
From: Peres Da Costa, David
Sent: 28 May 2019 08:21
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 2019/1515/P application / OBJECTION

Can this be logged as an objection on M3 and added to HPE RM

Thanks

David Peres da Costa
Senior Planning Officer

Tel.: 020 7974 5262
Visit camden.gov.uk for the latest council information and news

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 May 2019 17:28
To: Peres Da Costa, David <David.PeresDaCosta@Camden.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: 2019/1515/P application / OBJECTION

*dear david,
i forgot to paste the enclosed into my documentation of my objection by mistake
please can you add for me
and confirm all received and in order
thank you
mrs bacal
24a netherhall gardens*

TREES

*we cannot stress enough that these 5 trees are our amenity and our outlook. we bought our house as we love the greenery and trees around us and knew this is a Conservation Area. T
The views, our screening, our privacy and outlook are key for us at no [REDACTED] if these 5 trees are removed we will loose all of the above, as well as in their place instead we will have to endure overlooking and the imposition from the roof terraces at close proximity without any screening of any description which cannot in any way be fair to an existing neighbour or enhance the Conservation Area in any way possible.*

as stated in APPEAL DECISION OCT 16 appeal ref APP/X5210/W/16/3145922

point 15. There are a number of other trees on the boundary between nos. 26 and 24 [REDACTED] as I saw during my site visit. The appellant indicated at the hearing that the trees were category C at best and therefore not worthy of retention. However, in the absence of accurate information about their condition and justification for their removal I find that it has not been demonstrated that their removal would not be contrary to Policy DP24 of the LDF Development Policies which seeks to secure high quality design and Policy DP25 which aims to conserve Camden's heritage.

and in the Conclusion of the same document

"In addition that lack of justification for the removal of trees between nos. 26 and 24 [REDACTED] also weighs against the scheme."
"

BASEMENT

points 4 -13 of the appeal decision APRIL 19 appeal ref APP/X5210/W/18/3204394 illuminate all the pertinent points immediate neighbours are concerned about especially at no 24a, pertaining the depth and proximity to our property and all the adjoining worrying matters that accompany this.

Dear [REDACTED]

I can confirm receipt of your objection.

David Peres da Costa
Senior Planning Officer
Regeneration and planning
Supporting Communities

Tel.: 020 7974 5262
Visit camden.gov.uk for the latest council information and news

From: Billie Bacall <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 24 May 2019 13:25
To: Peres Da Costa, David <David.PeresDaCosta@Camden.gov.uk>
Subject: 2019/1515/P application / OBJECTION

hi david please confirm receipt of the enclosed thank you mrs bacal

dear david,

i am writing regarding planning application 2019 / 1515/P
i strongly object to this application
i strongly agree with all pertinent points raised by neighbours and especially those of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] on behalf of the NNA
as the immediate neighbour to no 26, and the property which these plans will have
detrimental effect we have serious concerns.
we have instructed kim gifford arboricultural consultant and david kemp DRK planning
consultants to prepare reports on our behalf which will be sent to you in due course
our concerns are the following:

1. window 78
serves a habitable room not a hallway as developers suggest
my daughter also has her study area at her desk here - is she meant to study in darkness
especially during the winter months?
these plans will rob us of 50% of our daylight and sunlight factor thus breaching the BRE
guidelines.
the higher authority of the planning inspectorate stated in the 1st dismissal report that this is a
habitable room after he inspected our property during his site visit

"At ground floor level the effect of the proposed development would be to reduce light levels to a room which serves as a link between the larger main living areas to the front and rear of the property and also leads to the stairs to first floor level. I saw during my visit that this space was much more than a hallway and in my view was a habitable room. As the side window to this room faces the ground floor of no. 26 and contains obscure glazing I do not consider that the outlook at ground floor level would be adversely affected to a significant degree although there would be an appreciable loss of daylight to a habitable room."

2. trees and greenery

removal of 5 trees on our boundary far too many should be protected and have TPO status

kim gifford states these trees are category B not category C as has been suggested by developers report

developers tree report is misleading - measurements are not correct. mr gifford made his own measurements which are in his new report. developers measurements accommodate building plans but the correct measurements cannot support these plans.

e.g. magnolia tree in our garden misrepresented in measurements it is much larger and taller than has been noted in developers tree report

please refer to his original report with other important and pertinent details which refer to our trees in our garden which have not changed and probably been growth in the last 3/4 years as well

these trees are our amenity they provide us with screening and privacy and our outlook.

they are healthy - show no signs disease

global concerns over air pollution and climate change therefore need every bit greenery as possible all trees should be protected even if only for this reason

if trees are removed they would add to ground instability in our already precarious patch of netherhall gardens where there is widespread subsidence, cracks on properties, dry soil, underpinning necessary, real and serious concerns for all living in the area. 26 netherhall gardens sits at the apex of 2 slopes

impossible to reinstate planting in the 1 metre gap between our boundary and proposed building so there will be ultimately no more greenery possible between the buildings and we will not have our amenity of any greenery and will instead have massive overlooking

public amenity there are 4 benches on our stretch of netherhall gardens. i do not know another street in london thus given. many people use these benches. public amenity is huge.

one bench sits directly outside no 26. people enjoy to sit, read a book, quiet moment.

the front garden offers greenery and screening and visual serenity. if the front garden is rearranged to remove foliage and trees and instead put a garbage area this is certainly not an improvement or enhancement for our conservation area and streetscape.

on 23/5/19 at 12.17 comments were posted regarding the trees supporting wildlife and local environment and i wholeheartedly support these very important comments

