

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2014/5401/P | Sara Jolly | 126A Torriano Avenue NW5 2RY | 23/09/2014 09:26:36 | COMMNT | Design and layout: the proposal to fit 2 new four storey houses into what was the pub garden until 1st September is inappropriate to the character of this mid-Victorian street. They will be the tallest buildings and will dominate a section of the street where the houses opposite have been placed on Camden's Local List as 'a unified row of Victorian houses with important historical features'. The proposed new buildings will be totally out of character. There will be a loss of daylight and afternoon sun to the houses opposite. The pub garden is the end of a row of gardens - a green vista and environmental amenity which will be blocked off by the new buildings. There is no mention of any social or affordable housing. The proposed new build is excessive in size and density of habitation and will ruin the character of this airy Victorian street. |
| 2014/5401/P | Mr Hilary Barnard | 24 Leighton Grove London NW5 2QP | 27/09/2014 11:02:44 | OBJ | <p>I wish to register my objection to this development. I do so on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That this application, if agreed, would represent serious overdevelopment of the site. 2. That contrary to the applicant's claim, this development does damage biodiversity through the loss of the pub garden, which was in use until summer 2014. 3. Contrary to the applicant's claim, this development has significant implications for surface water management through building over existing green space. I note that the applicant makes no provision for rainwater harvesting to mitigate, in part, against the damage that this development would have. 4. That the development represents a significant loss of amenity to neighbourhood and local economy. 5. That the proposed houses, as well as the extension to the pub, would impose architectural features completely out of harmony with the existing, valued facades of neighbouring Victorian properties. Probably due to inadequate examination of the streetscape, the applicant mistakenly suggests that the properties within the street are Edwardian. 6. The application fails to create a properly accessible building for the use of disabled people – particularly those who are wheelchair-bound. There are steps rather than a ramp to the front doors of these two houses. The door opening sizes are not suitable for people in wheelchairs to enter and exit independently i.e. without the assistance of another person wheeling them in and out. There are inadequate turning spaces inside the houses for a disabled person to lead a full and independent life. These and other defects make these houses wholly unsuitable as Lifetime Homes. 7. The applicant has failed to provide appropriate space for bicycles to be used by those living in the house. The handlebars indicated by the applicant are not manufactured for any adult bikes that I know of, as they are far too small! The space allocated to each cycle would prevent their use by those living in the houses independently of each other, as the bicycles are packed like sardines at 300mm centres – which is half the recommended space allocation for access and secure parking of bicycles. The inclusion of this defective provision in the proposal suggests that the applicant is seeking to tick Camden's boxes without the reality of providing workable space for people and their bikes, which I would normally support in principle. |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--|
| 2014/5401/P | Mark Webber | 134 Torriano Avenue London | 15/09/2014 16:29:57 | NOOBJEM AIL | <p>I/We wish to object to these proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * This street has a unique character, one that we love. Contrary to the narrative in the Design & Access Statement : this area is not "run down & untidy" ! Whilst there might be a few neglected properties, this part of Torriano Avenue is one of the best roads in the area, and the houses are generally very well maintained. * A unique characteristic of the street will be lost forever because no 135 currently signifies the natural end of the street. * There will be a loss of greenery which forms a break between Brecknock Road, Torriano Avenue and Leighton Grove. This is mirrored in neighbouring streets. Documents do not seem to refer to the trees / large shrubs in the pub garden that will be removed. * The decision to build, as shown on the plans, is not in character with the rest of the street. * These houses will result in significant over-development, especially if taken in conjunction with the application for flats above the pub on Torriano Avenue, Brecknock Road. * Parking will become much more difficult as there are already insufficient places in this CPZ. There are not enough spaces even now for the number of cars belonging to residents in the immediate area. Creating accommodation for 18 people in the pub & possibly 10 more in the houses is going to increase this problem significantly. * Loss of light and change of outlook. We value our privacy & I bought a house that is not overlooked by other houses, and that also has some open space opposite. The new houses, flats & terraces will dramatically change this, and could affect the value of our property. The lower floor of our house is already quite dark & the new buildings will significantly reduce the light coming into our bay window. * Though the claim is that the new houses will be in fitting with the rest of the street, there is insufficient detail in the drawings to comment on the design or the appropriateness of the materials. The house proposal talks about preserving the local style, but the pub application completely contradicts this with its metallic extension. * The Design & Access statement dated 8th July states that the garden was then no longer in use by the pub, and is an empty yard used to store building materials. This is not true ! It was used by pub customers until the end of August when the tables were moved out into the street. * The houses proposal talks about preserving the local style, but the related pub application (2014/4554/P) completely contradicts this with its metallic extension. * We think it's extremely important for the residents on our side of Torriano Avenue, and also those on Leighton Grove whose properties back onto the pub, to be involved in the consultation. We will all |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------|--|
