

02/06/2019

The Planning Office
TAO: Mr. Thomas Sild
London Borough of Camden
London

Planning Applications: 2018/5982 and 2019/2316

Dear Thomas,

Further to our conversation of last week please find following our objections to the above applications for planned work at 9 Nassington Road (the "property"). As you confirmed during the week objections can be lodged until end of today the 2nd June – unfortunately your website is down and I cannot access the drawing set or any other documents lodged with the applications. (I attach a screen shot of the web fault for your information – please note the day and time "Sun 13:44" in the top right corner.)

I have however a set of drawings I understand were lodged with the earlier application (2018/5982) and make my comments based on those. As I cannot access the second application – which you told me only pertain to the increase in width of the proposed new installation of terrace doors at upper ground floor level I can only make general comments on that in the notes below.

My partner and I have lived in [redacted] Nassington Road as our family home since 2005, we have only made very modest modifications to the property and I represent our family's interests in this matter. We are direct neighbours of No. 9 and our properties share a party wall.

In general, we have no issue with residential property improvement in this area as long as the work approved and executed is consistent with the values of the conservation area and serve to preserve both the character and value of residential property in this special defined Conservation Area.

To that end, we have no objection to the proposed plans regarding the front elevation of the property.

With regards the side elevation (facing No. 7), we do have an objection to the meaningful change in the roof line proposed by the installation of a dormer window at roof level.

Obj 1: Our houses are semi-detached and mirror each other in most respects, one of those being the roof line and it is our view that the installation of this proposed dormer unbalances the combined building in a meaningful way and detracts from: the authentic nature of the street, the attractiveness of the combined building, and the value of our property. We also note that very few houses of similar configuration in the area have had

①

side dormers installed and we would prefer to keep the authentic configurations of the street-visible roof lines intact as originally constructed.

A related point we would appreciate you noting is that we do recall from earlier design documents that the proposal contemplates a meaningful reduction in chimney breasts within the house, obviously something we have no objection to, however we do want to make sure that the external chimneys remain and are hopefully restored back to original form.

Our remaining objections pertain to the Ground Floors and the proposed new extension to the rear of the property.

We have three specific objections:

Obj 2: Whilst no dimensions are included on the drawings I have studied, it appears to us that the proposal contemplates a 5.4m (approx.) long extension at Lower Ground Floor level. That is a full 2.5m greater length in extension than on our property. To us this seems excessive and fundamentally changes the bulk, the visible mass, of the building's footprint to the detriment of neighboring properties and the conservation area in general. To be clear we would not object to a more modest extension and totally understand the desires of the new owner to open their house up to the light and rear garden.

Obj 3: We are *extremely concerned* with the extent of earth excavation at lower ground floor level that this proposal contemplates. Two issues concern us; the time, inconvenience, noise, dust, dirt, vibrations and pollution which will be created by this work, and the increase in risk to the stabilisation of the party wall and our property from the extraordinary depth of excavation contemplated. We do not object to the idea that the Lower Ground floor be excavated (as has happened prior to our ownership in our house) but like the meaningful increase in the footprint of the building that the 5.4m rear extension delivers we feel lowering of the LG floor datum by the amount proposed is unnecessary and dramatically increases both the inconvenience of neighbours and the stabilisation of the building.

The ceiling height in our lower ground floor is approx. 2.4m which would appear to be approximately the same as the rear portion of currently configured No.9. The drawings contemplate a new ceiling height of approximately 3.38m which implies excavation of an additional metre of earth across the entire footprint of the building. To my calculation that is approximately 110 cubic metres of spoil needing to be excavated, moved and trucked from the site. Is that entirely necessary? As it will meaningfully increase the inconvenience of neighbours already dramatically disturbed by this work. This is starting to look like a dreaded "super-basement" of days past and thankfully now widely restricted around London.

The increase of ceiling height, and so depth of excavation, also undoubtedly increases the risk of destabilization of the party wall. Whilst I am fully aware that this issue should be specifically addressed in a party wall agreement it is worth mentioning here that I am uncomfortable with that risk. In addition, this dramatic excavation meaningfully increases the inconvenience caused to my family, two of whom work from home.

Obj 4. Upper Ground Floor Terrace. This "terrace" - which I suspect should be more aptly described as a balcony - runs full width of the rear extension and is approximately 2.5m long. Our balcony which will abutt this "terrace" is only 1.2m. Our objection is that views from this proposed "terrace" will invade our privacy, particularly now that one of the existing trees will be removed in this work. Not only will our Lower Ground floor deck and garden be directly overlooked from this "terrace", which is not the case today – a person standing at the outer edge of the "terrace" and facing back at the rear elevation will be easily able to look onto our upper ground floor balcony and into our main sitting room. We feel that this is a meaningful invasion of our privacy and seriously compromises our current situation. Physical shielding may be contemplated but these would need to be above eye height and run the full length of the "terrace", in other words, bulky and invasive and they would also impede our current view of the trees and nature beyond No. 9's property to the west. A much more restrained solution would limit the depth of the proposed "terrace" to something in the order of 1 to 1.5m.

Given that I cannot access the width increase in the doors to the rear of the upper ground floor which access the "terrace" – contained in the most recent application I cannot comment however as long as they are proportionate and in an appropriate style we are doubtful that we would have any objection to that idea.

We are more than happy to accommodate sensible plans and would have appreciated some consultation with our new neighbours before this point. We would greatly appreciate your consideration of our 4 objections in the deliberations of your committee and welcome any further clarification you may require

[Redacted]
Yours truly,

[Redacted]

2nd June 2019

[Redacted]

[Handwritten mark]