

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2014/4554/P | Chris McWatters | 135 Torriano Avenue London NW52RX | 24/09/2014 13:51:52 | 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 August 2014, 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: |
|-----------------|------------------|--|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2014/4554/P | Mark Webber | 134 Torriano Avenue London NW5 2RY | 15/09/2014 16:27:55 | OBJEMAIL | <p>!/We wish to object to this proposal for the following reasons :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * This is a huge over-development of the site. * The roof extension, in particular, is very high and will overlook and dominate the area, creating a loss of privacy and light. The new houses, flats & terraces (especially the ugly metal tower) 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. * The side addition on Torriano Avenue, is unacceptable (between the proposed 2 houses and the pub), being totally out of character with the street. The 'urban' design is completely inappropriate for a traditional, residential area such as this. * The design for the new top floor, and especially the entrance to the flats is horrific. The development should be in keeping with the area and the period of the property, not in contrast to it as they state and intend. That metal tower will be directly opposite our bay window, and we should not be forced to look out on such a monstrosity. * The specific materials proposed for this side addition, and the reason for their use as opposed to traditional materials, are not made clear. * The new balconies will be intrusive and create a loss of privacy for local residents. * There is insufficient provision for internal or external recycling and refuse. * Parking will become much more difficult as there are insufficient places in this CPZ currently. 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. * The existing & proposed diagrams of the pub development misleadingly make it look more attractive by showing the open space of the yard and its vegetation. In reality this will be blocked by the two new houses (application 2014/5401/P). * One of the drawings (3461578) of the new elevation of the pub on Torriano indicates there might be a tree removed from the pavement. * The new houses proposal (by the same developer) talks about preserving the local style, but the pub application completely contradicts this with its metallic extension and additional floor. * 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 |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--|
| | | | | | <p>generally very well maintained.</p> <p>* We are concerned that the long-term intention of this development might be to ultimately transform the entire pub into apartments. The pub plays an integral part in the life of the neighbourhood and its forced closure would be a loss to the community.</p> <p>* 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 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 altering our houses so why is the pub not affected ?</p> <p>* The work appears to have already started ! Don't they have to wait until the plans are approved ?</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2014/4554/P | Maria Palacios Cruz | 134 Torriano Avenue London NW5 2RY | 15/09/2014 16:34:05 | OBJ | <p>I/We wish to object to this proposal for the following reasons :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * This is a huge over-development of the site. * The roof extension, in particular, is very high and will overlook and dominate the area, creating a loss of privacy and light. The new houses, flats & terraces (especially the ugly metal tower) 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. * The side addition on Torriano Avenue, is unacceptable (between the proposed 2 houses and the pub), being totally out of character with the street. The 'urban' design is completely inappropriate for a traditional, residential area such as this. * The design for the new top floor, and especially the entrance to the flats is horrific. The development should be in keeping with the area and the period of the property, not in contrast to it as they state and intend. That metal tower will be directly opposite our bay window, and we should not be forced to look out on such a monstrosity. * The specific materials proposed for this side addition, and the reason for their use as opposed to traditional materials, are not made clear. * The new balconies will be intrusive and create a loss of privacy for local residents. * There is insufficient provision for internal or external recycling and refuse. * Parking will become much more difficult as there are insufficient places in this CPZ currently. 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. * The existing & proposed diagrams of the pub development misleadingly make it look more attractive by showing the open space of the yard and its vegetation. In reality this will be blocked by the two new houses (application 2014/5401/P). * One of the drawings (3461578) of the new elevation of the pub on Torriano indicates there might be a tree removed from the pavement. * The new houses proposal (by the same developer) talks about preserving the local style, but the pub application completely contradicts this with its metallic extension and additional floor. * 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 |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--|
| | | | | | <p>generally very well maintained.</p> <p>* We are concerned that the long-term intention of this development might be to ultimately transform the entire pub into apartments. The pub plays an integral part in the life of the neighbourhood and its forced closure would be a loss to the community.</p> <p>* 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 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 altering our houses so why is the pub not affected ?</p> <p>* The work appears to have already started ! Don't they have to wait until the plans are approved ?</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|--|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2014/4554/P | Charlotte Bence | 17 Leighton Grove London NW5 2QT | 25/09/2014 22:52:54 | OBJNOT | <p>I wish to register my strong objection to these plans, on the following grounds.</p> <p>DESIGN AND LAYOUT The proposed roof extension is too high. This will dominate the area and result in a lack of privacy for neighbours. It is also not inkeeping with the current skyline.</p> <p>EXTERNAL APPEARANCE AND MATERIALS The use of aluminium cladding is totally out of character in this area. The side addition to link up the houses is also out of character and both of these things will cause a negative visual impact on a decent Victorian street. I am also concerned that the materials to be used for this side extension are not specified in the planning brief - are we to have yet more aluminium?</p> <p>LOSS OF PRIVACY The proposed balconies will look directly onto the street and therefore directly into the windows of opposite properties resulting in a lack of privacy for these neighbours. This is highly obtrusive, and not inkeeping with the character of the street.</p> <p>TRAFFIC AND PARKING Torriano Avenue already has insufficient parking for the requirements of the number of residents it serves, resulting in overspill onto surrounding streets. The additional number of properties proposed will only exacerbate this problem, will mean more traffic on our roads with all the resultant health and safety detriments to residents that implies.