
From: Elizabeth Richardson [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 January 2022 13:06
To: Planning Planning
Cc: Ramesh Depala; Charlie Goldblatt; Jennifer Balcombe
Subject: Re: Comments on 2021/5066/P have been received by the council.

[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 Sir/Madam

I received this acknowledgment on 31 Dec 2021 from Camden Planning after we put our letter of comments onto the portal of the below Planning Application. It hasn't appeared on the website yet.

Yours faithfully
Elizabeth Richardson



Sent from my iPhone

> On 31 Dec 2021, at 11:28, planning@camden.gov.uk wrote:

>

>

> Dear Sir/Madam

>

> Re: Planning Application No 2021/5066/P

>

>

> Please accept this email as our formal objection to the above planning application submitted by Dan and Louise Chamberlain ("the Applicants") of 11 Burghley Road, London, NW5 1UG on 6 December 2021.

>

> [REDACTED]

>

> [REDACTED] have written a letter of formal objection dated 30th December 2021, which they will send by email. We wish to state that we are in total agreement with all the points made in that letter. They have listed the chronological history (see Nos 1-17 in their email) and we would ask you to refer to this before reading our comments listed below. Different planning officers may not be aware of the long history. The structure suggested in the latest Application No 2021/5066/P is for "Installation of balustrade and external steps from roof of rear ground floor extension to garden of dwelling house. [Revised description for consultation purposes]".

>

> Please note that we are not only objecting to the latest plans for the erection of a balustrade/railings but we strongly object to a terrace on the roof of the extension which the balustrade is designed to surround. The terrace will overlook our garden, meaning that we will lose our privacy, will shield light (especially if a trellis or plants were erected) from our bedroom French doors and would have noise nuisance implications. We also object to the steps from roof of rear ground floor extension to garden of dwelling house if this would mean that the roof of the extension would be used as a terrace by the Applicants. As stated, [REDACTED] (but also by ourselves [REDACTED] in past emails to Camden Planning) a huge terrace covering the whole extension including the

████████████████████ was never included in any of the plans submitted by the Applicants. A small walkway was included at No 9 side on a previous Application but never a full-roof terrace.

>

> • What has already been built does not comply with previous applications (2018/4262/P, 2019/0110/P. We did alert Camden Planning on 18 August 2020 that a structure had been built which did not comply with the submitted plans. Please refer to my email sent to Bethany Cullen at Camden Planning (cc'd to Ben Farrant and Ramesh Depala) on 18 August 2020. We received a reply which included:-

>

> "The developers have been warned and if they so continue to build then they do so at their own risk knowing that the extension may end up having to be significantly altered or demolished."

>

> The developers did continue . . .

>

> • Shading: Two planning officers have already visited our garden area at ██████████ and agreed that it was necessary for any extension to remain below the boundary wall between ██████████ which is approximately 10 ft in height next to our bedroom. This area allows us sunlight in the summer by our French doors which is very important to us. If access to the roof of the Applicant's extension adjacent to No 13 is permitted, then the growing of tall shrubs, etc, on the flat roof becomes a possibility which would prevent the enjoyment of our tiny garden space. (I make this point because plants have already been placed on the roof of the extension ██████████ side by Applicants). I am an artist and light is a priority for me. (From the compass on the architect's drawings it is possible to envisage the direction of the sunlight at different times of the day). Contrary to architect's drawings on Applications, no trellis existed between No 11 ██████████ until the Applicants suddenly erected one in 2018. (We have dated photographic evidence which has been submitted to your officers in the past demonstrating this point). The Applicants have since removed this trellis.

>

> • Amenity Space for Applicants on Roof: It is suggested that if your officers permit the extension as it has been built at present, the footprint of the garden area covered over by the extension has simply been moved up on top of the extension in the form of a terrace (contrary to anything which appeared in any of the submitted plans) to make a new amenity space for the Applicants. Neighbours appear to have been disregarded. If this is allowed by Camden Planning, then we have lost our privacy and there is an opportunity for nuisance, noise and overlooking from those using this space. A terrace on top of the extension will look directly into our garden area.

> NOTE: This space is already being walked upon, and as mentioned, planters have already been placed there suggesting that there is the intention to place further trellis/plants/obstructions which will shield our light.

>

> • External steps from roof of rear ground floor extension to garden of dwelling house: We object to external steps being built as this gives access to the roof of the extension which is overlooking our garden.

>

> • Site Visit: We would be grateful if you would make a third site visit to inspect the extension to see and understand that what has been built follows neither Plan 2018/4262P nor 2019/0110P and to help you comprehend that the newly formed roof terrace increases the potential for nuisance, noise, loss of privacy and light and therefore will adversely affect the lives of the residents ██████████. I believe the two previous Planning Officers (Emily Whittredge and Ben Farrant) who came round ██████████ to view the planning application on two separate occasions were aware of the problems which would occur if the proposed extension was above boundary level height.

>

> • Balustrade itself: We do not feel comfortable making a comment of any kind on the balustrade as that might be construed, in some way, as suggesting that we endorse its right to be there. We have noted, however, that during the few weeks on which Application No 2021/5066/P has been displayed on Council Planning website the design of the railings has changed from "brickwork and clear safety glass panels" to "metal railings". We strongly object to both designs as there should be no requirement for any balustrade as no roof terrace extending across the whole surface area of the roof of the extension from ██████████ was suggested in the applications nor ever approved.

>

> We hope that warnings given in the past by Camden Planners regarding any breaches will be acted upon by the Planning Department and that your officers will not simply accept the structure which is there as complying with

submitted plans. We, as Camden residents, have to rely upon the planners to prevent anything unlawful from being built and used in a manner which will seriously affect the lives of immediate neighbours.

>

> We object in the strongest possible terms to the Application No 2021/5066/P.

>

> Yours faithfully

>

> Elizabeth Richardson & Philip Gladstone

>

>

>

>

> Comments made by Elizabeth Richardson and Phil Gladstone

[Redacted]

> Preferred Method of Contact is Email

>

> Comment Type is Objection