
From: Peres Da Costa, David
Sent: 06 February 2020 17:17
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 26 netherhall gardens proposed development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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 -----Original Message-----

Sent: 06 February 2020 16:21

To: Peres Da Costa, David <David.PeresDaCosta@Camden.gov.uk>

Cc: Cullen, Bethany <Bethany.Cullen@camden.gov.uk>;

Subject: 26 netherhall gardens proposed development

Planning application 2019/1515/P

Dear David

I write as owner of [redacted] netherhall gardens which is next door to the proposed scheme .

I am totally dismayed to hear that the council meeting regarding this application will be done without a public hearing and a without a say from the very neighbours that are badly affected by it especially as it has been refused previously. This can be construed as a bias favouring the developer at the expense of the very multitude of neighbours who have strongly objected to it going ahead and who are most affected. The objections you have received are not small and therefore a proper hearing is deserved and the scheme has been refused by 2 separate inspectorates as well.

The scheme has objections on many levels which have been voiced by well over a dozen residents and on which I have taken advice on as unacceptable for approval.

1) excessive destruction of trees on 24 which is their rightful amenity. Why should they suffer from loss of screening and loss of privacy as well as enjoyment from the trees. I'm advised that the tree plan submitted by the developers is also totally inaccurate. The submission of their tree drawing on the impact assessment plan submitted on planning website is not in line with the proposed layout and doesn't represent the new scheme but the old scheme.

2) The appearance of the new scheme is substantially different in fenestration design to 28 and 24a -any architect will advise you of that and this is a conservation area so it is Camden's responsibility to make sure that the character is kept in line with the rest of the street . Please come and view for yourself and it will appear evident how odd ,

weird and different the design will look next to our building. How come their is no site visit this time ? We have always had site visits in the past .

3) The underpinning of the existing building will lead to ground movement to 24 and 24a which is unacceptable and I'm advised that there are no calculations for underpinning so how can this be approved.? The fact that the existing building needs to be underpinned as well as the side extension shows that we have not been shown the whole scheme which is misleading . Double basements which this is should not be acceptable ! . The basement proximity to neighbouring properties is also unacceptable .

4) The top floor 2nd terrace of proposed scheme will overlook 24 and I'm advised that councils dont usually approve overlooking . Why would camden be biased otherwise and take a different line ?

5) the rear extension goes beyond the building line of 28 and again this is usually not acceptable . why would camden take a different view ?

6) the proposal would call mass darkness to 24 study as the inspectorate calls it , rather than what the developers call a hallway which is misleading . Why should a resident child study in darkness as a result of appeasing developers? The loss of daylight is at unacceptable BRE levels.

7) The development sit on a slope in excess of 7 degrees hillside setting which is a concern -come and have a look at the fallen trees and sheds at the area behind 26 to see subsidence and ground movement.

If the inspectorate refused this twice, its for a reason and the residents deserve to be heard.

regards

