

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0071/P	Verna Hughes	11/03/2022 11:20:47	OBJ	<p>Objection to the size of the extension.</p> <p>We were advised the proposed extension would be 'squaring off the current outhouse'. This would have been acceptable but that is not what has been submitted in the plans. The current extension is a further 1.4m into the garden forming an extension which is clearly much larger and not inline with the other extensions on Chesterford Gardens.</p> <p>Removing so much of the garden, has a clear environmental impact. Other planning applications have been rejected on the basis that paving over garden in Hampstead has issues for drainage and the environment. The size of the extension should be in line with those of houses 15 and 19.</p> <p>We also have concerns about the roof lights which are much too close to the current house and will clearly cause light issues for the other flats in the building.</p> <p>Access has not been provided for general maintenance such as window cleaning, gutter clearance and roofing works which are a requirement and condition of the freeholder agreement.</p>
2022/0071/P	Verna Hughes	11/03/2022 11:06:03	OBJ	<p>The access to the bin storage area should NOT be from the main entrance but from the side stairs where the bins are currently located. The proposed placement will be unsightly and inconvenience the residents who have no objection to the current bin storage location which is in the same location as the neighbours. On collection days, the bins are currently moved to the open space (where there are no parking bays) between houses 17 and 19 for bin collection and the operatives use the open space for their vehicle and to move the bins. The bins cannot be left in front of number 17 as cars are parked in the bays and the refuse lorries/operatives will not be able to access them. Also, if bins are moved for collection onto the pavement according to the proposed design, the pavement will be blocked for pedestrians.</p> <p>Additionally, moving bins in and out of the storage area on the main stairs will damage the tiles on the base of the stairs and may accidentally damage the stone stairs.</p> <p>This has not been thought through and our previous request to change the plans have not been taken into consideration.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0071/P	Melih Odemis	12/03/2022 22:44:20	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden Planning Solutions Team,</p> <p>We kindly object to this planning application. Although we have no comments on the west elevation refuse store design, we are quite concerned about the design of the new proposed full width east elevation rear extension.</p> <p>Here are our concern points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scale of the proposed new extension are overbearing in every dimension. <p>A) Its length is more than 6m, which is longer than their existing extension on the non-bay side, and requires extensive digging in their rear garden. They even proposed a flat terrace after the extension, which will require even more digging. We have a big tree in our garden labelled as Tree T2 in their plans. The tree base is 2.5m above our own patio – with quite along, but steep rake upwards. The safety and practicality of this proposal needs to be questioned therefore. The tree officer from Camden will, we suppose, need to get involved. We suggest that a full garden design should be required with the planning application. We are very worried about scale of garden digging, the amount of work required and the safety of digging so close to the tree.</p> <p>B) It's a full width extension. We are very aware that a full width extension in Chesterford Gardens would not be in harmony with the characteristics of our conservation area, and also would not be subservient to the main dwelling. Extensions in our street, including our extension are only on the non-bay window side of the rear elevations. Actually when we purchased our own house, and submitted our pre-planning application on March 2018 (2018/0598/PRE), it was kindly rejected by your team with mainly this reasoning.</p> <p>C) The planned height is about 3,6m. This is higher than the existing close boarded fence, which separates our garden from 17. This will likely materially reduce our amenity in the lower patio – in terms of sunlight, enjoyment of our outside areas and will probably create an overbearing sense of enclosure. We kindly ask for a full daylight / sunlight assessment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. As it can be clearly seen in the plans, the sheer volume of the proposed extension and adjacent terrace will come at a big cost of lost green area in a highly protected and cared conservation area. 3. Our rear garden, very similar to theirs has a steep geography. In the case of number 17, the slope of the rear garden starts within 1-2m to the bay window side of the dwelling. In order to build the extension proposed, very extensive digging will be required in an area with very limited access for garden digging equipment. It will probably create very substantial disruption for flats 17-B and 17C; and also for us being their adjacent neighbour. <p>Kind Regards</p>