| | | | | | <p>be effected long term by the development, and inconvenienced in the short term by the works.</p> <p>* There was an intention from the council earlier this year towards making the area some kind of conservation zone - the Local List - what has happened to that ? It seemed to be moving towards restricting us from significantly altering our properties so why are the pub and the pub's garden not affected ?</p> <p>* The work appears to have already started! Don't they have to wait until the plans are approved ?</p> |
| 2014/5401/P | Maria Palacios Cruz | 134 Torriano Avenue London NW5 2RY | 15/09/2014 16:35:16 | OBJ | |
| 2014/5401/P | Mr & Mrs T McIntyre | 103b Brecknock Road N7 0DA | 30/08/2014 13:02:56 | COMMNT | <p>We live in the neighbouring property and our back balcony will be hugely affected with this application. The building of 2 four storey properties will impede on our natural light and privacy. Our buildings are quite old and any new structure will impede on this building.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|--|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2014/5401/P | Jackie Herald | 24 Leighton Grove London NW5 2QP | 30/09/2014 10:44:36 | OBJ | <p>It would appear that not all documents - notably the application form - relating to this application number 2014/5401/P are available online for public consultation and comment. Nevertheless, based on the detailed drawings and documents that are available, I ask that the Council refuses application number 2014/5401/P for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Over-development: the application to construct 2no four storey houses – together with its associated current application 2014/4554/P for 6no residential units involving an extension to the rear and on the roof of The Leighton pub - would generate serious negative impacts, and constitute a totally unacceptable and harmful planning precedent. Contrary to the assertion that this proposed development constitutes ‘infill’, the land to the rear of 101 Brecknock Road is not an ‘infill site’ because it has another purpose. 2. Loss of visual and community amenity: contrary to the Design and Access Statement (DAS) for this application - which states that the site ‘is no longer part of the public house and is in different ownership due to the lack of use by customers of the public house’ - The Leighton’s pub garden has been in very active use – until the day that the developer’s hoardings went up. Business has picked up through the summer, welcoming families and local groups for parties, BBQs and the occasional bouncy castle – as well as a quiet drink and chat in the sun. In early September 2014 hoardings were installed to shut off the pub garden – after this planning application had been registered with Camden Planning in late August 2014. 3. Further misleading and factually incorrect statements: the DAS is dated 8 July 2014. It was therefore misleading and premature, to say the least, for the applicant to assert that the site ‘is no longer part of the public house’ (DAS page 1) and that the site ‘is currently an empty yard used by the owners for storing of building materials’ (DAS page 2) when local residents have clearly witnessed the pub thriving and its garden in lively use till early September 2014. Perhaps the assertion about ‘different ownership’ is also misleading? The applicants for the two proposed schemes (i.e. extensions to the pub and the construction of 2no houses) bear the same surname; it would be surprising if the site reserved for 2no houses was sold without securing planning permission beforehand. 4. Loss of green space and biodiversity: construction of 2no houses on the environmentally significant, though compact, pub garden space would result in the loss of a vital green corridor behind the buildings on Brecknock Road, between Leighton Grove and Torriano Avenue. This neighbourhood provides habitats for many species of birds and invertebrates. This application will damage biodiversity, contrary to what the applicant claims. The greenery of the pub garden is clearly indicated in the photograph on page 1 of the Design and Access Statement for this application. 5. Architectural design out of keeping with the streetscape and existing buildings: the proposed houses have little architectural merit and would misfit the attractive architecture of Torriano Avenue, with its distinctive quoin detailing. The quoins on the corners of 101 Brecknock Road (i.e. The Leighton pub) and number 135 Torriano Avenue frame the space that is the site of this application. The comments on building development in the neighbourhood, and the exceedingly patronising tone of the DAS (e.g. page 2 ‘The area has suffered from poor planning control over many years and is not part of any conservation area, the neighbourhood does have an individual character and sense of identity which is endearing.’) suggest that the applicant lacks respect for the local planning authority and quality of housing in the neighbourhood. All the more reason for conserving the integrity of the street patterns, and rejecting this proposal for 2no new houses. |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--|
