

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6903/P	Jane Wernick	76 Upper Park Road NW3 2UX	02/01/2015 17:51:18	COMMNT	<p>1/ Density and height of proposal.</p> <p>The proposal has a density of 292 dwellings per hectare, or 844 habitable rooms per hectare, which greatly exceeds the densities recommended by Camden and in the Greater London Authority 'London Plan' of 260 dwellings or 700 habitable rooms. (London Plan states density maximum of 260 dwellings or 700 habitable rooms).</p> <p>The Planning Statement claims that such a high density is justified because of the proposal's good design, and because it optimises "additional housing on an underutilised, brownfield site in an accessible location".(6.82). It is not clear why either of these should be considered as adequate reasons for ignoring the guidance.</p> <p>I do not consider that claims of "financial viability" on behalf of the developer should be taken into account.</p> <p>Given that this property was, until recently owned by Camden i.e. by the public, all negotiation documents should be made available to the public - there should not be "confidential documents" about key issues in the planning application. There should be a clear public statement of:</p> <p>1/ Fairview's cost of purchasing the site</p> <p>2/ the estimated construction cost</p> <p>3/ the estimated sale prices, and thus the profit to be made by Fairview. It is hard to believe that Fairview will make less than around £20 million profit on this project.</p> <p>The height and layout of the building may create problems of overlooking, shading and micro-climate effects. Fairview's architect says that these points have all been checked and are within planning requirements. But the information provided is not sufficient to evaluate whether or not this is true. Residents living all around the new block will certainly suffer some overlooking, and loss of views and light.</p> <p>2/ "Affordable" flats.</p> <p>Camden has a policy that 50% of the flats should be "Affordable" housing. It appears that Fairview does not want to provide 50% and will negotiate to reduce this substantially. It is unacceptable that the proportion is not stated at this stage. I am concerned that Fairview may use a claim of "financial viability", in a confidential statement to Camden Council, to say that they cannot afford to develop the site unless they are allowed a much lower % of "Affordable" flats, as well as such a large total number of flats. This detail of the planning application should be public, not confidential.</p> <p>The "Affordable" flats, if any, will be a mix of flats for rent and flats for shared equity. The mix is not yet decided. "Affordable does not mean affordable for anybody, but a bit less than the full market price."</p> <p>There should be a reasonable proportion available for key workers, in perpetuity.</p> <p>3/ Parking</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

Fairview states that the development will be “car free”. Fairview states that the flats will be leasehold and all leases will require that residents cannot apply for Residents’ Parking permits. How can this be enforced? Even if enforced, can it be guaranteed for ever, or can the policy be changed in a few years? It is likely that residents will challenge this policy as being discrimination against them - maybe using European law. I believe that Fairview should be forced to provide one parking space per residence on the site.

Even if residents are not allowed Residents’ Parking permits, what about parking after 6.30pm and at weekends?

Visitors to the new flats will take many local parking spaces. The residents’ parking spaces in the surrounding streets are already full most of the time. Another 70 plus cars looking for parking will be a serious problem. Will the residents be able to apply for visitor permits?

The proposal plan drawing shows that “existing parking to Garnett House to be relocated”. This is 5 parking spaces - are these cars going to find space in the existing residents’ parking bays?

It is noted that the covered parking block that is to be demolished was originally built for the residents of the tower blocks, and was then for general use by Camden.

4/ Traffic circulation and rights of way.

Camden and Fairview confirm that the cul-de-sac at this end of Upper Park Road will remain. There will be no through road to Lawn Road. It is essential that this remain. To allow through traffic would completely change the nature of Upper Park Road.

Fairview says there are no rights of way across the site. Residents state that there is a right of way between the parking block and the community centre linking Upper Park Road with Lawn Road. This right of way has been in use for many years, and should not be removed.

5/ Site conditions.

Long term residents know that there is a history of problems of flooding with rainwater run-off from higher land, and flooding from the Fleet sewer below the area. Other projects have been required to construct water retention tanks below their buildings. The Fleet sewer is currently causing problems with rat infestation in the area, and may need repair works. There are also the railway tunnels close to the site, and there may be problems with ground subsidence.

What guarantees will existing residents have that the new construction will not cause problems with flooding, ground subsidence and with rat infestation?

