exactly what is happening with the planning permission example mentioned in the application - 12 Strathray Gardens.</p> <p>-) Overall, we feel that the additional building-up up of 24sqm of outside space combined with the chopping down of trees to the back of the property proves just too big of a loss in nature - both for the neighbours and the animals of the conservation area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2018/4949/P	Mr M Dibb	08/12/2018 11:47:34	COMMENT

Response:

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write to you in order to object to the planning proposal 2018/4949/P.

[REDACTED] where we spend a large amount of time, and during the summer and autumn months we make considerable and frequent use of the lovely garden and patio to which this proposal is adjacent.

We are concerned that the proposed development is considerably closer and taller than the extant single-storey structure (which is already clearly visible over the shared garden wall). Although I appreciate that the plans appear to have made efforts to avoid the impact of this extra height by slanting the structure immediately nearest to the shared garden wall, the extra height will still present an obtrusive and dominating mass plainly visible towering high above the shared wall.

As well as impacting the enjoyment gained from the patio area, this additional height will block a lot of light from entering the main living spaces in the Garden Flat in 8 Strathray gardens, which currently enjoy a bright outlook through a large sash window and large double patio doors.

As well as blocking light entering the property during the day, the proposal will also present the opposite problem of light pollution at night, by allowing light to exit from the side-facing windows and roof-lights. This light will spill in the side-windows of all of the properties in 8 Strathray Gardens and present a considerable annoyance.

The extra glazing also will represent a material loss of privacy to those in 8 Strathray Gardens, as well as offering unobscured views into the proposal from the upper floors of both 8 and 7 Strathray Gardens!

Finally, the current structure has a grass roof which means that it effectively blends into the leafy, green gardens around it. This grass roof effectively camouflages it when looking out of the windows of the first and second floors of 8 Strathray Gardens. Although the new proposal has a similar roof finish, the large glazed areas (and the views into the inside of the structure they offer) and brick sidings will be highly conspicuous and prevent the camouflage effect the current structure enjoys.

To summarise my objections: too close, too tall, and too much glazing.

Yours,

Mr M Dibb

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/4949/P	Jesse Carroll	08/12/2018 11:15:50	OBJ	<p>████████████████████ This new proposed structure is going to dominate the left-hand side patio and large double doors in to the primary living space of Flat 1.</p> <p>The proposed structure comes right up next to the communal wall between numbers 8 & 10, dominating that side of the house. In addition, it will block sunlight through 3 windows and a double door throughout the year. The patio of number 8 is used daily throughout the summer and the proposed structure will impact on the sunlight able to reach the patio.</p> <p>Currently the views from the upstairs windows overlook the roof of the existing structure, hidden by the grass roof. The new proposals are presenting a much more brutalist brick structure that is larger and more obtrusive on the eye and less able to blend in to the garden background.</p> <p>I object to the proposed plans.</p>
2018/4949/P	Mourad Boutros	04/12/2018 19:56:16	OBJ	<p>We occupy the top flat of the adjoining property at No 8 and we submit our objection to this application. We are particularly concerned that the proposed scheme is a much larger structure than the one that it proposes to demolish and replace with a much higher roof that will overlook our communal garden. This will impact our enjoyment of our communal garden as it will tower over it and block the natural light and will be a ghastly sight as it is mostly made of brick. The scheme goes counter to the ethos of our Conservation Area and it will demolish the fine architectural features that Camden is committed to preserve. The scheme also aims to cover all space around the structure therefore impacting our party wall and potentially creating hazard around our building. Also we have been in the process of selling our flat but now we believe what you are doing will have impact on our sale price.</p>