

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4335/P	Stephen Russell and Anna Mackmin	31/10/2022 12:35:03	OBJ	<p>The plans for the proposed extension at No. 14 St. Paul's Crescent show a clear gap between the new development and our property, No. 14a, implying an intention to build a new wall on No. 14's land next to the existing wall. The new wall would bear the weight of the new roof, act as an effective sound block between the two properties and maintain our modern house as detached and No.14 as the end of the traditional Victorian terrace. If this wall is included as part of the conditions for planning permission then we have no objection to the development.</p> <p>However, after a call to the architect it seems the plans are not exact and there 'may' be an intention not to build a new wall but to use the existing wall and 'attach' the new extension to our property. If this is the case then we strongly object to the granting of planning permission.</p> <p>We object on the grounds that there would only be a thin wall between our kitchen and next door's kitchen and WC and there would be serious noise nuisance as a result of the development. At present, our property is completely detached. There is a shed between the properties made of wooden batons and plastic sheeting that is not significantly attached and is only occasionally used by the current owner. When he does go into the shed we can hear this very clearly. The more frequent and daily use of a kitchen and WC would be a severe impairment to our privacy and the quiet enjoyment of our property (and our noise would potentially be annoying to the new neighbour – because of our particular family circumstances we deliberately chose a detached house to minimise this possibility).</p> <p>We'd object on the grounds that work on our wall would be a severe disturbance. We both work from home and require a quiet environment.</p> <p>We'd object on architectural grounds. Our house is modern (reflecting many of the individual mews type properties Camden is noted for) and attaching it to a traditional Victorian terrace would be an unsightly mismatch and inappropriate. The two styles should not be attached to each other and our house is not appropriate as the end of a Victorian terrace.</p> <p>We object to the widening of No. 14 as it makes what is essentially at present a covered alley into an integral part of the house. This is incongruous visually and against architectural precedent in Camden.</p> <p>We object as our wall was not built to withstand further weight being added to it (we appreciate this, along with adequate foundations, drainage and guttering problems may be outside of your remit but they are serious practical considerations which the plans do not address).</p> <p>We object to the plans saying there is a supposed benefit to us of increased light when the tree is removed when no one has consulted us. It might be argued that the removal of the tree – home to a great deal of wildlife – is an environmental consideration.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4335/P	Stephen Russell and Anna Mackmin	09/11/2022 13:17:32	OBJ	<p>Revised plans have been submitted and as the intentions of the planning permission submission are now clearer we'd like to revise our objection to the granting of planning permission at 14 St. Paul's Crescent NW1 9XL.</p> <p>We object on the material grounds that there would only be a thin wall between our kitchen and next door's kitchen and WC and there would be serious noise nuisance as a result of the development.</p> <p>At present, our property is completely detached (this is specified in previous planning applications e.g. 2015/5096/P). There is currently a shed between the properties made of wooden batons and plastic sheeting that is not significantly attached (and was attached by a previous owner of our property as a courtesy). This shed is only occasionally used by the current owner. When he does go into the shed we can hear all activity very clearly. The more frequent and daily use of a kitchen and WC (flushing right behind our cooker) would be a severe impairment to our privacy and the quiet enjoyment of our property.</p> <p>It should also be noted that noise created by us would potentially be annoying to the new neighbour. Because of our particular family circumstances and the special needs and behavioural issues of one of the residents we deliberately chose a detached house to minimise this possibility (we could elaborate on this privately if necessary).</p> <p>We object on the material grounds that work on our wall would be a severe disturbance. We both work from home and a quiet environment is vital to our employment.</p> <p>We object on the material grounds of design. Our house is modern (reflecting many of the individual mews type properties Camden is noted for and echoed by other DETACHED properties along this street) and attaching it to a traditional Victorian terrace would be an unsightly mismatch and inappropriate. The two styles should not be attached to each other. Our house is clearly not suitable or appropriate as the end of a Victorian terrace.</p> <p>We object on the material grounds of the size of the property. The widening of No. 14 makes what is at present a covered alley with plastic roof into an integral part of the house which is much wider than the current width of the house. This is incongruous visually and against architectural precedent in Camden.</p> <p>We object as our wall was not built to withstand further weight being added to it. We appreciate this, along with adequate foundations, drainage and guttering problems may be outside of your remit but they are serious practical considerations which the plans do not address. We object to planning being granted before they're addressed.</p> <p>We object to the plans saying there is a supposed benefit to us of increased light when the tree is removed when no one has consulted us. Appropriate alternative provision for wildlife should be proposed to replace the tree.</p> <p>We'd also like it noted that the date for making comments on this application as posted in the street outside No.14 is wrong - it states Monday 12th November as the date by which comments should be received. This may mean other interested parties have not been able to object to the plans and the plans should therefore be resubmitted.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**