6/ Community Centre.

At the consultation meeting in June 2014 Fairview stated that they have no requirement to replace the community centre on this site or elsewhere. They have paid Camden a Community Infrastructure Levy, and they have no requirement to provide a community centre. Surely the Community Centre should be re-instated?

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

7/ Employment provision. The loss of the workshop spaces.

At the consultation meeting in June 2014 Fairview stated that there was a requirement on them to provide working spaces in their purchase agreement for the site, but they are negotiating with Camden to remove this. They have paid Camden a Community Infrastructure Levy, and state that this should pay to provide any workspace elsewhere.

Camden states that there is no need to replace these working spaces in the area. This is not acceptable.

8/ Demolition and construction: 24 to 30 months.

Fairview aims to start the construction programme early in 2015. If so, there will be 6 months of demolition (to Autumn 2015), and 18 to 24 months of construction. They state that there will be noise and disruption during this period of 24 to 30 months, but they will try to limit this.

Residents point out that Lawn Road and Upper Park Road are already congested, and often blocked by rubbish collection lorries, and by delivery lorries. Supplying this demolition and construction site with lorries and equipment is likely to cause major blockages of these roads. Camden should make explicit restrictions in the Planning Permission documents in order to reduce disruption to residents, and should enforce these.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6903/P	H Hinsley	64 Upper Park Road London NW3 2UX	04/01/2015 21:35:41	COMNOT	<p>Response to Planning Application for 32 Lawn Road. NW3</p> <p>DIFFICULTIES WITH THE CONSULTATION PROCEDURE:</p> <p>I received a letter headed Planning Application Consultation, dated 15 December, on 19 December. It gives 21 days from date of letter for anyone to make comments on the application. (Until 5 January). I have emailed Jonathan Markwell, the planning officer named in the letter, to complain about the timing and to request an extension of the 21 days so that local residents will have a chance to comment if they wish. I received an “out-of-office” reply saying he would return to work on 5 January.</p> <p>This timetable means that the 21 days exactly spans the Christmas and New Year holidays, with the result that many affected residents will have been away during the 21 days and will not have been informed. Checking Camden’s Planning website on 4 January I note that the consultation period has been extended to 14.01.15.</p> <p>Checking with three neighbours on 22 December and one other on 04 January, none of them had received the letter.</p> <p>Only one public notice is visible in the surrounding area - it is directly outside the site on Lawn Road. It is dated 17/12/14. Mysteriously, an identical notice has been added to the same location, dated 24/12/14. For the consultation by Camden Council Planning last summer notices were put up along Lawn Road, Upper Park Road, Garnett Road and Parkhill Road. Why is only one notice visible for this important consultation?</p> <p>ERROR IN INFORMATION:</p> <p>There is an error in the Details Page for the Planning Application which states: Existing Land Use: C3 Dwelling House Proposed Land Use: C3 Dwelling House This is incorrect, and suggests that the current buildings have the same use class as the proposed.</p> <p>DECISION PROCESS:</p> <p>Please will Camden Council give confirmation that the decision about this proposal will not be made by “Delegated Powers” (by a planning officer) but by the “Development Control Committee” (elected Councillors). Please inform me of the extended period of consultation and of the proposed date for a meeting of the Development Control Committee.</p> <p>OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSAL:</p> <p>1/ Density and height of proposal.</p> <p>Fairview states that when they purchased the site there was no definition of maximum density imposed</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

by Camden.

The proposal has a density of 292 dwellings per hectare, or 844 habitable rooms per hectare. (see Planning Statement, section 6.69 to 6.82) This greatly exceeds the densities recommended by Camden and in the Greater London Authority 'London Plan'. (London Plan states density maximum of 260 dwellings or 700 habitable rooms).

The Planning Statement claims that such a high density is justified because of the proposal's good design, and because it optimises "additional housing on an underutilised, brownfield site in an accessible location".(6.82). "Good design" and "optimising" are not valid arguments for imposing such high density onto the area.

Probably, not many people would object to some new housing being built on the site, at a density within the recommended limits, if the design does not reduce the quality of living for existing residents, by overlooking, overcrowding, overloading of parking and streets, overloading of local schools, social resources, GP surgeries and so on.

