

*Glause*

6 Park Village West, London, NW1 4AE

Camden Planning Dept,  
Argyle Street,  
London, WC1 H8AJD

19th November 2012



Dear Sir or Madam,

Applications 2012/2797/P & 2012/2800/L

I wish to object to the above Planning Applications in respect of No. 3  
Park Village West, NW1 4AE.

Two years ago, Planning Permission was granted to No. 5 Park Village West to undertake a major reconstruction of what is an identical and linked Georgian cottage involving removal of basement soil by means of a running conveyor belt into the street which was powered by a noisy compressor whose motor was running all day, five days a week from 8 a.m. - 5p.m. It was located approximately 1 metre from my dining room windows so meals in that room were out of question for a period of over nine months not only due to noise but ingressing dust.

I had raised objections about the length, extent and degradation to the living environment for myself and my very elderly neighbour in No.7. These were set aside without explanation. When I rang to speak to someone I was told that no account could be taken by Planning to the objections I had raised and that in the event of noise, mud, disturbance etc I might contact the Environment Dept but only after the work had started. I endured 12 months of unrelieved disturbance.

It is because I understand that the Planning Dept now IS able to take these types of objections into account that I wish to object to the above applications. The property in question, No.3, is part of a joined L-shaped run of cottages built in 1821 with very small linked patio gardens at the back. These gardens are bordered at their ends by the high wall of Park Village Mews with the result that building work in this contained space, altogether not even the size of a modest back garden, results in a high level of resounding and reverberating noise around the backs of all the cottages. Frankly, that noise is unacceptable and inconsistent over a period of more than few days with being able to live at a reasonable standard of comfort and peace.

I do not wish to discuss whether these permissions should ever have been granted on aesthetic grounds - in my view they should not. They have altered the character and nature of these historic houses and although modest and essential updating can never be objected to, the drive for additional lebensraum by those whose requirements could easily be met elsewhere, is to me, offensive on moral and ethical grounds, the more so since we are undergoing a period of great recession where the number of homeless grows by the day.

A subsidiary nuisance is the smallness of the crescent itself which barely will accommodate a single car passage so that lorries carrying spoil, and the necessity for daily removal of skips, result in a quagmire of mud, rubbish, blocked parking and a high risk of accidents and damage. No direct access to the back of the property is possible so all spoil and other extract must be either wheel-barrowed out or exit via electrically operated conveyor - acceptable on an industrial site but not on a public pavement and roadway in general and frequent residential use.

I wonder if the Council should be considering whether its Planning Permission Policy ought to fall within the wider strategic policy of the Council to limit excessive disruption whether - as has been accepted by Camden in the case of HSR II - but also in the unnecessary and highly disruptive extensions of already commodious homes. I attach a letter from Today's Times which although the point relates principally to tax, expresses a widely held opinion of underground extensions by the residents of London.

Yours faithfully,

Yve M Newbold