

[REDACTED]

From: SUE ROBERTSON [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 August 2014 16:20
To: Planning
Subject: Fwd: Planning Application 2014/4559/P 23 Rochester Road
Attachments: Planning Application 2014.docx

Dear Camden Planning

I would be grateful for confirmation of safe receipt of this response (below).

I have also e-mailed Jonathan Markwell but I understand he is now away until September.

With thanks

Sue Robertson

-----Original message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Date : 20/08/2014 - 09:04 (UTC)
To : planning@camden.gov.uk
Cc : neil.quinn@camden.gov.uk
Subject : Planning Application 2014/4559/P 23 Rochester Road

Dear Camden Planning

I attach comments/objection to the planning application, reference number 2014/4559/P, for 23 Rochester Road by the due date. I would be grateful for confirmation of safe receipt.

My email is as above and my number is 07774 161296 although I would prefer as few contact details published, either in print or online, as is allowable.

Although included in my comments attached, I should just re-emphasise here that there has been no notification, information or consultation on these proposed works prior to the notice placed by Camden Council on the lamppost in the street. This has left very little time or capacity for full response and, as it has come during the summer holidays, I expect some neighbours potentially affected will miss the notice altogether. For such major work, I do not think this is acceptable.

With thanks.

Sue Robertson
19c Rochester Road
NW1

Planning Application 2014/4559/P

23 Rochester Road, Camden

I write to submit an objection to the planning application for 23 Rochester Road (basement) which gives serious cause for concern in this conservation area.

I am the leaseholder/occupier of 19c Rochester Road, immediately adjacent to No 23, and believe that the neighbours and the neighbourhood would be adversely affected by the proposed works.

I should say that, contrary to the statement in the planning application that neighbouring properties have been approached about the plans, as far as I can ascertain there has been no contact, consultation or information to date. Had I not by chance spotted Camden Council's notice on the lamppost in the street with formal notice of the planning application, I would have been unaware of the proposals and now respond with very little time. It is also important to note that the proposals were announced in the summer holiday period when many families are away on holiday and will not have sufficient opportunity to respond.

The only reference in the planning application to the small block immediately adjacent to No 23, of which my flat is part, is that it "impacts negatively on the setting of the building", demonstrating a lack of understanding of (disregard for?) the history of the street, the design of the block and the care and concerns of its tenants and leaseholders.

Timing and lack of proper consultation apart, my concerns are as follows:

1. Whilst I appreciate the need to improve and refurbish the house, in particular the basement/ground floor flat, and understand that an extension at the back could be a useful addition for the owners/residents, the overall scale of the refurbishment currently proposed is unnecessarily large, out-of keeping with the property/other similar properties in the street and will be unduly dominant in its setting in the road/area as a whole. I believe that it will impact negatively on my property and the block in which it is situated.
2. The scale and depth of excavation would set a very worrying precedent and seems hard to justify. I am not an expert but, whatever the claims made in accompanying documents, it seems to me self-evident that there will be a serious risk of creating ground instability and potential damage to neighbouring properties. I believe that Camden Council, who own the freehold of the block in which my property is situated, have a responsibility to take separate and independent advice on this matter and to consult fully with its leaseholders and tenants on the basis of that advice before arriving at a decision on these proposals.

3. Not a primary but nonetheless important issue – I am concerned that the original and rather precious garden wall separating our properties will be destabilised, damaged or destroyed by the proposed works.
4. Based on the limited information I have, I fear that the front, rear and side lightwells will be visually disturbing for neighbouring properties and do not accept that this level of externally visible development is justified.
5. "A series of semi-external spaces where the boundaries between garden and house are blurred... thus inviting the occupants to make use of their outdoor green space" looks set to create a permanent disturbance for neighbouring properties which goes beyond usual and reasonable domestic garden use. This is a quiet residential road with houses/flats with living and sleeping accommodation close together; it does not lend itself to this kind of development, which might be more suited to a large open rural area, and the planting will not be sufficient to mitigate disturbance created by noise and light.
6. The protracted and major disruption caused by the works – months of dust, dirt, noise, deliveries and disturbance with the use of large plant and equipment – is unacceptable and unjustified. We are all used to accommodating the temporary impact of neighbours' maintenance and refurbishment works but this goes beyond what is reasonable.

