From:
 Helen Vassilakas

 Sent:
 19 June 2022 21:00

To: David Fowler; Jaspreet Chana

Cc: Planning Planning

Subject: OBJECTIONS Planning Application 2021/6234/P 14 Glenmore Road

[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.

ATTENTION JASPREET CHANA AND DAVID FOWLER

I have not received a reply from either of you to my email sent on 21 March 2022 with my concerns and objections on Application 2021/6234/P.

I understand that there has been some delay in the application.

Please acknowledge receipt of the 21 March email which is copied below and advise on all concerns with up to date information

Thank you

Helen Vassilakas

```
> On 21 Mar 2022, at 21:59, Helen Vassilakas > FOR THE ATTENTION OF DAVID FOWLER > REF: PLANNNG APPLICATION: FLAT 1, 14 G;ENMORE ROAD, LONDON NW3 4DB > PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension, alteration to front light well boundary wall and associated works > APPLICATION NO: 2021/6234/P > Dear David Fowler >
```

> . . .

- > It has just come to my attention that Flat 1, 14 Glenmore Road is
- > applying for planning permission for work that will involve front
- > boundary wall with basement and a back extension

>

- > 12 Glenmore Road has just recuperated from damage to the building `and
- > loss of tenants through what appears to be similar work completed at
- > 10 Glenmore Road, NW3 4DB

>

- > I have not been able to trace on Camden's Planning Portal, the
- > architectural drawings on the proposal, although I have found the
- > proposal

- >
- > However even without the drawings I object strongly to the following two proposals:
- > 1. Changes to Boundary Walls.
- > Any changes to the boundary wall in which the original grey intricate stonework/brickwork is not retained.
- > They are an important feature of the period and the road itself.
- > They are also within a conservation area.
- > The majority of buildings on the Road still retain them.
- > Where they have been lost and replaced by other boundary means they detract much from the beauty and individuality of the road.
- >
- > 2. Rear Extension:
- > The rear garden of 14 Glenmore Road is small.
- > The rear garden of 12 Glenmore Road is even smaller and would be greatly enclosed with an extension wall.
- > Both gardens do not have much light and the light in the smaller
- > garden of 12, but also within its building on the ground floor, will
- > be adversely affected by an extension at 14 The above applies to both gardens in the opposite buildings in Glenlock Road The fork created by Glenmore Road off-shooting from Glenlock Road makes the majority of gardens very small for those buildings lucky enough to have one.
- > Most buildings in both Roads have the original French doors with
- > coloured lead windows which would be destroyed by extensions To allow
- > an extension for 14 Glenmore sets a precedent which would be
- > detrimental to the whole of both Glenmore Road and Glenlock Road and
- > specifically to 12 Glenmore
- > I assume the Planning Committee who make the decisions will be
- > provided with a google map arial view of the garden spaces between the
- $\mathbin{\hspace{-0.05cm}\text{>}}$ two roads involved I also assume that my objections will be given in
- > full to the Planning Committee Please advise if this is correct
- >
- > I would be grateful if you would advise me on the link required for seeing the architects drawings of the proposals.
- •
- > I would also appreciate being advised on the safety precautions that
- > will be taken for neighbouring buildings as I have, as yet, not been
- > approached by the owner, Marianne Brun-Rovet of Flat 1, 14 Glenmore
- > Road
- >
- > I thank you in advance for your prompt reply on all above
- > Helen Vassilakas

>