

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6438/P	Jean MacRae	34B Allcroft Rd NW5 4NE	30/10/2014 10:30:59	OBJ	<p>I wish to oppose the variation two elements of this application for variation:</p> <p>1. Removal of living wall. The living wall forms a significant element of reducing the environmental impact of the increase in carbon emissions from replacement a low-rise workshop building with 18 dwelling units – it is well known that such living walls are of great benefit in reducing emissions. In addition, the rear wall of the new development looms over the flats in the low-rise block at 127 Weedington Road; it is very stark and ugly and the living wall will at least give the residents there a view which may compensate in some small way for the loss of light and vista which they will have. The “health and safety” grounds for requesting seem pathetic: living walls once established require little maintenance and abseiling down buildings to perform such routine and regular tasks as window cleaning has become a common practice – including within Camden Council where when I was based in the Town Hall Extension the windows were cleaned by abseilers! – and so can present no significant health and safety issue.</p> <p>2. Increasing height of building by 600mm. This may seem insignificant but the block is already higher than is the norm for the street and I feel strongly that to continue to allow extra height on buildings in this essentially low-rise neighbourhood is a dangerous precedent which could lead to the granting of further building height alterations, such as that which was allowed against neighbour objections at number 49. 600mm will not, I suspect, feel insignificant to residents of Geoff Marsh Court and for residents of numbers 32-38 Allcroft Rd represents another slice of light and vista removed</p>
2014/6438/P	Jake Francis	30B Allcroft Rd	29/10/2014 15:13:59	OBJEMAIL	<p>I am concerned that this building has applied to be increased in height again after the original proposal. I am also very concerned that I have received no information at all from the local authority regarding this application despite it being directly opposite our property.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the reduction of the boundary wall and the prospect of sunlight sunlight glare from the properties and balconies directly into our and other properties. the glare from the bright white fence was problematic when the sun was bright this summer.</p> <p>I think it is wrong that this application should now be changed and the original plans should be stuck to. I believe it is wrong to allow this increase in height and will set a precedent.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6438/P	Val Stevenson	38 Allcroft Road NW5 4NE	22/10/2014 14:36:05	COMNOT	<p>I do not object to the removal of the living wall. However, the wording of the letter soliciting comments and that on the planning alteration online are quite different. I strongly object to an already high building being raised by 600mm (not mentioned in your letter) and to the lowering of the height of front boundary walls (also not mentioned).</p> <p>I further object to the alteration of door and window heights, and the replacement of metal railings with glass balustrading. We get reflected glare from the building the planned development will block, and this problem would be exacerbated.</p> <p>It seems inappropriate to vary plans after permission has been granted, especially when they will have an effect on those overlooking the site. Perhaps the architect and developer could have considered these issues beforehand, so an informed planning consent could have been given.</p>
2014/6438/P	John Lowe	Flat B 40 Allcroft Rd NW5 4NE	28/10/2014 13:29:26	OBJCOMP AP	<p>Building should be in keeping with surrounding built environment ie no taller than adjacent buildings and metal balustrades only. All glazing should be anti-glare as reflected light from adjacent building is already troublesome.</p>