

| 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> |
