

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Penelope Davis [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 September 2014 14:52  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Re: Comments on 2014/4654/P have been received by the council.

This comment is an OBJECTION

On 13 Sep 2014, at 14:51, <planning@camden.gov.uk> <planning@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

- > The proposals are not in keeping with retaining the look and feel of this conservation area.
- >
- > These houses, designed by Quinnell are in the simple arts and crafts style, reducing the soft landscape and creating extensive parking area destroys the look of the street.
- >
- > This work has almost been completed. I am surprised that Camden is prepared to tolerate work going ahead without permission as well as the destruction of 4 trees - again without permission.
- >
- >
- > Comments made by Penny Davis of 29 Briardale Gardens, London, NW3 7PN
- > [REDACTED]
- >
- > Comment Type is Comment
- >
- >

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Watts, Sam  
**Sent:** 05 September 2014 13:41  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: 2014/4654/P

Please upload onto idox

Sam Watts  
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 6552

-----Original Message-----

From: nicole sochor [REDACTED]  
Sent: 05 September 2014 13:40  
To: Watts, Sam  
Subject: 2014/4654/P

Dear Mr Watts,

I would like to object to the plan at No 14 Briardale Gardens to enlarge their driveway. There are several grounds for objection.

Firstly, this application should be referred to Camden's Highways Department for comment. There is an excessive amount of single yellow line area on either side of No 14's house, which should be turned into more parking bay area. There are huge parking pressures on Briardale Gardens, and residents have enough trouble finding space to park their own car. They compete with businesses, builders and visitors in this very busy and congested area adjacent to Finchley Rd. No 14 already has substantial off-street parking for several cars and the largest off-street driveway on the street. Now, it wants to enlarge it further, and to do so, will require free passage over that precious 'single yellow' area - an area which is already used informally for parking outside of the restricted hours of 12.30-2.30pm. The applicant claims that no on-street parking spaces will be affected. However, that is not quite accurate given the actual use of the single yellow area for informal parking. I suggest that Camden could enlarge its parking bay area by several feet on each side of 14 and should do this, rather than allow No 14 even more parking.

The proposal is contrary to the Redington/Frogna Conservation Area Statement.

The section: Works to Frontages says:

"A number of front gardens have been turned into parking areas, and what should be a soft landscape with a path, possibly tiled becomes a hard surface. The principle is not acceptable and further loss will be resisted."

The Conservation statement singles out Briardale Gardens for special comment as SubSection 1, as a street of houses of 'modest scale' with 'front gardens founded by low walls and hedges to give an informal domestic feel'.

The applicant proposes demolishing part of its low front wall, and increasing its parking area. The intent, it would seem, is to turn a modest Briardale House into more of a Ferncroft Avenue mansion. This is not in keeping with the rest of the street. Camden is bound by the Conservation statement to 'safeguard its special character'. Distinguished architect Charles Quennell had an overarching plan when he designed Briardale Gardens, the original garden suburb street, in 1897, and the houses were designed in alternating pairs of two designs to complement each other and

be elements of an overall design. By enlarging No 14's forecourt, this would make No 14 inappropriately over-dominant on the street.

The Conservation Statement notes the special contribution made by vegetation and street trees. Also, permission must be given by Camden before trees are cut down. No 14 has cut down five very large mature trees, apparently without permission. This is to be greatly regretted. The trees were a sound and visual shield against ugly building and construction work, and now they are gone. It is a loss to the street. The case should be referred to Camden's tree officer for enforcement action.

It has been noted that No 14's contractors are using a heavy skip, which is balanced on a number of breeze blocks on the steps on the front drive. This would appear to be unsafe. The skip is not on solid ground. The support could collapse. The skip could slide onto the pavement with nothing to stop it coming in the path of pedestrians.

I do not mean to be unneighbourly, but many people on the street are upset by the loss of the trees, and I feel obliged to add my comments.

Nicole Sochor  
33 Briardale Gardens