

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4661/P	Andrew Farrington	15/12/2023 15:16:41	OBJ	<p>I welcome the investment to allow occupation of the house.</p> <p>It would suit a family of between 4 and 5 people, as per the other houses in the area.</p> <p>The plans do have occupancy at 8 or 9 people, which would be over occupied for a house of this size. It is on the basis of over occupancy and overcrowding that I object.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Between 8-10 people (including children) is too many for the size of the house (bedrooms, bathrooms, kitchen) and so would overcrowd the house.</li> <li>2. The increased coming and going associated with over-occupancy will impact the noise levels on the street, including privacy and quiet enjoyment levels. This would not be the case for a 4-5 person family occupation (including children).</li> <li>3. The over-occupation plan may be a route to subdividing the house, which again would lead to over-occupation.</li> <li>4. Sub-division of the house may lead to Camden turning the house into temporary accommodation, further exacerbating noise levels, peace and quiet, and potential to lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour on the street.</li> </ol> <p>Camden Council often veto new development (apartments for young professionals) as it is 'not the right type of accommodation', meaning affordable for families. I hope that this investment provides that sought after accommodation for a family, and not the route of over-occupancy.</p>

Regards,

---

2023/4661/P	Nicholas Farnell	14/12/2023 15:14:57	OBJ	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I am a resident of the street for 20 years and have not seen such an application for over occupation before, 8 maybe more persons . The potential for further occupation is also possible and is completely out of balance with the vicinity and the level of surrounding occupation, including those properties already converted . Yes of course the house needs to be brought back into use but I must ask you to reconsider these plans . We have put up with a lot on this street , the persistent drug dealing , whilst being very accommodating to all positive Council proposals. We have a strong community and desire some privacy and a right to have a level of peace within our house . We have always been engaging and active in street events .These houses are also very porous on noise ,as from personal experience, was hugely debilitating with a private rental next to our house on the top floor . We spent a great deal of money to attempt to soundproof so we think is fully justified to object to a proposal that would see even more in the residence than exists on our side and its associated effects. This would in my opinion set an unreasonable precedent , out of step with the conservation area and previous attitude of Camden planning to maintain the balance and peace in one of its most community led and engaging streets . Please I ask you to reconsider these plans.</p>
-------------	------------------	---------------------	-----	--

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4661/P	DPCAAC	17/12/2023 15:25:47	OBJ	<p>Twisden Road is noted in DPCAAMS as being “An exceptionally well-preserved street and roofline, exhibiting a pleasing sense of unity” with No 39 Twisden Road making a positive contribution to the character of the area.</p> <p>Although we are pleased this building is to be renovated and brought back to use as a single family dwelling, DPCAAC has objections to elements of this application.</p> <p><b>SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</b></p> <p>The Council has a crucial opportunity to contribute to establishing an energy efficient building that creates a climate resilient property thereby meeting the Council's policy objectives and climate commitments outlined in the Climate Action Plan 2020-2025.</p> <p>Extra loft insulation and external wall insulation to the walls of the existing and new extensions are welcome but there is insufficient detail to the proposed new double glazed doors and windows to assess their thermal efficiency and demonstrate that the alterations to this designated heritage asset will not harm the character or appearance of the CA.</p> <p>A judgment cannot be reached on the basis of the sparse information submitted.</p> <p>1:50/1:20 scale drawings should therefore be submitted to ensure details are a true match to the existing and meet SPG Energy Efficiency and Adaptation (2021) guidance. Point 8.6 states: “Double glazed panels can now be fitted into some original wooden frames, without the need to replace the whole frame. This helps preserve the historic character of the building and should be considered”. Other measures in Table 3 of the SPG should also be considered.</p> <p><b>NEW EXTENSION</b></p> <p>The light coloured render to the new and existing extension together are a visual improvement. At a distance of only 10m to the glazed extension of No 42 Chetwynd Road opposite there will be significant loss of amenity to those residents, see SPG Amenity (2021): 2 "Overlooking, privacy and outlook". However there is precedent for this type of infill extension. Mitigation measures could be considered by raising the back boundary wall.</p> <p><b>REAR SECOND FLOOR TERRACE</b></p> <p>This second floor terrace is unlawful with no planning permission but has been in place for some years. It appears a former tenant converted a window into a door to allow access to the flat roof space. Had planning permission been applied for, it would certainly not have been granted as it conflicts with the policies below. DPCAAMS Appendix 5 - Issues affecting the whole of the CA noted the negative impact of: “Unsympathetic rear and side extensions (including inappropriate roof terraces)”.</p> <p>DPNF Policies DC2 and DC3.</p> <p>Policy DC4: Small residential extensions, supports proposals for small residential developments (including roof, side and rear extensions) where the development:</p> <p>(b) does not harm the amenity of neighbouring properties (in particular in respect of privacy, overlooking and loss of light).</p> <p>SPG Amenity (2021): 2 Overlooking, privacy and outlook – in particular 2.4 states “that to ensure privacy it is good practice to provide a minimum distance of 18m between the windows of habitable rooms in existing properties directly facing the proposed (either residential or non-residential) development.....”. The rear of No 42 Chetwynd Road directly faces the rear of 39 Twisden Road. The distance between buildings is 10m, falling significantly short of this minimum requirement.</p> <p>This present situation is clearly unacceptable, inflicting substantial harm to the amenity of Nos 40/42 Chetwynd</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Road as well as adjacent neighbours in terms of privacy and overlooking.</p> <p>The property as a single family dwelling already possesses a garden which like all other Twisden Road properties is sufficient for a 3/4 bedroom house in Camden.</p> <p>The Council now has an opportunity to restrict its use for amenity purposes by imposing a planning condition to this effect. This would remove its impact on surrounding residential amenity, particularly in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy and the use of neighbours own amenity areas. The original window could be reinstated.</p> <p>DPCAAC therefore strongly objects to measures that legitimise the amenity use of this flat roof space.</p> <p>Given the proposal indicates a potential household of eight adults or more, sound insulation should also be considered for the inadequate party walls to mitigate the effects of noise on the occupants of No 37 Twisden Road.</p>

---