GREEN SPACES

reducing size of front and back gardens loss of open green spaces back garden already diminished. garden should be protected in accordance planning guidelines to maintain the green open spaces 25% of front garden will be lost with its greenery and shrubswa the Conservation Statement recognises that through views to leafy back areas is an important characteristic of the Fitzjohns and Netherhall Conservation area - if these trees are removed this is contrary to this statement

developers suggest these trees not visible as local amenity - totally wrong POINT 5.10.1

TREE REPORT

these trees are. very visible. they are a grouping offering an amenity

they are not small as been suggested. [REDACTED] neighbour opposite comments that from their window they enjoy the greenery as well on street level

3. BASEMENT

this is clearly a double basement

due to the necessity to dig out so much earth and so deeply because the basement is large and runs far into the back garden which is on a slope so need to dig deeper at the back than the front. totally unacceptable. camden's local plan i believe only allows 1 floor basement again worry effect of subsidence

worry to 24a and 24 structural problems to our properties
no documentation provided showing 100% guarantee no damage to our properties
building 1 metre from our boundary too close unnecessarily so
apex two slopes on the hill
very bad idea to dig so deep down
neighbouring properties affected
local drainage could be negatively affected
i support catrien harris's observations of such potential damage and problems by this
basement proposal

4. design

proposals disharmonious to neighbouring properties
plans excessive too large for the site envelopes the original building
poor and unsightly design at the front lack of garden at the back green spaces diminished
window designs appalling not in harmony surrounding properties
overall this design does not enhance in any way the existing building or our stretch of street
point 4.4.4. of design and access statement - these notes from the planning inspector relate to
the last proposals - not this proposal. therefore including this as a basis for approval for this
application is misleading.
the notes pertaining how our daylight and sunlight will not be compromised are not evident
at all in this plan point 4.4.4. of design access report. clearly window 78 is still compromised
hugely for example. therefore a misleading statement

5. loss of views between street and rear gardens

no other properties on right side of the street have a 1 metre gap its too tight too small u
cannot see any greenery through such a tight alleyway on south side street of netherhall are
some large terrace houses these houses have a shorter gap but they were designed as such to
sit in a row.
design and access statement fig 4.2.4 clearly shows this
this uniformity on the other side of the street has nothing to do with the more natural free
flow of buildings on the other. side of the street
the east side of the street has a different character with much greenery especially through the
buildings so planning application with 1 meters gap is foolish and totally not in keeping with
the conservation area
unacceptable that will be visibility to recycle bins and refuse area front garden
clearly better to have the present greenery and trees as public amenity

6. roof terraces

we will have severe overlooking into our garden and property.
we will be exposed.
will be hugely overlooked especially into our private garden areas
our property value will be diminished because of this.
massive loss of privacy

7. window 76 [redacted] bedroom

outlook and amenity seriously compromised
will be akin to looking down an alley there will be a sense of enclosure will impact on my
[redacted] mental health. its a small room and loosing this amenity will have detrimental
effects. will feel like being boxed in the space inside the room. my [redacted] will not have his
privacy.
planning inspector's report ist dismissal / point 12 and point 14
"At first floor level of no. 24a the only window serving the bedroom closest to no. 26 is small and is
angled at approximately 45 degrees toward the neighbouring property. The window adjoins a wall which
extends eastwards which restricts daylight to the bedroom. Whilst setback from the southernmost

extent of the proposed building, adjoining this bedroom the proposed development at first and second floor levels would, in my view, result in a material loss of daylight and an increased sense of enclosure" "Consequently I find that the loss of daylight and increased sense of enclosure experienced by occupiers of no. 24 and the loss of daylight and sunlight experienced by occupiers of no. 28 would be harmful to their living conditions. The proposals would therefore be contrary to Policy CS5 of the Camden Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy, 2010 which seeks to protect the living conditions of residents and Policy DP26 of the LDF Development Policies, 2010 which aims to manage the impact of development on neighbours."

6a BUILDING LINE

proposed building is far forward from our building line. the proposal should be pushed back to meet the line of 24 and 28 .as it stands by pushing out the building line encroaching on green spaces and putting a high roof terrace on top will be an eyesore for the whole community and especially for us 1 metre away and totally not in keeping with our conservation area no-one else has a large 2nd floor terrace which everyone in the locale can see and vice versa.

6b. as [REDACTED] for the NNA has highlighted misleading floor plans and artist impressions - so no real clarity and exact definition presented. because this is misleading it is unfair to make sound judgement on the application.

eg fig 4.6.8 of design access report depicts greenery enhancing the look of the facade of the building but this would be unachievable based on the application

fig 6.7.2 proposed view again misleading artists impression depicts a tree in front garden boundary 24 which does not exist and profound greenery which again will not exist as developers want to cut the trees on the boundary and clear shrubs front garden and loose 25% front garden. clearly the frontage will never ever look like this even in time.

7. general notes

this application is no small matter for the impact it will have on our property.

numerous points not just one point that concern us

. developers time and time again over the last 5 years show total disregard for the local environment, neighbouring properties, neighbours wellbeing. it is unfortunate that their desires do not match the locale of their plot. for this very reason i urge the council to refute their plans. they need to be guided back to the drawing board to assess what is realistically possible and beneficial for all what to submit.

NB / neighbours notes about park [bench no 26](#)

i would like to add that the residents of no 26 do not use this.as they have their own private garden.they are all polite and responsible residents and enjoy the benefit of living i the NW3 locale. it is usually school children from the local secondary schools or random young people who use the bench and on a few occasions have been a bit noisy as befits their ages

i strongly request the council to refuse this application

thank you

a. bacal

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.