

Davies, Fiona

From: David Jenkin [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 November 2014 15:00
To: Planning
Subject: RE: Comments on 2014/6295/T have been received by the council. BUT not yet appeared on the website

Importance: High

Dear Sirs
Below you will see my objection to planning application 2013/6295/T.
it was sent yesterday on the website, but has not yet appeared on it. Can you please make sure that it does. It was submitted within the required time.
Regards
David

.....
David Jenkin
AMA Alexi Marmot Associates Limited
[REDACTED]
.....

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 November 2014 11:58
To: David JenkinAND
Subject: Comments on 2014/6295/T have been received by the council.

I object to this application.

My house backs directly onto the rear of the ORT. Their building would now be considered too close and with their very large windows, privacy is a major problem.
There were once two trees in their car park, and more in their side area (which is now mechanical plant). One tree in the car park was removed some years ago, and an application was also made some years ago to remove this one which we objected to and the application was refused.

My objections are:

- 1, loss of visual privacy and amenity
- 2, damage to the environment
- 3, ability to add more car parking.

1, the tree provides invaluable visual screening between the offices and the residential properties. This is important and must not be lost. It is not only the views from the offices, but also the views down onto their cars and bins which are in an area raised up above the garden levels and very poorly screened by walls.

2, many trees have been removed from the rear of these houses and the office building in recent years and this is the last one. the green environment is crucial in the backways of these houses in

this particularly busy part of Camden. it is a refuge. If it really is beyond saving and is removed, then it must be replaced with one of a similar size to replace the screening of the offices/ bins/ cars and continue the green contribution to this back area.

3, the argument for 'more room' in their car park encourages more cars and pollution to the rear of these buildings and should be resisted. It will also increase the visual damage caused by no tree canopy.

In conclusion, a tree is needed in the location, and it needs to be of sufficient size to screen the building, cars and bins. It also needs to retain the contribution to the greenery of the area and number of trees in these back ways. ideally it should be retained. If it is removed then it must be replaced with a substantial tree of similar size to immediately provide the screening etc described above.

Comments made by DAVID JENKIN of 157 ARLINGTON ROAD [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Comment Type is Objection