The only positive factor I can see is that the beautiful and well-established eucalyptus tree will not now be needlessly destroyed.

It is a great shame to have to respond in this way and I appreciate that I may not have a full and accurate understanding of all aspects of the proposals. However, the absence of any prior written communication, discussion, consultation or presentation of the plans and the lack of time now available for response, leave no alternative but to express profound concern based on what knowledge we have.

S. Robertson
19c Rochester Road
18th August 2014

[REDACTED]

From: Russell Bennetts [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 August 2014 12:08
To: Planning
Subject: 2014/4559/P objection

Dear Camden Planning,

I live and work above the flat in question (2014/4559/P). I strongly oppose the new basement proposed.

This will out of keeping with the road. The building stage will be noisy and disrupting.

Best wishes
Russell Bennetts

Planning Application 2014/4559/P

23 Rochester Road, Camden

I write to submit an objection to the planning application for 23 Rochester Road (basement) which gives serious cause for concern in this conservation area.

I am the leaseholder/occupier of 19c Rochester Road, immediately adjacent to No 23, and believe that the neighbours and the neighbourhood would be adversely affected by the proposed works.

I should say that, contrary to the statement in the planning application that neighbouring properties have been approached about the plans, as far as I can ascertain there has been no contact, consultation or information to date. Had I not by chance spotted Camden Council's notice on the lamppost in the street with formal notice of the planning application, I would have been unaware of the proposals and now respond with very little time. It is also important to note that the proposals were announced in the summer holiday period when many families are away on holiday and will not have sufficient opportunity to respond.

The only reference in the planning application to the small block immediately adjacent to No 23, of which my flat is part, is that it "impacts negatively on the setting of the building", demonstrating a lack of understanding of (disregard for?) the history of the street, the design of the block and the care and concerns of its tenants and leaseholders.

Timing and lack of proper consultation apart, my concerns are as follows:

1. Whilst I appreciate the need to improve and refurbish the house, in particular the basement/ground floor flat, and understand that an extension at the back could be a useful addition for the owners/residents, the overall scale of the refurbishment currently proposed is unnecessarily large, out-of keeping with the property/other similar properties in the street and will be unduly dominant in its setting in the road/area as a whole. I believe that it will impact negatively on my property and the block in which it is situated.
2. The scale and depth of excavation would set a very worrying precedent and seems hard to justify. I am not an expert but, whatever the claims made in accompanying documents, it seems to me self-evident that there will be a serious risk of creating ground instability and potential damage to neighbouring properties. I believe that Camden Council, who own the freehold of the block in which my property is situated, have a responsibility to take separate and independent advice on this matter and to consult fully with its leaseholders and tenants on the basis of that advice before arriving at a decision on these proposals.

3. Not a primary but nonetheless important issue – I am concerned that the original and rather precious garden wall separating our properties will be destabilised, damaged or destroyed by the proposed works.
4. Based on the limited information I have, I fear that the front, rear and side lightwells will be visually disturbing for neighbouring properties and do not accept that this level of externally visible development is justified.
5. "A series of semi-external spaces where the boundaries between garden and house are blurred... thus inviting the occupants to make use of their outdoor green space" looks set to create a permanent disturbance for neighbouring properties which goes beyond usual and reasonable domestic garden use. This is a quiet residential road with houses/flats with living and sleeping accommodation close together; it does not lend itself to this kind of development, which might be more suited to a large open rural area, and the planting will not be sufficient to mitigate disturbance created by noise and light.
6. The protracted and major disruption caused by the works – months of dust, dirt, noise, deliveries and disturbance with the use of large plant and equipment – is unacceptable and unjustified. We are all used to accommodating the temporary impact of neighbours' maintenance and refurbishment works but this goes beyond what is reasonable.

The only positive factor I can see is that the beautiful and well-established eucalyptus tree will not now be needlessly destroyed.

It is a great shame to have to respond in this way and I appreciate that I may not have a full and accurate understanding of all aspects of the proposals. However, the absence of any prior written communication, discussion, consultation or presentation of the plans and the lack of time now available for response, leave no alternative but to express profound concern based on what knowledge we have.

S. Robertson
19c Rochester Road
18th August 2014