| | | | | | <p>6. Unworkable spaces that do not meet the criteria for Lifetime Homes: The application fails to meet the most basic of mobility standards – despite slapping Lifetime Homes criteria all over the plans. It is evident from the drawings that no clear, realistic design principles have been applied to the proposed development. They are opportunistic and exceedingly optimistic, given the compactness of the site. For example, the dimensions given of door widths apply to the width of the door frames, NOT the width of the clear opening. The front door entry width is less than the minimum requirement of 800mm [the door frame measures 800mm wide; but this is reduced to 750mm once the front door is hung!]. In the kitchen there is some space for wheelchairs to pass between sink and cooker; but neither a wheelchair user nor someone dependent on a walking frame would have practical access to the tiny pantry-laundry room off the kitchen [for which the door frame is 750mm wide, but the passable opening is only 630mm wide; similarly for the sliding door into the living room on the 1st floor]. On the Ground Floor, there is inadequate space for a bed in the corner next to the dining table, or for a shower in the toilet. These and other defects make these houses wholly unsuitable as Lifetime Homes.</p> <p>7. Inadequate provision for safe cycle parking, for occupants of the proposed new houses: the cycle cupboard indicated in each front garden of the proposed ground floor plan is totally inadequate and impractical; its internal length is 1810mm – falling short of the 2m length recommended in the Government's Cycle Parking Standards design guide 'Creating Places' and repeated in subsequent publications. The cycles are sandwiched one behind the other, and in turn the cycle storage appears to be sandwiched between the front and side hedges. This does not allow access for securing each cycle to a bracket for security purposes, or easy access to take the cycle out for daily use.</p> <p>8. Invasion of existing local residents' privacy and light: the houses would intrude on neighbouring residents' privacy, also causing loss of light to the adjacent properties.</p> <p>9. Unacceptable pressure on street parking spaces: currently it is extremely difficult to find parking spaces in Torriano Avenue, Leighton Grove and neighbouring streets – especially in the evenings. The construction of 2no houses, plus the increase of residential units over the pub, from existing 1no to 6no, would pose real problems for residents' car parking in the vicinity.</p> <p>10. No provision for surface water management: The proposed development scores no credits for surface water management in the Code for Sustainable Homes pre-assessment report Score Sheet. Of course the foundations required for the construction of 2no new houses, as well as the extensions to the pub, would impact on local drainage. The site is not in a flood zone; however its location at the top of a hill necessitates responsible management and conservation of rainwater from roofs and hardscapes, to avoid surface run-off into the main drains and watercourse. It would appear that this and many other aspects of the proposed development's declared aspirations to achieve sustainable design standards, including Lifetime Homes principles, do not stand up to scrutiny.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2014/5401/P | Chris McWatters | 135 Torriano Avenue London NW5 2RX | 24/09/2014 13:56:38 | OBJ | <p>Objections to proposed development at 101 Brecknock road and rear of Brecknock road</p> <p>We are including our objections to both the proposed developments as one document as it seems to us the proposed applications should be dealt with as a whole. We consider it misleading of the applicant to approach the proposed development(s) in the way they have done as two separate developments and would request the planning authority approach the two applications as if they were one.</p> <p>Right of Light</p> <p>We believe we may have a right of light as the proposed buildings will affect our light in our kitchen/dining room, our courtyard and our roof garden which has been uninterrupted for more than 20 years. We understand that the planning authority have requested the applicant to instruct a right of light survey to be completed. We would wish to see this document and reserve the right to respond through our own instruction if required. We would request the planning authority to visit our property in order to assess the effect the proposed development will have on our home.</p> <p>Right of Sunlight</p> <p>As above</p> <p>Right of Privacy</p> <p>In particular the plans to the rear of the house include large windows that will mean the inhabitants will be able to look into our kitchen/dining room and courtyard / roof garden. Again this is privacy we have enjoyed since living in the property.</p> <p>Design</p> <p>In respect of the two houses it is difficult to comment as the plans do not contain sufficient detail. However it is clear the design of our house was meant to be an end of terrace house and the gap providing between the rear of the pub and our house provides a green corridor that continues along the rear of the houses of Brecknock road to Leighton Grove, and the same gap is reflected between the end of terrace house in Leighton Grove and Brecknock Road house accordingly. The proposed new houses would disrupt the symmetry of the Victorian design of the terraced houses. It should be noted that the plans incorrectly refer to the neighbouring houses being Edwardian and Georgian when in fact they are Victorian. This inaccuracy is concerning as it suggests the architect has little understanding of the neighbouring architecture, which is reflected in the drawings</p> <p>The design of the 2 houses suggest they would both have a greater width than the houses on the street, therefore disrupting the design of the terraced houses. Furthermore the proposed front gardens are not symmetric to the front gardens of the rest of the street and would disrupt the look of the street. (We note that the new owners have reclaimed a significant part of the pavement to the front of the original wall, which we query their lawful entitlement to) We do not accept that the two houses reflect the opposite side of the street in the way suggested by the applicant, especially if this is considered alongside the proposals for the pub building extension, which is intending to include an aluminium side and roof extension, which is in any event, a wholly incongruous loud design for a Victorian residential street. (we note that the proposed design is borrowed from another building in a high street - quite different from Torriano Avenue/101 Brecknock Road)</p> |

