

On 09/04/2020, 09:03, "planning@camden.gov.uk" <planning@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Whilst we support the reversion of both no 12 and 14 Maresfield Gardens to single occupancy residential use, we object to the current application on the basis of it being an inadequate application.

The unsigned form accompanying this application refers to 17 drawings. Only one is shown on Camden's website making it impossible to fully assess the nature, extent and implications of the proposals.

Reference is made to "addition of windows to side elevation" in the application form. No further information is supplied to show the nature, location and size of these windows to assess the overlooking impact which will result on the adjacent properties at 10 and 16 Maresfield Gardens. No plans or side elevational drawings are provided.

We oppose the introduction of large terraces at upper ground floor level. These are effectively at 1st floor level and result in severe overlooking of not only the rear gardens of the adjacent dwelling at 10 and 16 but also of gardens in Fitzjohn's Avenue and gardens of properties either side of 10 and 16. This extent of these very large terraces is not typical of the area and will cause considerable loss of privacy. The introduction of side screens will only at best ameliorate the nuisance and not avoid it. No information is given on these screens and their extent will visually dominate as seen from adjacent gardens in Maresfield Gardens and Fitzjohn's Avenue. Again, no site plan, side elevations, ground floor plan and sections are provided to illustrate the impact of these roof terrace proposals.

The introduction of extensive metal railings to the upper ground floor terrace is poor design as seen on the one elevation supplied.

The introduction of full glazing at ground floor and new large windows at 1st Floor indicates that the internal planning will be substantially altered as the original stairs are currently abutting these windows. Full existing and proposed plans should be submitted to assess the full extent of the proposals.

Whilst the introduction of roof lights at the rear is in principle acceptable. The upper group of roof lights indicate the possible intension of introducing an additional floor at roof level. Plans should be shown to clarify.

No plans are shown for the front and rear gardens. The building until it recently became vacant was used for institutional use and the existing front gardens would not be suitable for residential use. There are existing trees in the rear gardens some which are protected. Proposals for the external landscaping should be provided before any application is considered.

Substantial building work has been in progress for several weeks at both properties and the external metal staircase appears to be being removed from no 12 MG. The proposed rear elevation drawing does not illustrate this metal staircases nor show the existing escape doors. Can it be relied upon to demonstrate the changes to the rear elevation?

Stephen Williams

for and on behalf of Netherhall Neighbourhood Association

Comments made by Stephen Williams for and on behalf of the Netherhall Neighbourhood Association of Little House A, 16A Maresfield Gardens, London NW3 5SU

Phone 0207 435 2908

EEmail stephen@osbandpress.co.uk

Preferred Method of Contact is Post

Comment Type is Objection