

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5744/P	Diana Kossoff and Daniel Kossoff	01/03/2025 23:55:22	COMMNT	<p>We have seen the objection of our neighbour the owner of 45 whose first name is Zita we agree with those objections. We own 49.</p> <p>We are concerned about the height of the fill in of what is now the passageway at the rear of 47 (adjacent to the side of the back addition). One of the plans appears to indicate that it will be well above the height of the existing ground floor of the back addition. This will inevitably considerably darken the natural light to our ground floor window of our rear reception room (and may even give a common law right of light issue). If we have understood the plan correctly we object to that height.</p> <p>We object to any extension of the foot print of the building beyond the main rear wall of the existing back addition of 47. We think that is oppressive development.</p> <p>The plans misdescribe the existing topography of our back addition making it extremely difficult to assess the application. We would like the plans redrawn accurately for further review. We are happy to discuss all this but have run out of time.</p>
2024/5744/P	Miss S Ifan	01/03/2025 15:21:46	OBJ	<p>Strong Objection on the grounds of 1) overdevelopment and 2) sustainability.</p> <p>1.1 The wholesale demolition of the rear element of the house, and the rebuilding of which on Ground and First Floor levels, along with the full width extension of the Ground Floor to the "rear line" proposed, as well as an extension at second floor level and roof dormers, constitutes overdevelopment.</p> <p>1.2 The local recent permissions sighted within the Architect's Design and Access Statement (pp.6-10) are scarce (only two on the road that resemble the volume of the proposal, one of which a clear outlier as it's positioned at the end of the terrace). These are of poor quality and do not represent exemplars, nor do they automatically set a precedent for this sort of development on the remainder of the street.</p> <p>1.3 The suggestion that the rear building line is in the location shown in the Architect's D&A Statement (page 12) is disingenuous. This line is taken from lightweight garden structures abutting the main rear elevations. The rear line of the rear "closet wings" are what accurately represents the true rear building line along the street.</p> <p>2.1 Measuring the demolition plan 1906-3-N-0-100, 30% of the building (i.e the entire rear "closet wing") will be demolished which is materially huge.</p> <p>2.2 Quite apart from the immense disruption and dust to immediate neighbours and indeed wider street, the proposed wholesale demolition of the rear of the house should be unacceptable to Camden on sustainability grounds.</p> <p>2.2 Camden declared a climate and ecological emergency in 2019.</p> <p>2.3 This application is not compliant with Camdens Planning Policy CC1: Climate Change Mitigation, where the Council require all developments to minimise the effects of climate change.</p> <p>2.4 In particular all development should "e) require all proposals that involve substantial demolition to demonstrate that it is not possible to retain and improve the existing building". This has not been demonstrated and the opportunity of retrofitting has not been explored, nor has the subject of sustainability been covered anywhere within the Design and Access Statement or wider application.</p> <p>2.5 It is clear from documentation that had this been explored, the existing structure is sound and fully capable of being effectively retrofitted to minimise wastage and disruption. However this has been ignored at potential huge inconvenience and cost to neighbours and the wider community.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5744/P	Peter Scotney	01/03/2025 14:11:34	OBJ	<p>1.0 Objection to Demolition</p> <p>I strongly object to the application's claim that demolishing the original outrigger is necessary. Based on the provided photos, the masonry appears to be in a condition typical of historic structures that have been recently neglected. Completely demolishing and rebuilding the rear section will result in modern brickwork that lacks the original patina developed over more than 100 years. This alteration will starkly contrast with the neighboring buildings and disrupt the architectural harmony of the area. Additionally, such extensive work will cause significant disruption to local residents.</p> <p>2.0 Overdevelopment Concerns</p> <p>The proposed third-storey rear extension constitutes overdevelopment. The substantial amount of glazing at this level raises privacy concerns and could become a nuisance for local residents. The scale and design of this extension should be reconsidered to better align with the surrounding area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5744/P	Zita Nevile	01/03/2025 18:10:18	OBJ	<p>Objection on the grounds of 1) overdevelopment and 2) sustainability.</p> <p>1.1 I contend that the wholesale demolition of the rear element of the house, and the rebuilding of which on Ground and First Floor levels, along with the full width extension of the Ground Floor to the "rear line" proposed, as well as an extension at second floor level and roof dormers, constitutes overdevelopment.</p> <p>1.2 The local recent permissions sighted are of poor quality and do not represent exemplars, nor do they automatically set a precedent for this sort of development on the remainder of the street. Only two on the road that resemble the volume of the proposal, one of which a clear outlier as it is positioned at the end of the terrace).</p> <p>1.3 The suggestion that the rear building line is in the location shown in the Architect's D&A Statement (page 12) is disingenuous. This line is taken from the highest point of the roof of the lightweight garden structures abutting the main rear elevations. The rear line of the rear "closet wings" are what accurately represents the true rear building line along the street.</p> <p>2.1 The demolition proposed is materially huge. it is proposed that 30% of the building (i.e the entire rear "closet wing") will be demolished.</p> <p>2.2 This will cause significant dust and disruption to immediate neighbours and wider street.</p> <p>2.3 The proposed wholesale demolition of the rear of the house should be unacceptable to Camden on sustainability grounds. This application is not compliant with Camdens Planning Policy CC1: Climate Change Mitigation, where the Council require all developments to minimise the effects of climate change. In particular all development should "e) require all proposals that involve substantial demolition to demonstrate that it is not possible to retain and improve the existing building". This has not been demonstrated and the opportunity of retrofitting has not been explored, nor has the subject of sustainability been covered anywhere within the Design and Access Statement or wider application. The documentation does not suggests that the existing structure is not sound and fully capable of being effectively retrofitted to minimise wastage and disruption. This has been ignored at the potentially huge inconvenience and cost to building's neighbours and the wider community.</p>
