

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2833/P	Laura Evans	108b Agar Grove London NW1 9TY	29/06/2014 17:16:12	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to the proposed development at 51 &amp; 53 Agar Grove on the basis that the proposals as outlined in this application are harmful to the setting of the Camden Square conservation area.</p> <p>The visibility of the metal clad extension to the rear of the main building from Agar Grove is unacceptable, breaking up the established rhythm of paired villas that make up the townscape along this street.</p> <p>The mass and bulk of the development is excessive and out of keeping with the area. Efforts to gain as much uplift as possible on the small site have led to the creation of low quality internal layouts, with north-facing single-aspect habitable rooms (note also that a full set of floor plans does not seem to be available for inspection via the planning website). Additionally, the poor detailing and architectural quality of the Agar Grove elevation merely pays lip service to its neighbours, and as a result is neither historically appropriate nor an exemplar of contemporary design.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2833/P	Jennifer Bramlette	19 St. Pauls Crescent Camden London NW19XN	27/06/2014 14:33:11	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the application for planning permission for a variety of reasons as outlined below. My strongest objection is to the proposed building of a 3 story + basement mews house at what is being called #2 St. Pauls Crescent. I have only minor objections/concerns to the proposed rebuilding of the joined houses at 51 and 53 Agar Grove.</p> <p>The building of a mews house at #2 St. Pauls Crescent constitutes a new-use of the garden behind #51 Agar Grove. I contest this new use. It will result in the loss of 4 mature trees. It will result in the loss of green space in the Camden Square zone. It will diminish the light, privacy and pleasure of property currently enjoyed at #19 St. Pauls Crescent. It will also increase shadows, noise, parked cars and traffic for #19, as well as other properties on St. Pauls Crescent. The vibrations and noise from the construction of the proposed mews house will negatively impact #19.</p> <p>The proposal to rebuild #51-53 is far less objectionable. While it would be preferable to see the Victorian properties restored as they were for the sake of the historical beauty of the neighborhood, it is also understandable that additional modern housing is required in London. As long as the buildings are structurally no larger than the previously-existing houses, my only objection would be to the proposed roof terraces which will promote increased noise and cause loss of privacy to #19's garden and sun terrace.</p> <p>While the conversion of the derelict properties at 51-53 Agar Grove appear to fit the needs of London professionals and families for flexible housing, the removal of the garden space from these once-graceful houses to squeeze in an assuredly-expensive, single-family home appears more as a profit-making exercise than a building plan to meet London/Camden housing goals.</p> <p>My specific objections to the building of the proposed mews house at #2 St. Pauls Crescent are outlined below:</p> <p><b>** THE DESIGN, SIZE AND HEIGHT OF NEW BUILDINGS OR EXTENSIONS **</b></p> <p>The proposed building at #2 St. Pauls Crescent is a new use. There has never been a house/apartment building here before since the original development of the neighborhood (more than 250 years). The only structure was a dilapidated, small, low-height garage. The building of a house/structure at #2 St. Pauls Crescent is undesirable and I strongly object to it.</p> <p>I note that previous planning permission was granted in 2008 (although I never saw a notice from the Council regarding this planning request, and certainly would have objected) for a 2-story house (as per paragraph 3.13 in the Planning and Heritage Statement attached to this request). While this sets a precedent for potential building on this site, this new proposed structure is one story higher and includes a basement. This new structure is well outside the bounds of the previous approved project. I object to any building on this site, and particularly to the building of such a large/high structure within proximity to the property line of #19 St. Pauls Crescent.</p>

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Consultees Addr:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

Further, while precedent was set for the development of a corner site (the house behind #49 Agar Grove), this was previously the site of a more substantial/higher garage than what sits at the proposed #2 St. Pauls Crescent. Moreover, the space behind #49 Agar Grove was/is next to a large driveway leading to parking and storage units for the council estate and the council estate itself. That property did not abut a private house and garden and the building of the 2 story house did not affect light, privacy, noise-levels, and enjoyment of the tenants of the Council flats in the same way.

The height and position of the new building will block sunlight and cause shadows. Despite the “Daylight, Sunlight and Shadow Assessment” report claiming it is within official boundaries, there will be a change, as acknowledged in paragraph 8.12. While the report claims in paragraph 8.13 that this “will not cause any effects on neighboring properties’ gardens and ... amenity spaces”, I contest that it will. My garden is planted and landscaped to the amount of sunlight currently received and many of my plants will die/diminish with increased shadow and lessened sunlight. Moreover, my sun terrace will be overshadowed by the new building, as well as blocked from level of sun it currently receives. Given that no inspection was made of my property, it is difficult to believe that the particulars of my living space and “amenity spaces” were taken into consideration. This is wholly unacceptable.