Fairview may try to use a claim of "financial viability" (the documents state that Fairview will make a "confidential statement" to Camden Council about this), to say that they cannot afford to develop the site unless they are allowed such a large number of flats. This argument is now used by many developers to try to persuade councils that they must weaken their policies on density and on the % of "affordable" flats. I request that Camden Council makes all negotiation documents available to the public - there should not be "confidential documents" about key issues in the planning application. There should be a clear public statement of:

1/ Fairview's cost of purchasing the site

2/ the estimated construction cost

3/ the estimated sale prices, and thus the profit to be made by Fairview. A rough estimate without access to these figures is that Fairview will make around £20 million profit if it is allowed to construct 73 flats. More information is required - it is likely that Fairview can make a very good profit if the proposal is reduced to comply with Camden's and the GLA's maximum density figures.

The residential buildings surrounding the site already produce a very high residential density in the local area: two tower blocks with 56 flats each; the Garrett block with 24 flats; Park Drive with 42 flats and several other large blocks of flats. There is already overloading of local schools and other services, and rubbish collection.

The height and layout of the building may create problems of overlooking, shading and micro-climate effects. Fairview's planning application says that these points have all been checked and are within planning requirements. Residents living all around the new block will certainly suffer some overlooking, and loss of views.

2/ "AFFORDABLE" FLATS:

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

Camden has a policy that 50% of the flats should be “Affordable” housing. Fairview does not want to provide 50% and will negotiate to reduce this substantially. This negotiation should be available to the public so that the electorate can see on what grounds Camden Council makes adjustments to its 50% policy. Fairview may use a claim of “financial viability”, and hope for a “confidential” negotiation, claiming that they cannot afford to develop the site unless they are allowed a much lower % of “Affordable” flats (the same claim may be used to justify the very high density). This detail of the planning application should be public, not confidential.

The “Affordable” flats, if any, will be a mix of flats for rent and flats for shared equity. The mix is not yet decided. This detail of the planning application should be public, not confidential.

If the development is to help Camden’s housing problem then there should be a significant number of flats for rent or shared equity that will be affordable to residents on normal salaries.

3/ PARKING:

Fairview and Camden have both stated that the development will be “car free”. Fairview states that the flats will be leasehold and all leases will require that residents cannot apply for Residents’ Parking permits.

How can this be enforced? Even if enforced, can it be guaranteed for more than a few years, or can the policy be changed in a few years? It is likely that residents of the new flats will challenge this policy as being discrimination against them - maybe using European law.

If Camden cannot give a firm legal statement about the credibility of refusing Residents’ Parking permits, Fairview should be providing car parking on site. The scenario of 73, or more, additional cars trying to park in the neighbourhood in the future will be a severe problem for existing residents.

Even if residents are not allowed Residents’ Parking permits, what additional street parking spaces will Camden provide for parking after 6.30pm and at weekends? Visitors to the new flats will take many local parking spaces. The residents’ parking spaces in the surrounding streets are already full most of the time. Another 73 plus cars looking for parking will be a serious problem.

The proposal plan drawing shows that “existing parking to Garnett House to be relocated”. This is 4 parking spaces - are these cars going to find space in the existing residents’ parking bays?

It is noted that the covered parking block that is to be demolished was originally built for the residents of the tower blocks, and was then for general use by Camden.

4/ RIGHTS OF WAY AND TRAFFIC CIRCULATION:

The drawings of the new proposal show no foot passage across the site. There is a right of way between the parking block and the community centre linking Upper Park Road with Lawn Road. This right of way has been in use for many years, ever since these buildings were constructed, and Camden Council must clarify on what basis it is able to remove this right of way.

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

Comment: **Response:**

Camden Council has confirmed that the cul-de-sac at this end of Upper Park Road will remain. There will be no through road to Lawn Road. The grass triangle next to Lawn Road will have a landscape design.

5/ SITE CONDITIONS:

Long term residents know that there is a history of problems of flooding with rainwater run-off from higher land, and flooding from the Fleet sewer below the site area. Other projects in this area have been required to construct water retention tanks below their buildings. The Fleet sewer is currently causing problems with rat infestation in the area, and may need repair works. There are also the railway tunnels close to the site, and there may be problems with ground subsidence.

