

From: Adrian Paterson [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 October 2014 15:05
To: Planning
Subject: RE: Comments on 2014/5401/P have been received by the council.

> From: planning@camden.gov.uk
> To: [REDACTED]
> Date: Tue, 7 Oct 2014 16:39:00 +0100
> Subject: Comments on 2014/5401/P have been received by the council.

>
> I wish to object to this proposal. The application is being made on two false presumptions. Firstly, that the site is a builders yard/infill site when in fact it was a successful pub garden until the time this application was submitted. The site has been artificially split into two without planning permission for a change of use of the garden on either of the two applications. Also it is claimed that this is an operational builders yard when in fact the hoarding belies this - the sign is for construction works and not a builders yard. Since the recent placing of building materials in the garden there has been no movement of the limited stock of materials.

> Secondly that the site available for development extends on to the public footpath when the land registry shows that this is not the case; indeed in the 35 years I have lived here has this been part of the footpath until the applicant erected, without planning permission, hoarding around the site in order to annex it for development purposes. On both counts, this should be leading to urgent enforcement action, and not a planning application that is being consulted on.

>
> The application is itself flawed in a number of respects :
> . is wholly out of character with the urban design/grain of this much loved local area, in particular the green corridor that it is proposed to build on and the fact that the houses opposite are on the Local List. The proposal seeks to join up the completely separate terraces on Torriano Avenue and Brecknock Road to create an entirely different kind of street. Also the details for the new house are either inadequate or insufficient to warrant consultation at this time.
> . fails to address or meet a considerable number of national, London and Camden planning policies and design guidelines

>
> If approved, the proposal is at risk of setting a precedent for
> . a garden being lost on a green site/backlands site
> . closing up a green corridor which is a valued local visual amenity and serves a wider ecological purpose.

>
> I understand that the two proposals - 5401 and 4554 will be considered together. It is essential that all comments for both should be considered together, my own included.

>
> I shall now set out my detailed comments.
>

> Urban design/grain

>

> Torriano Avenue is a much loved street. Over the years many different people have commented on its attractiveness and the features they value :

> . the curve of the street on a hill culminating with a house, No 135, at the top of the hill. This is set forward to mark the end of the terrace, a feature replicated elsewhere in the area.

> the terraces on the right hand side of the street which are considered as being of such value that they are on the Local List

> .the widespread existence of defining quoins up the sides of buildings that add significant variation

> . the open views at the end of terraces,including the green corridor that the applicant proposes to build on.

>

> National, London, Camden and other relevant policies and guidelines

>

> The current two applications do not address or meet Camden's UDP policies in the following respects.

> They do not "recognise" or "protect the character of this special area". Furthermore, the proposal is not "designed to the highest standard" and certainly not in a way that it would "protect and enhance its surroundings". It is not "sensitively designed with regard to the surrounding area and amenity" and fails to "consider the character and built form of the surrounding area."

> It fails to meet Amenity guidelines in the areas of "visual privacy and amenities", "sunlight and daylight levels", and the "adequacy of facilities for the storage and disposal of waste".

> The proposals will result in "unacceptable disturbance to the privacy of neighbouring habitable rooms".

> They do not "protect the natural environment including open spaces". They contravene National guidelines and the London Plan presumptions against 'garden grabbing' and backyard development.

> They fail to meet Lifetime Homes standards.

> There are issues around ground water run off.

> In the case of the pub there are issues around public health and safety standards.

> They do not meet Camden parking policy requirements, in particular with regard to the recent rejection of an application in the same street.

>

> The Developers Statement

>

> The developer and his architect fail to address or respect these matters. They call the street Edwardian when it is not. They refer to No 153 when they mean 135. They say that "the street was until recently very run down and untidy". This is not correct as I can confirm as a resident of over 35 years. Furthermore, neither the developer nor the architect are based locally to know !

> They have failed to provide a set of drawings that are sufficiently detailed to warrant consideration.

> They have stated that the site for the two houses is "in different ownership due to lack of use by the customers of the public house" and at the the same time claim it is an infill site

and a builders yard. Also , according to the Land Registry the 'two' sites are in one ownership. The two applications come from the same family.

> They developers themselves recognise that the street "does have an individual character and sense of identity which is endearing". Yes, it does have a strong character and identity. We wish to keep that and not live with a hugely insensitive over development of the sites individually and collectively.

> They also recognise that the "setting forward of the corner buildings (135 Torriano and 106 Brecknock) is a feature common in the local area and helps to identify the entrance to the side street". Yes, and they wish to take away that feature.

> In the case of 106 the materials of the roof extension and the side entrance block are certainly not "in keeping with the language of the street" as they claim, and the materials are not "relevant to the street".

> They contradict themselves, and make their position clear, by stating their "desire to create a distinctly different architectural language between the existing building and the proposed development." To achieve this the propose an insensitively designed

> metal clad roof extension and side entrance that has been borrowed from a completely different kind of development.

>

> They have not been open about the fact the the public house had a thriving garden up until the time the hoarding was erected and the notices published. They do, however admit that the sites are in separate ownership "due to the lack of use by the customers of the public house."

>

> Detailed Considerations

>

> Design of the houses.

> . this does not appear to reflect the fact the site is on a slope. As such the front elevation cannot be correctly drawn, both being shown at the same level. This must in turn affect wheelchair access.

> . the detailed measurements of the doors and windows and the proportions are out of character with the rest of the street . One illustration of this is that neighbouring houses do not have a toilet at the front of the house - the provision of this must inevitably mean a narrower front door and ground front window. This is further reflected in the abutting front doors, not a feature of the area.

> .the loss of the quoins down the side of 135 and 106

> .the proposed joining up of two separate terraces in two separate streets

> .the lack of glazing bars on the windows. Also it is not clear if the are sash windows.

> .lack of stucco and quoins

> .not in character with the Local Listing of the houses opposite

> .very large windows at the rear need to be demonstrable shown to address privacy concerns

> .insufficient space to address standards inside for wheelchair access and outside for bicycle storage.

>

> CPZ/Parking

>

> There is already a shortage of spaces to park particularly in the evening. Demand from 8

additional units would make this intolerable.

>

> Personal Considerations

>

> One of the main reasons I bought this house was because of the open aspect on to the green corridor. I specifically object to the potential loss of this visual amenity, especially when this is a clear case of 'garden grabbing'.

>

> Conclusion

>

> I maintain that enforcement action should be taken.

>

> The proposals are both incomplete and should not be considered in their current form. If they are subsequently deemed to be capable/worthy of consideration then there should be a further consultation. Given the impact on the rest of the area

> this should be with a wider number of households than the current consultation has been extended to.

>

> The pub garden has been artificially separated, by virtue of making separate applications, from the pub itself making it increasingly likely that it will prove to be uneconomic. This in turn will result in a further application for the conversion of the ground floor of the pub into residential, thereby increasing the level of overdevelopment.

>

> They fail to meet/address a whole the requirements of a series of plans and guidelines.

>

> The applicants are inconsistent in their statements.

>

> I therefore object to this proposal and to the separate proposal. I would wish all comments for both to be considered together for this over development of this site which is out of character with the street/area, and which takes away a much valued visual amenity.

>

>

>

> Comments made by Adrian Paterson of 132 Torriano Avenue

>

>

>

>

> Comment Type is Comment Made

>

>