[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 18 March 2014 12:38
To:
Cc: [redacted]
Subject:

Dear Lilian,

I hope you are well.

I have objected to this application and will let you know any news.

Allbest,

Simon

[redacted]

Sent: 14 March 2014 03:27
To: Carr, Seonaid; Carr, Seonaid
Cc: Leyland, Claire-Louise (Councillor); Spinella, Gio (Councillor); Marcus, Simon (Councillor); Mennear, Andrew (Councillor[redacted]
Subject: Planning application 2014/1037/P

RE: 10 A Oakhill Avenue, London NW3 7RE

Application Ref: 2014/1037/P

Associated Ref: 2013/3477/P

For the attention of Ms Seonaid Carr,

The character. siting and design form of the proposed dwelling house emphasizes excessively the bulk, scale and size of the building that is in a highly visible location, at the junction of Oakhill Avenue and Greenaway Garden. It detracts from the environmental character of RedFrog CA and in particular of Oakhill Avenue (DP 25.3) It fails to establish a design relationship with Oakhill Avenue buildings and in particular with the adjoining number 10 block of flats. This proposal adds one further floor to the existing building, too closely to the pitched roof of number 10 and is invasive and unrelated to the predominant form of the street skyline and the prevailing material and details that are part of the environmental qualities long established as the RedFrog character.

In contrast, the existing building breaks down the apparent scale and size of the building bulk, using separate blocks and a setback of the main building. The proposed change will obliterate the views from the dormer windows of my habitable room at number 10, which exist by the Northeast side corner from where all the roofscapes and street trees, on both sides of Oakhill Avenue Northwards towards Redington Road are currently in view.

The choice of quite alien materials, such as bronze frames proposed for the window surrounds, bronze canopy, steel panel, and aluminium garage doors makes this proposal for a four-storey dwelling house depart from the traditional RedFrog conservation area character materials, associated with brick and timber windows. Thus, the proposed

four-storey dwelling house departs from the prevailing character of the majority of the street's dwelling houses and flats.

The design proposal fails to justify the demolition of an existing neutral building, choosing to substitute it by another neutral building design. This is an unacceptable loss of opportunity to create a special architectural project for a block of flats for this particular location.

The RedFrog CA does not need a mega-block of flats that will result from this proposal which extends beyond the existing rear building lines, spreads through and reduces large areas of existing verdant garden. This will alter completely the rain water regime that sustains trees, plants, shrubs, worms, insects, birds, owls, squirrels and foxes. Recent Camden Biodiversity report accepted responsibility to ensure that the fledgling new and revised green policies support such biodiversity values and seeks to protect the existing green corridor, which is one of the topographical features that runs between Oakhill Avenue and Heath Drive, enhancing their value to control climate change. The level differences ensure a biodiverse green valley and corridor to the this area. The current proposal will, thus, have a detrimental effect on the existing air quality and noise pollution to this valley of outstanding biodiversity.

Furthermore, the block of flats spread by affecting the existing topographical levels will also affect its entire water run regime, thus deserving entirely the serious comment produced by Thames Water that stated their inability to accommodate into their waste water infrastructure the needs created by application proposal Ref 2014/1016/P (DTS Ref 39753), which I presume is also applicable to the present application.

Even if the report's conclusion considers the loss of sunlight and light as being minimal, this finding bears no relationship to the effect that will be created by the substantial loss of garden and boundary trees to make room for construction, that will certainly introduce overlooking of number 10 habitable rooms on the North East and West facades by the proposed increase over the height and depth of garden take-up next to number 10, beyond the existing rear envelope. It will obviously open the opportunity for noise and visual intrusion from the various levels of excessively large patios, balconies and terraces of number 10 A to the side and back gardens of number 10 block of flats.

The new block of flats side extension, above the upper ground floor level is located approximately at 700 mm from the site boundary from number 10, and 1200 mm from number 8. However, the basement, sub-basement line is sited next to the boundary line of number 10 block of flats. Due to further depths use to create flats numbers 1 and 2, the resulting height and the associated structures, the total basement may result in a depth of 11m down from the ground floor level at the front of number 10A and number 10. Considering the comments provided in number 10A IBA report, there is a clear need to investigate further the hydrological report findings and the possible risk of subsidence for number 10, as well as the landscape report which apart from suggesting the need for substantial planting does not shy of endorsing the loss of substantial number of trees necessary to make room for extending (by 12.5 m) the new construction of excessive accommodation, balconies, terraces, patios, oversized lightwell and garden or how the proposal could endanger number 27 Heath Drive garden/property or avoid subsidence claims in the future. It should also mention that this block of flats extension would impose an obstructive blank wall, possibly 4m in height over sections of the lower garden level of number 10.

The London Plan and Camden policy advice for blocks of flats near transport links should be limited to 1 parking space per flat. The proposal suggests 5 parking spaces and to include 2 car parking spaces already leased to number 8.

No proposal to attenuate the levels of noise and vibration to be expected from lift over run and motor room, water tanks, plant equipment, as well as basement air-conditioning is put forward. These are very important details to protect adjacent roofs, as well as to protect flank walls and back gardens. They should be centrally located, inside the dwelling house, so as to contain the impact they will create. Proposal for extensive terraces, green roofs and photovoltaic panels should be tested, not simply empirically suggested. Local conditions can defeat design solutions. Remedial measures must be realistically proposed for the reasons I described previously for application number 2013/3477/P, which was refused. I sincerely hope that Camden has been able to address and progress the reserved reasons already published as part of refusal, particularly reason number nine raised for this refusal, that required sufficiently comprehensive and robust assessment of the provision of affordable housing, which the applicant has failed to demonstrate that an on-site or off-site contribution is not the appropriate method for ensuring the provision of affordable housing (policy CS6 and policy DP3). It is an important element for balancing the socio-economic and environmental balance of RedFrog conservation area as well.

No concession should be allowed, to accommodate the demolition of the concrete embankment of number 10A, which is located next to number 10 or demolition and erection of main stairs to first floor entrance door that might prejudice the life of very important oak trees. The survey plan excludes this concrete embankment outside number 10A and connects it to number 10. Even if ownership of this tree is a civil matter, independent of planning, at this point this should be questioned as to why the proposed site plans depict this embankment and oak tree outside the boundaries of number 10A.

Considering my arguments I strongly urge you to refuse permission to this application and avoid the creation of precedents. I also wish to be notified of the committee date and the decision that is finally reached.

Thank you for your attention.

With best wishes,

Lilian Z Brafman, MRTPI, PhD (Bartlett School, UCL)