What guarantees will existing residents have that the new construction will not cause problems with flooding, ground subsidence and with rat infestation?

6/ COMMUNITY CENTRE:

At the consultation meeting in June 2014 Fairview stated that they have no requirement to replace the community centre on this site or elsewhere. They have paid Camden a Community Infrastructure Levy, and they have no requirement to provide a community centre.

The Camden planning officer stated that he did not know where another community centre can be built – maybe at Gospel Oak.

Fairview and Camden both confirm that the mural will be protected and re-sited. Camden requires it to be re-sited within the new development.

Will Camden Council make a statement in relation to this planning application about replacing the Community Centre, and about re-siting the mural.

8/ DEMOLITION AND CONSTRUCTION: 24 to 30 months.

Lawn Road and Upper Park Road are already congested, and often blocked by rubbish collection lorries, and by delivery lorries. If this proposal, or a revised proposal, achieve planning consent, then supplying this demolition and construction site with lorries and equipment is likely to cause major blockages of these roads. There will be 6 months of demolition, and 18 to 24 months of construction. Camden should strengthen the restrictions in the Planning Permission documents in order to reduce disruption to residents, and should enforce these.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6903/P	Jeanne Howe	Jeanne Howe 7 garnett road london	02/01/2015 10:34:28	OBJEMPER	Dear Sir/Madam RE: Proposed 7 storey development at 32 lawn Rd

I am writing with regard to the above proposed development. Please find below the objections to the proposed development detailed below.

Camden's neglect of the site to date and loss of a key community centre

Following Camden's sale of the site to private development company, the area, which was formerly used as workshops, a community centre, green space and a playground, has been closed sealed off and allowed to substantially dilapidate. These are is now run down and an eyesore viable, coincidentally now making most change of use applications preferable to the sealed off area created by Camden's neglect off the site. Camden has failed to provide any evidence of when these amenities will be replaced and where. In addition, this whole project has been shrouded in secrecy since the outset. Neither Camden, nor the developer has given any indication of any positive investment in the area following the development. The only mention of investment was a rather unprofessional attempt by the developer to manipulate and effectively blackmail the residents at the Palgrave TRA stating that if there are any objections to the development form the residents the likelihood being the developer would then in turn "punish" the residents by withdrawing and investment in the surrounding area. The position of the developer has been further solidified by Camden's collusion in the process by supporting the developer in making such statements.

Light

The 7 Storey proposed building (which was originally proposed as a 4 storey development!) is being placed within a few metres of Palgrave house which will face directly onto a building site for 2 years and then the subsequent towerblock.

The height of the building and the lack of any sunlight now on Palgrave house (floors 1-6) will also cause untold damage to value of the privately owned properties in Palgrave House and surrounding properties and not increase the value as the developer has incorrectly submitted. Please also note that although questioned in person and on the phone, the developer has failed to provide any evidence to support their view that the price of Palgrave House properties will increase. Camden has clearly put its own and a private companies profits ahead of the health and finances of its tenants. I am surprised no offer of compensation has already been made either financial or otherwise, especially considering the conflict of interest Camden has placed itself in.

Right of way

It has been incorrectly assumed by Camden that local residents accept the removal of a long established right of way. The right of way is a key access point to Lawn Road and its removal is unacceptable.

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

Comment: **Response:**

Overcrowding and increase in crime

There will be 7 stories of 70+ luxury flats, the existing block will now be looking upward onto ground floor amenity spaces, such as 70 refuse, recycling and storage areas The existing tower blocks will lose their light, becoming darkened and inevitably more susceptible to petty crime and antisocial behaviour which is already a significant concern which Camden has failed to address. This will in turn lower the moral of residents already tarnished with the reputation of tower block residence.

Pressure on local amenities

There will be an enormous impact on local schools, state and private, and the commensurate traffic during the school run, in addition to the impact on the public transport, GP and hospital congestion, and parking availability as a direct result of the increased and unsustainable population density and their needs. The existing sewerage / drainage / water supply will not be updated to account for the new flats. There are already two 14 storey council blocks, and the work may structurally undermine them.

Parking will now become impossible. The developer has stated that no new parking permits will be granted but where will there be spaces at the weekend or evening? If any new development goes ahead, even one which confirms to planning regulations and not the proposed 7 storey tower block, the parking will need to be extended to 11pm during the week and all weekend. Camden has completely ignored this fact so far.