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

We are concerned about the proposed design of the rear of the houses as, the windows appear quite at odds with the rest of the street, although again there is a lack of detail as to the rear of the houses, as well as to the rear extension on 101 Brecknock Road.

Overdevelopment

we are extremely concerned that the proposed buildings add to the overdevelopment of the area, which we understand is a concern of Camden, ultimately detracting from the architectural and environmental design of the area.

Parking

We are extremely concerned that there will be significantly more residents parking spaces required. There are no parking spaces in front of the proposed two houses in Torriano Avenue and certainly limited space in front of 101 Brecknock Road to accomodate the 8 residential proposed flats there. In the evenings, we currently struggle to find parking space as it is. There could be 12 or more new parking permits required for this development which the area cannot accommodate in a reasonable way.

Water

We are concerned as to the effect this development would have on water pressure in the area - as it is our home only has 0.8 bar pressure and this would inevitable be further reduced with this proposed development. This needs further exploration with Thames Water.

Subsidence

We are concerned as to the effect this proposed development will have on the problem of subsidence to the buildings in the street, which is a significant issue in Torriano Avenue, particularly at the proposed area of development.

Use of Garden / Garden Grabbing

We note that the applicant refers to the land at the rear of the pub as a builders yard. However up until it was purchased in late August2014, it was a beer garden, used frequently by drinkers in the pub. We query its change of use to a builders yard when no formal application for its change of use has been lodged (to our knowledge). We therefore query whether this is a form of "garden grabbing" for the purpose of building development (which we say as is over-development - see above) and therefore question its lawfulness as such.

We reserve the right to add / amend our objections / concerns as and when new information arises.

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2014/5401/P | Louisa Saunders | 122 Torriano Avenue NW5 2RY | 24/09/2014 15:01:22 | OBJEMPER | I am very concerned about this proposal for a massive over-development in my street. Ours is a Victorian street, carefully planned to optimise light and greenery between the streets and houses. The pub garden completes a row of such gardens. The curve of the street, which finishes with the last house on Torriano Avenue, number 135, would be dramatically altered by the addition of two houses here, and with it the essential character of the street. The height of the building, and their windows to the rear and balconies to the front would mean a breach of privacy for neighbours. They would also block out light. Building at all on this site would be very detrimental to the street, and would set a precedent for concreting over precious garden space. But in addition, the design is entirely unsympathetic and out of character with the rest of the street. In summary, there are no advantages to this plan for any but the developers themselves, who stand to profit from. But there are many disadvantages that would affect the quality of life of those in the area |