**\*\* THE IMPACT OF NEW USES OF BUILDINGS OR OF LAND \*\***

There has never been a house/apartment building on the proposed site of #2 St. Pauls Crescent. It has always been a garden/amenity space. Loss of this green space will remove much needed green spaces from Camden, remove homes from birds and other wildlife, and greatly diminish the views and tranquility enjoyed by #19 St. Pauls Crescent since the building of this neighborhood. Considering that #19 St. Pauls Crescent was built in the 1740s, that is a long time.

The building of the new property at #2 St. Pauls Crescent will force the removal of four mature trees. All are currently healthy, according to the Arboricultural Report. While two have been classed as CatU trees, the other two are a CatB and a CatC. Three of the trees sit within a large Root Protection area for Cat A and B trees. These trees provide homes for birds and wildlife. They provide privacy to the sun terrace, garden and side windows of #19 St. Pauls Crescent. They also provide noise reduction to the properties on the south-side of St. Pauls Crescent from the traffic on Agar Grove. Their removal will lessen privacy, increase noise, and force many animals to rehome. It will also reduce the green space in this area, already greatly reduced by Council decisions to remove a mature cherry tree from the front of #19 St. Pauls Crescent and the auctioning of land in the center of the triangle between Agar Grove, St. Pauls Crescent and Cantelowed Road to a private owner who chopped down a number of mature trees without consent.

Given that #19 St. Pauls Crescent experienced subsidence during the time that #51-53 Agar Grove collapsed due to underground excavation and also due to the shift in tree roots around #19, the proposal to dig a basement within 1 meter proximity to #19 St. Pauls Crescent’s property line and to remove 4 mature trees which certainly have a root system extending towards #19 is deeply worrying.

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Consultees Addr:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

**\*\* LOSS OF LIGHT AND THE PRIVACY OF NEIGHBORS \*\***

As previously noted, the building of #2 St. Pauls Crescent will decrease the light and increase the shadow received by #19 St. Pauls Crescent to the degree that the garden and sun terrace will be negatively affected. The office extension will also suffer from loss of light, as will the kitchen and dining room (ground floor spaces). The first floor will also be under shadows not previously experienced. I would be interested to have more information on how loss of light was calculated, as I do not entirely believe the results reported within the report. In table 7.1, it was noted that there would be a 65% change in light to the garden...surely that is not acceptable?

The building of a new structure just 1 meter from the property fence-line significantly reduces the privacy enjoyed by #19 St. Pauls Crescent, which has always enjoyed a large buffer of green space from the structure on Agar Grove. Moreover, #19 St. Pauls Crescent was always an end-of-terrace with no structure (other than a very low garage) next to it since its construction in the 1740s. The proposed structure at #2 St. Pauls Crescent will have a family located at 1 meter from #19's fence line and will also provide a roof terrace from which people can directly overlook the garden, 1st-floor sun terrace and side windows of #19.

The previous arrangement of 51-53 Agar Grove was two 2-storey maisonettes with large gardens. In the original form, only two families could overlook the gardens and sun terrace of #19 St. Pauls Crescent. The currently proposed structure of apartments will allow significantly more people to invade the privacy of #19's side windows, garden and terrace.

**\*\* THE IMPACT OF NOISE FROM PLANT EQUIPMENT \*\***

Given the proximity of the proposed building to #19 St. Pauls Crescent, noise and vibration from the plant equipment is expected to be loud and invasive for the duration of the works. Given previous subsidence to #19, the vibration from plant equipment is of concern.

**\*\* NOISE FROM NEW USES \*\***

Noise from the increase in persons living at 51-53 Agar Grove and #2 St. Pauls Crescent is expected to be significantly higher than that caused by the previous tenants of 51 and 53 Agar Grove, given that in previous use there were only a total of four 2-bed maisonettes. Now, there are proposed to be one 2-bed and two 1-bed units at ground floor; one 1-bed and one 2-bed units at first floor; one 2-bed duplex and one 3-bed duplex at second and third floor; and a three bed house to the rear of the site. These units will house significantly more people who will produce significantly more noise. The outdoor space will also include roof terraces, which will increase noise as people make use of these new outdoor, high-up spaces.

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

**\*\* THE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON TRAFFIC, PARKING AND ROAD SAFETY \*\***

The building of all these new units will impact already tight parking on Agar Grove and St. Pauls Crescent. The resident of #51 Agar Grove kept one vehicle in the garage on the property and the other tenants parked on Agar Grove. I expect there to be an increase in the number of cars parked on St. Pauls Crescent — at least one belonging to the proposed house at #2, and likely additional cars belonging to the new units at #51-53. There will also be additional people and cars traveling down St. Pauls Crescent, currently a quiet cul-de-sac.

---