As you can see from the above there are valid and substantial social and legal objections to the proposed development which will need to be addressed in turn and in full. In addition, Camden using the developer to blackmail its residents, some of whom are vulnerable is a disgrace and this will need to also be investigated further.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6903/P	Susan Poole	74 Lawn Road London NW3 2XB	03/01/2015 14:01:43	OBJEMPER	<p>(a) The proposed building is too large, dense and bulky. The developers are trying to squeeze too many units onto the site. It is too high and extends too close to the surrounding buildings and streets etc. The design is trying to maximise profits to a degree that detracts from the area for everyone else. The nearby Isokon building demonstrates what a well-proportioned and well-balanced building should be like. Given the high property prices, it is simply untrue that "financial viability" requires such a large development. If the developer is making any such claims then all supporting documents should be published.</p> <p>(b) The design is very unimpressive for such a high profile site. Again, the developer's priority seems simply to be to maximise profit, with no consideration of how to improve aesthetics. Many of the drawings that have been made available are also quite misleading as to the overall bulk of the development.</p> <p>(c) The site lacks green space and will also see the removal of a number of trees. No such permission would be given to local residents, so why should such permission be granted for this development?</p> <p>(d) The drainage statement is not acceptable. It risks future flooding in the area.</p> <p>(e) Parking. It is fanciful that buyers who have enough money to purchase these flats will not also want to own cars, regardless of Camden's attempts to dissuade them. This will create additional pressure on parking in the area, and volumes of traffic. Indeed, it is likely that residents will challenge any car-free policy as being discrimination against them - maybe using European law. And visitors to the new block will also arrive in cars - where will they park? (We do not have a car, but we are very much in the minority in this area. We rely on the local City Car Club cars so as not to need to own a car - if Camden is assuming that 73 flats will also be relying on City Car Club then there will be a need for far more car club cars.)</p> <p>f) The mosaic is being preserved -- but its new position must be such that it is open to full public view - it must not disappear inside non-accessible areas of the development.</p> <p>g) Fairview says there are no rights of way across the site. Residents state that there is a right of way between the parking block and the community centre linking Upper Park Road with Lawn Road. This right of way has been in use for many years and Camden must clarify on what basis it is able to remove a right of way.</p> <p>h) Fairview aims to start the construction programme early in 2015. If so, there will be 6 months of demolition (to Autumn 2015), and 18 to 24 months of construction. They state that there will be noise and disruption during this period of 24 to 30 months, but they will try to limit this. Lawn Road and Upper Park Road are already congested, and often blocked by rubbish collection lorries, and When the speed bumps were removed (without consultation with the residents) on Lawn Road we were told that they could not be reinstalled because the Lawn Road to Fleet Road route is essential for ambulances. What safeguards will be in place to ensure no delays for ambulances during this lengthy building period, given that the need to supply the demolition and construction site with lorries and equipment is likely to cause major blockages of these roads. Camden should make explicit restrictions in the Planning Permission documents in order to reduce disruption to residents, and should enforce these.</p> <p>I) Camden's communication with local residents on this development has been lamentable. Notices about public meetings have been put up too late; as far as I can see only one lamp post is carrying a notice about this revised planning submission; letters were not received about the deadline; the original</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>date on the planning letter on the lamp post was 15 December with a closing date of 5 January, coinciding with Christmas/new Year holiday period. It was only after complaints that the deadline was extended to 14 January. From any outsider's viewpoint, it looks as if Camden is trying to minimise public involvement in this consultation process.</p> <p>j) Camden has a policy that 50% of the flats should be “Affordable” housing. Fairview does not want to provide 50% and will negotiate to reduce this substantially. Any such discussions should be help in public, with all documents published. This area has a severe need of affordable housing.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6903/P	Alexander Howe	15 Palgrave House Fleet Road London	02/01/2015 10:29:12	OBJEMPER	Dear Sir/Madam RE: Proposed 7 storey development at 32 lawn Rd

I am writing with regard to the above proposed development. Please find below the objections to the proposed development detailed below.

