

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4037/P	Jonathan Merison	17/03/2024 13:10:20	OBJ	<p>As a neighbour of the occupants of 6 Ivor Street, which backs onto the applicant's house, I can confirm that trellis and planting does not provide an adequate screen which would allow privacy to the occupants of no.6 Ivor Street. Not only is their courtyard garden overlooked by the applicant but also, debris from the applicant's terrace does fall into their courtyard; their first floor rooms are also visible from the applicant's terrace.</p> <p>The original appeal decision required the applicant (Condition 10) to "construct an ornamental trellis and obscured glazing" which shall be "1.7 M high". The applicant has failed to comply with that decision.</p> <p>No amount of trellis and planting can provide adequate privacy as any planting is subject to the vagaries of climate, disease and neglect hence the requirement that the applicant should erect obscured glazing to a height of 1.7M.</p> <p>To allow this application would be to condone the applicant's failure to comply with the Planning Appeal decision.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4037/P	Alkarim Jivani	17/03/2024 14:36:53	OBJ	<p>I am writing to make an objection to this application.</p> <p>As you will be aware, this roof terrace was originally constructed without planning permission. A retrospective planning application to Camden Council was rejected. It was given a reprieve only after an appeal to the National Planning Inspectorate which did so "subject to the condition that the ornamental trellis and obscured glazing shall be 1.7M high"</p> <p>In the Inspectorate's view there was not only no question that there should be a trellis and a screen but that both should be 1.7m high.</p> <p>The applicant's removal of the opaque screen was a wilful contravention of that condition and should not be endorsed by Camden Council by retrospectively removing a condition the Inspectorate considered crucial. . Not only does it set a very poor precedent but it effectively signals that conditions attached to the granting of planning consent have no merit and can either be ignored as has been the case here, or simply amended at a later date - as this application is attempting to do.</p> <p>The applicant's provides two main arguments for removal of the condition. First the planting will obscure the view. The screen, as you will be aware was removed some years ago but there is no evidence that planting has obscured the view to date. But even if that were to be the case, it depends on it being fed, watered and generally well maintained and there is no guarantee that that will happen with any future owners of the property.</p> <p>The second argument put forward is that any screen put in place will rattle and create noise but there is no need for this to be necessarily so. Overlapping panels which are firmly secured are extremely stable and other materials are even sturdier. I have an external frosted glass parapet on a property I own which has been in place for nearly 14 years now and hasn't shifted an inch and creates no noise.</p> <p>I would urge Camden Council to ask that the condition of planning insisted upon by the Inspectorate be observed and the screen which was removed be reinstated in order to comply with planning regulations. This allow the inhabitants of the house at the rear not have their courtyard overlooked from above at such close quarters and will also mitigate the noise pollution currently caused by loud music.</p> <p>More important I would urge the council to reject this application because not to do so would set a very poor precedent about whether conditions of planning need to be adhered to or not.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4037/P	natalie kearney	17/03/2024 22:50:53	OBJ	<p>I am writing to make an objection to this application.</p> <p>As you will be aware, this roof terrace was originally constructed without planning permission. A retrospective planning application to Camden Council was rejected. It was given a reprieve only after an appeal to the National Planning Inspectorate which did so "subject to the condition that the ornamental trellis and obscured glazing shall be 1.7M high'</p> <p>In the Inspectorate's view there was not only no question that there should be a trellis and a screen but that both should be 1.7m high.</p> <p>The applicant's removal of the opaque screen was contrary to the planning conditions obtained and one which the Inspectorate considered crucial. Not only does it set a very poor precedent but it effectively signals that conditions attached to the granting of planning consent can either be ignored as has been the case here, or simply amended at a later date - as this application is attempting to do.</p> <p>The applicant provides two main arguments for removal of the condition. First the planting will obscure the view. This can only happen when there is foliage / greenery that is properly fed, watered and maintained and is sufficient to provide obscuring of the view, which seems to not be the case.</p> <p>The second argument put forward is that any screen put in place will rattle and create noise but there is no need for this to be necessarily so. I not a builder but I can imagine that panels securely fixed, and which are stable, should not rattle or move.</p> <p>I would urge Camden Council to ask that the condition of planning insisted upon by the Inspectorate be observed and the screen which was removed be reinstated in order to comply with planning regulations. This allows the inhabitants of the house at the rear not to have their courtyard overlooked from above at such close quarters and will also mitigate the noise pollution currently caused by loud music. Where houses are so close together, privacy as well as being able to enjoy your outside space is paramount to mental health and well being.</p> <p>More importantly, I would kindly urge the council to reject this application because if you don't it would set a very poor precedent about whether Camden's planning conditions need to be adhered to or not.</p> <p>Kind regards, Natalie</p>
