

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6697/P	Belinda Rogers	3 Oak Village London NW5 4QR	19/12/2014 00:01:54	COMMNT	<p>BELINDA ROGERS &amp; RUSSELL TICKNER - 3 OAK VILLAGE - LONDON - NW5 4QR 17 December 2014 To: Eimear.Heavey@camden.gov.uk RE: planning application 2014/6697/P Proposed development at Kiln Place I live in Oak Village close to the proposed development and have serious objections to the house at the end of the terrace- Unit 1.1. I am commenting at this late stage as it has only been recently that the design has been clarified -not all the detail of the end house was clear at the drop-in stage. My concerns are as follows. The position of Unit 1.1 Unit 1.1 has been pushed onto the very edge of the Kiln Place Estate boundary, the proposed position of the unit is beyond the building line set by Kiln Place and Hemmingway Close. (see attached) This raises concerns both practically and aesthetically. Practically The plans seem to indicate a new pavement line will be established and the road will be reduced in width. The corner where the development is proposed is at the junction of two roads which are only wide enough for single file traffic, and as the road emerges from the estate the pavement line is not very clear. At peak times the pavements are busy with Primary &amp; Secondary school children on their way to the local schools and commuters using the nearby Overground station. This busy corner is also tight for vehicles and already results in much manoeuvring as cars and vans try to negotiate it. The situation is exacerbated when larger vehicles, like bin lorries and delivery trucks or those vehicles redirected from Mansfield Rd because of the height restriction on the railway bridge try to negotiate the corner Many of them often mounting the pavement and just missing (or sometimes in the case of larger vehicles scraping) the wall of the existing planter which is the proposed position of the outer wall of Unit 1.1. Practically, positioning Unit 1.1 on the boundary with the inevitable reduction in road &amp; pavement space will endanger lives. Aesthetically The position of the existing Kiln Place block, set back from the pavement line rather than built hard up against it, is a decision made by the original architects which stopped the existing two storey buildings in the area being dominated by the new taller Kiln Place buildings. Aesthetically, positioning Unit 1.1 on the boundary forces the entire new terrace into Oak Village where the enormous building will dominate not just its two storey neighbours, but also the existing flats.  Building right up to the boundary will also result in a significant loss of planting and irrevocably change the feel of the local environment.  Aesthetically positioning the Unit 1.1 on the boundary will create a building that dominates the locality. The opportunity for future landscaping, will be removed, which will change the local environment forever.</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

The height of Unit 1.1

Unit 1.1 is the tallest building in the proposed terrace. It will be nearly as tall as the 5 storey buildings in Kiln Place, yet built on the boundary it is 15metres closer to the cottages of Oak Village.

It is out of scale with its surroundings, it is too tall and domineering and as such is not appropriate.

Landscaping

There appears to be a complete disregard for the current feel of the area. Both Kiln Place and Oak Village although densely populated are green. The proposed scheme creates more housing but unlike previous schemes the council has built in the area, it not only removes a substantial swathe planting - the green outlook for Kiln Place residents, a mature tree, & a large planter. By building to the boundary, and internalising the gardens it removes the opportunity of reinstating any planting to soften the building and integrate the scheme into the local area.

In conclusion, I do not have any objections to the development in principle, however I feel that the design of the end building has now been compromised to such an extent by the restrictions of the site, that it is inappropriate and should be refused planning permission.

Yours

Belinda Rogers & Russell Tickner.

---