
From: RLJ [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 June 2021 18:04
To: Nora-Andreea Constantinescu
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Application: 2020/0927/P - 31 Willoughby Road, NW3 1RT
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[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 Nora-Andreea,

We have lived at the immediately adjoining property, [REDACTED] since early mid April 2021 (purchased on 25th March 2021).

The application in question, 2020/0927/P, was not brought to our attention during the conveyancing process when we purchased the house.

The applicants, our neighbours, have not consulted us about the application.

Camden has not notified us about the application.

We have only just been made aware of the application by another neighbour.

Please ignore the statements in "March Revision-BIAWilloughby Road_cover letter etc-HIGHLIGHT", that there have been not objections from adjoining properties.

Therefore, for all of these reasons, we have had only a few days to assess the application, its potential impacts on our home and our family and to compose our response.

As immediately adjoining owners who would be one of the most impacted by the proposals we would ask that Camden consider our comments carefully.

Kindly please confirm receipt of this email?

Summary

Having considered the proposals we **OBJECT** to the proposals for the following reasons:

Information Submitted

The drawings describing the application are vague, lack detail and are inaccurate in several crucial places.

For example, Proposed Rear Elevation (109 PLA ELE R) shows what appears to be a new rear-facing window at ground floor level in the rear WC extension. However, this window is not shown on the corresponding Proposed Ground Floor Plan (109 PLA GFP) or Proposed Section CC (109 PLA SEC CC) which should, presumably, show exactly the same information in this location. We therefore do not know what is correct and what is a mistake. To contain such a crucial error about something as simple as a window, we are concerned about the overall accuracy of the proposals and how well this design has been co-ordinated. With something as complex as a basement extension in such a sensitive location, this gives us great cause for concern.

Proposed Section CC (109 PLA SEC CC) also appears to be inaccurate when compared to Proposed Ground Floor Plan (109 PLA GFP) in relation to the area of our rear garden that adjoins what I believe would be a proposed approx. 1m wide strip of garden. Section CC does not show the boundary, or indeed our boundary fence so is incorrect. Given this boundary is proposed to be rebuilt as part of the basement works, I would expect such a crucial junction to be accurately drawn and properly co-ordinated.

Proposed Section CC (109 PLA SEC CC) also shows a large rectangle obscuring our rear facing patio doors. This object does not exist, has never existed and therefore this drawing is inaccurate.

There are no dimensions on drawings and they are unclear as to showing what is existing and what is proposed construction.

The drawings generally do not describe the proposal adequately enough for us to understand what the size, massing, character and therefore impact of the proposals will be.

No 3D visuals etc have been submitted that would show us what the proposals would be like, rather than expecting us to imagine.

All of the above makes it impossible to assess what the real impact of the proposals will be and therefore we ask that the application be refused until accurate and descriptive drawings can be submitted.

Overbearing Impact

The proposals seek to extend an existing WC which has already been constructed as a rear extension at ground floor level along the boundary with our house. This would be done by extending the existing wall on the boundary by some 1.8m further along the boundary to the rear. This wall is some 2.7m high and the extended wall would continue at this height. The affect of this would be to more than double the area of this wall on our boundary which is immediately adjacent to our living room window. This would have a hugely overbearing impact and dramatically increase the sense of enclosure experienced from our rear facing living room patio doors. The fact that Proposed Ground Floor Plan (109 PLA GFP) does not even show our patio doors demonstrates that not enough concern has been shown to our amenity as neighbours.

This overbearing impact and tunnel like sense of enclosure would also be experienced within our rear garden, which again is not shown on Proposed Ground Floor Plan (109 PLA GFP). Our rear garden is extremely small and already enclosed and any further enclosure would be unacceptable to us.

Daylight and Sunlight

The WC proposed to be extended at ground floor level discussed above would cross the notional 45 degree lines on both plan and elevation from our rear facing living room patio doors and would therefore adversely impact our daylight and sunlight as set out by BRE Daylight and Sunlight rules of thumb.

Again, it must be pointed out that the proposed plan does not show our patio doors and demonstrates that the impact of the proposals on our amenity has not been closely considered.

The application contains no daylight and sunlight analysis, calculation or discussion of how the ground floor rear extension would impact us.

For these reasons, we request that the proposals be refused until such time as the applicants can provide BRE compliant calculations and analysis to show that our daylight and sunlight would not be adversely impacted.

Basement Proposals

Rather than re-state all the detailed points in the OBJECTIONS to Planning Application 2020/0927/P: 31 Willoughby Road NW3 1RT in the April PETITION OBJECTION DOCUMENT dated 24 APRIL 2020 from the Willow Cottages, we would also just ask that these points are carefully considered and addressed given the significant potential impact.

Many thanks and please do reach out if anything isn't clear.

Again if you could kindly acknowledge receipt of this objection?

Warm regards,

Richard Lewis Jones &
Tara Chandra