</p> <p>NOISE NUISANCE The loss of the pub garden will inevitably result in yet more tables and chairs on the pavements, meaning even more noise and nuisance than we are currently obliged to tolerate, particularly after closing times and in the summer months.</p> <p>There is insufficient provision for recycling for six flats and the pub - so where will the pub and residents have their bins? In the middle of the street? Wholly unacceptable, and unsafe. We already have a problem on Torriano Avenue of refuse being left in the road and attracting vermin - the introduction of yet more residences will only exacerbate this.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL I am also concerned that this area has a history of subsidence, as many residents know to our cost. The extra weight on the pub and at the top of the hill is likely to create problems for residents further down the road. Together with the two new four story houses this represents an unacceptable overdevelopment of the site.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2014/4554/P | Mr Joseph Killeen | 17 Leighton Grove London NW5 2QT | 25/09/2014 22:54:43 | OBJ | <p>I wish to register my strong objection to these plans, on the following grounds.</p> <p>DESIGN AND LAYOUT The proposed roof extension is too high. This will dominate the area and result in a lack of privacy for neighbours. It is also not inkeeping with the current skyline.</p> <p>EXTERNAL APPEARANCE AND MATERIALS The use of aluminium cladding is totally out of character in this area. The side addition to link up the houses is also out of character and both of these things will cause a negative visual impact on a decent Victorian street. I am also concerned that the materials to be used for this side extension are not specified in the planning brief - are we to have yet more aluminium?</p> <p>LOSS OF PRIVACY The proposed balconies will look directly onto the street and therefore directly into the windows of opposite properties resulting in a lack of privacy for these neighbours. This is highly obtrusive, and not inkeeping with the character of the street.</p> <p>TRAFFIC AND PARKING Torriano Avenue already has insufficient parking for the requirements of the number of residents it serves, resulting in overspill onto surrounding streets. The additional number of properties proposed will only exacerbate this problem, will mean more traffic on our roads with all the resultant health and safety detriments to residents that implies.</p> <p>NOISE NUISANCE The loss of the pub garden will inevitably result in yet more tables and chairs on the pavements, meaning even more noise and nuisance than we are currently obliged to tolerate, particularly after closing times and in the summer months.</p> <p>There is insufficient provision for recycling for six flats and the pub - so where will the pub and residents have their bins? In the middle of the street? Wholly unacceptable, and unsafe. We already have a problem on Torriano Avenue of refuse being left in the road and attracting vermin - the introduction of yet more residences will only exacerbate this.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL I am also concerned that this area has a history of subsidence, as many residents know to our cost. The extra weight on the pub and at the top of the hill is likely to create problems for residents further down the road. Together with the two new four story houses this represents an unacceptable overdevelopment of the site.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2014/4554/P | Louisa Saunders | 122 Torriano Avenue NW5 2RY | 24/09/2014 12:35:03 | OBJEMPER | I am very concerned about the proposed development of 101 Brecknock Road. This would be an over-development that is out of character with the surrounding area. The height of the proposed building would tower over the surrounding roads and would also threaten the privacy of neighbours. The balconies would also intrude on neighbours' privacy. All our houses are affected by subsidence, and the weight of a development such as this is likely to cause further problems to neighbouring properties. The height of the building and the materials used would greatly alter the character of the street and the layout that goes back to Victorian times |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2014/4554/P | David O'Brien | 131 Torriano Avenue | 25/09/2014 07:46:39 | OBJ | <p>I object to the proposal on the following grounds:-</p> <p>1.All residents in the Streets surrounding the pub should be notified of the proposal. This is a major change to the landscape and make up of the area surrounding the Leighton pub. It will undoubtedly lead to the closing of the pub due to complaints from future residents of the proposed flats who will have to endure the noise of departing customers at closing time and during the warmer months when customers stand outside. As such all residents of local streets should be informed by letter of what is proposed in addition to the immediate neighbours. There are many older residents in the local streets that do not have internet access and therefore do not know what is proposed for this local amenity. They should have the opportunity to voice their concerns or support for the proposed development.</p> <p>2.The documents supplied are mis-leading.</p> <p>The height of the proposed development on drawing BRE-PL-GA-10 is mis-leading as it is shown below the height of 135 Torriano Avenue. The proposed development will be much higher than surrounding buildings and will dominate the sky scene while walking up Torriano Avenue and from Brecknok Road.</p> <p>The privacy screening in drawings BRE-PL-GA-15 and 16 is shown as full height the privacy screening on drawing BRE-PL-GA-05 shows the screening as 1.8m, there is clearly a discrepancy here that should be rectified.</p> <p>3. No on site Parking</p> <p>The proposed development does not have provision for off street parking and does not propose a legal agreement for car-free housing. This would contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area. The design and access statement proposes that the 6 flats would accommodate 18 people. This development has a potential for an additional 18 cars, which could not be accommodated in the surrounding streets. A recent application 2013/6719/P in Torriano Avenue for a single flat was refused because it would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area, it is clearly more of an issue with a proposed development to accommodate 18 people.</p> <p>4. Insufficient provision for waste and recycling.</p> <p>The proposed development shows a provision on drawing BRE-PL-GA-04 for 4 x waste bins. This is insufficient for the proposed 6 units, a minimum of 12 bin spaces should be provided, 6 for waste and 6 for recycling.</p> <p>5. Insufficient provision for bicycle storage</p> <p>The proposed development shows a provision on drawing BRE-PL-GA-04 for 6 bicycle spaces. This is</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|---|
| | | | | | insufficient the design and access statement states that the units will accommodate 18 people, either sufficient on site parking or sufficient on site bicycle spaces should be provided to accommodate the proposed residents. |
| | | | | | 6. The proposed roof extension, by reason of its location, bulk and detailed design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and street scene contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) |
