

Mohammed Ahmed

From: Patrick Meier [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 August 2021 16:49
To: Planning Planning
Subject: Objection to 2021/3242/P

[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.

Objection to Planning Application 2021/3241/P
141 King Henry's Road
London NW3 3RD

We live in the adjoining property 139 King Henry's Road and wish to object to the above planning application.

Wall between 139 and 141

- The proposal incorporates the wall adjoining our property. Apart from Party Wall issues, this would leave a very small gap between our property and 141 at the ground level. We are advised that this would lead to major problems in terms of weathering and access for maintenance.
- When we added our extension at 139, to which the application refers, we specifically did NOT build up to the boundary because of this issue.
- At the time Mr McKay's surveyors also INSISTED that we do not build up to the wall between the properties and that a physical separation be maintained and also raised the issue regarding access for maintenance mentioned above.
- We expect Mr McKay to abide by his requirements regarding our extension and therefore, should the application be approved, NOT to incorporate the wall between us .

Proposal too large and out of character

- The proposed extension reaches across two thirds of the width of the property. This is out of line with neighbouring properties and will be totally at odds with character of the neighbourhood and the guidelines covering the conservation area.
- The proposed extension is right under the bay window of the flat above and will ruin the enjoyment of the garden and outlook for its occupants.
- The size of the skylight is extremely large and will cause light pollution to us at 139 as well as to other flats in 141.
- The reconstruction of the bay window is of concern given the fragile nature of these old Victorian houses. We suffered severe damage to 139 when similar works were undertaken by 137 and fear for the same with this proposal to the building in general and to our foundations in particular.

Effect on neighbours and the environment

- The proposal will be seriously damaging to the other flats in 141. It directly contravenes the covenants on the leases at 141; these covenants were put in place to enshrine the right to unimpaired enjoyment of the amenity of the house for all the residents and should not be interfered with by one resident, to the detriment of the others.
- The light pollution will further degrade the fragile environment for owls, birds and bats and cause disorientation as well as disturbing us at 139 and diminishing our enjoyment of our property.

In summary we object on the grounds of the deleterious effect the overall scheme would have on the adjoining properties, the other residents of 141, the general character of the neighbourhood, and in particular the requirement to leave space between our two properties for necessary access and maintenance.

 Patrick Meier