Camden's neglect of the site to date and loss of a key community centre

Following Camden's sale of the site to private development company, the area, which was formerly used as workshops, a community centre, green space and a playground, has been closed sealed off and allowed to substantially dilapidate. These are is now run down and an eyesore viable, coincidentally now making most change of use applications preferable to the sealed off area created by Camden's neglect off the site. Camden has failed to provide any evidence of when these amenities will be replaced and where. In addition, this whole project has been shrouded in secrecy since the outset. Neither Camden, nor the developer has given any indication of any positive investment in the area following the development. The only mention of investment was a rather unprofessional attempt by the developer to manipulate and effectively blackmail the residents at the Palgrave TRA stating that if there are any objections to the development form the residents the likelihood being the developer would then in turn "punish" the residents by withdrawing and investment in the surrounding area. The position of the developer has been further solidified by Camden's collusion in the process by supporting the developer in making such statements.

Light

The 7 Storey proposed building (which was originally proposed as a 4 storey development!) is being placed within a few metres of Palgrave house and my fourth floor flat which will face directly onto a building site for 2 years and then the subsequent towerblock. The proposed development will result in an unacceptable and complete loss of daylight. The reason I purchased this flat was because I suffer with a diagnosed medical condition called Seasonal Affective Disorder, commonly known as "SAD". If the proposed development goes ahead this will prevent any sunlight from coming into my flat and hence this will severely negatively impact upon my mental health.

The height of the building and the lack of any sunlight now on Palgrave house (floors 1-6) will also cause untold damage to value of the privately owned properties in Palgrave House and surrounding properties and not increase the value as the developer has incorrectly submitted. Please also note that although questioned in person and on the phone, the developer has failed to provide any evidence to support their view that the price of Palgrave House properties will increase. Camden has clearly put its own and a private companies profits ahead of the health and finances of its tenants. I am surprised no offer of compensation has already been made either financial or otherwise, especially considering the conflict of interest Camden has placed itself in.

Right of way

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>It has been incorrectly assumed by Camden that local residents accept the removal of a long established right of way. The right of way is a key access point to Lawn Road and its removal is unacceptable.</p> <p>Overcrowding and increase in crime</p> <p>There will be 7 stories of 70+ luxury flats, the existing block will now be looking upward onto ground floor amenity spaces, such as 70 refuse, recycling and storage areas The existing tower blocks will lose their light, becoming darkened and inevitably more susceptible to petty crime and antisocial behaviour which is already a significant concern which Camden has failed to address. This will in turn lower the moral of residents already tarnished with the reputation of tower block residence.</p> <p>Pressure on local amenities</p> <p>There will be an enormous impact on local schools, state and private, and the commensurate traffic during the school run, in addition to the impact on the public transport, GP and hospital congestion, and parking availability as a direct result of the increased and unsustainable population density and their needs. The existing sewerage / drainage / water supply will not be updated to account for the new flats. There are already two 14 storey council blocks, and the work may structurally undermine them.</p> <p>Parking will now become impossible. The developer has stated that no new parking permits will be granted but where will there be spaces at the weekend or evening? If any new development goes ahead, even one which confirms to planning regulations and not the proposed 7 storey tower block, the parking will need to be extended to 11pm during the week and all weekend. Camden has completely ignored this fact so far.</p> <p>As you can see from thee above there are valid and substantial social and legal objections to the proposed development which will need to be addressed in turn and in full. In addition, Camden using the developer to blackmail its residents, some of whom are vulnerable is a disgrace and this will need to also be investigated further.</p>
2014/6903/P	David Kitchen, SEGA	13 Parliament Hill London NW3 2SY	04/01/2015 18:17:23	OBJEMAIL	Could you please list as a Constraint the prescriptive public rights of way across this site

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6903/P	Monica Lotta	20 B Lawn Road	04/01/2015 17:55:01	COMMNT	<p>I wish to object to the new building at 32 Lawn Road application and these are the reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The New building is too big. The new building of 5/7 stories will reduce light to the local residents and put more strain on local amenities.2. It will have a negative impact on the local conservation area and air quality.3. Traffic and Noise. Lawn Road is already congested during rush hours; this new building will have serious negative effects on traffic and Noise pollution. Parking space will be reduced further.4. The construction of this new building is on a sewage ground and it is likely to have health implications for local residents.
