

Hazelton, Laura

From: Swag Shop (London) Ltd [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 January 2021 12:40
To: Hazelton, Laura
Cc: 'Sarah Robins'
Subject: PLANNING APPLICATION 2019/3948/P - OBJECTION FROM STUART LIGHTBAND LTD, OWNER OF FREEHOLD OF 47 NETHERHALL GARDENS, NW3

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Laura Hazelton

I am emailing you rather than objecting via The Camden web site because we are shocked to see that the Objection we posted on 16th October 2019 (copy below) does not appear to be in the Application document section with the other Objections and comments Previously submitted.

I called you on or around the 21st October 2019 to say that our objection had not appeared on the web site. You confirmed by email on 21st October 2019 that you had definitely received our online Objection and there were often a few days delay before it would appear.

ORIGINAL OBJECTION (not posted)

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 2019/3948/P - proposed basement to 47d Netherhall gardens
POSTED ON CAMDEN WEB SITE ON **16th OCTOBER 2019** - on behalf of Stuart Lightband Ltd

We are the freeholders of 47 Netherhall Gardens, comprising 10 flats.

We own the forecourt, accessed from Netherhall Gardens, of which 47, 47b, 47c and 47d adjoin.
We would like to make you aware of the following:-

As stated, 47d Netherhall Gardens adjoins our forecourt and There are limitations in the owners title on their ability to carry out certain works. The 1949 Transfer imposes restrictive covenants on the owner of 47d Netherhall Gardens including:-

- Not to park any vehicles of any description on the land edged blue on the plan – this is effectively the forecourt of 47 Netherhall Gardens.
- Not to make any structural alterations modifications or extensions to the exterior of the premises... without the plans first being “submitted to and approved by the Transferor”.

We strongly object to the planning application submitted on the following grounds:-

Having been given access, by Mr Rohan Heath of 47c, to the report from the consulting engineering firm Eldred Geotechnics Ltd Mr Heath employed to give opinion on the BIA report (conducted by CET Infrastructure) we fully concur with Mr Heath's objections submitted.

Some of the findings from the Eldred geotech Ltd report are extremely worrying and we are deeply concerned about the possible danger to the foundations of our forecourt and the surrounding buildings and our services and drainage that run through the forecourt.

We completely agree with Mr Heath's other objections to the proposed development and consider the extent of the proposal to be over bearing on a small site, especially as the house is in a conservation area.

In particular we are also concerned with the proposed light well bordering on our forecourt and the loss of valuable amenity this would cause. The existing flower bed, which is proposed to be replaced by a light well, is appreciated by all the residents around the forecourt and very visible from the road.

Another of our big concerns is the long term noise, mess and disturbance from the construction of the proposed development for all the neighbouring residents.

In view of the above and all the other objections that have been put forward We feel there are very good reasons to decline this application.

Yours faithfully

Sarah Robins

CURRENT OBJECTION

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 2019/3948/P - proposed basement to 47d Netherhall gardens
DATED 21st JANUARY 2021 on behalf of Stuart Lightband Ltd.

Following recent discussions and correspondence with Mr Rohan Heath, owner of 47c Netherhall Gardens, his latest letter to you reflects and includes our objections to the proposed Development and to avoid repeating everything we ask that you please take Mr Heath's objections as reflecting our own.

In particular, referring to Mr Heath's letter, we would like to bring several points he has raised to your attention, as they would directly affect our driveway and courtyard.

These points are:- 4.7.13.16.23,24,29,37,42 and 59.

Our Solicitor has raised a point of extreme concern to us that the Applicant Has failed to make any contact with us To survey our Courtyard and verify boundaries especially bearing in mind there is a restrictive Covenant in place, as detailed in our previous objection, which he will be Fully aware of.

Also of great concern to us is how the Applicant could construct the proposed light well, which would have to be done from his property, bearing in mind the Covenant On 47D.

We cannot see dimensions for the proposed light well (assumed boundaries) and are therefore unable to determine if it reflects the true boundary.

Surely this should be established and submitted so you can determine if this would provide sufficient light for the proposed basement.

We mentioned previously the loss of valuable amenity if the existing flower bed is proposed to be replaced by a light well and we would also like to point out the "light bleed" from the proposed light well which will affect all the surrounding residents.

In view of the above and all the other objections that have been put forward We feel there are very good reasons to decline this application.

Kind regards

Sarah Robins

I would be grateful if you would confirm receipt of this email

Kind regards

Sarah

STUART LIGHTBAND LTD

Sarah Robins: [REDACTED]

Kind regards