

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/0937/P	Peter Lewis	86 Parkway NW1 7AN	26/02/2015 21:44:40	OBJ	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the planning permission, application ref: 2015/0937/P. If you are not already aware, Camden Council has already refused a near identical planning application in 2013, for a 1st floor rear extension. Adding to this, there are also unresolved previous planning infringements that Camden Council and 84 Parkway have a responsibility to resolve, notably a 3rd floor roof extension that was built without planning permission, or without any Party Wall agreement. We are still waiting for the enforcement action to be taken at 84 Parkway regarding their refused application: 2013/0389/P.</p> <p>Firstly I object to this current planning application, as it will severely affect the living conditions at 86 Parkway. The extension will block out light from the 1st floor rear window and reduce visibility. To quote from the original 2013 application refusal:</p> <p>“The proposed first floor rear extension by reason of its siting and height would result in the loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure experienced by the occupiers of no. 86 Parkway and would therefore be detrimental to their residential amenity”</p> <p>Secondly, the building work itself will cause a major disruption to living and working conditions at 86 Parkway, as we have previously experienced from earlier illegal building work undertaken at 84 Parkway under the instruction of Leo Kaufmann. We have suffered from aggressive builders working all hours of the day and weekends (including Sundays), creating building waste without attempts to clear up. We have had a damaged roof as a result of discarded debris from 84 Parkway, including abandoned scaffolding that still remains. We have also experienced blocked exterior drains immediately after their previous building, creating several costly leakages (tennis balls were found forced into our drain pipes).</p> <p>We are not prepared to entertain further building work at 84 Parkway that has been on-going for the last 3-4 years. We now have a new-born baby (under 1 years) in 86 Parkway, and strongly desire an end to the building disturbances of 84 Parkway. We have witnessed an abuse of regulations at every opportunity, such as scaffolding erected without permits or meeting health and safety guidelines. It has been a continual attempt at avoiding enforcements from the owners of 84 Parkway, which has highlighted the stretched capabilities of the Camden Planning Department.</p> <p>I would also like to put it on record that we are aware that 84 Parkway has erected a wooden exterior fence outside their 1st floor dwelling. This fence was erected on the 25th February 2015 and we have date-stamped photographs to prove when this work was begun. This fence was erected without any dialogue, despite it being built up on a shared wall. As of writing this objection letter, this fence has been up for one day. This fence suggests Leo Kaufmann plans to begin the building work on the 1st floor extension with the benefit of it being hidden from view behind this new fence. For the record, the 3rd floor roof extension was built under the guise that they were “fixing the chimney”.</p> <p>Finally we are also concerned as to how well, or not, the building of 84 Parkway has been underpinned, as we believe most regulations have been ignored during the 3rd floor roof extension. To add more weight to the building would only add to our concerns. We would also like reassurances if the Camden Housing department knows whether 84 Parkway has the correct fire escapes, and the legal amount of</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>tenants are occupying 84 Parkway.</p> <p>We conclude with the words from Camden Council taken from the previous 2013 planning refusal:</p> <p>“The proposed first floor rear extension by reason of its size, siting and detailed design would create an unacceptably obtrusive form of development. The proposed extension would lead to a harmful overdevelopment of the rear of the host building and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and the Camden Town Conservation Area”</p> <p>We implore you to end this building saga, as its conclusion would improve our peace and living environment.</p> <p>We still await the enforcement action to be completed from the previous 2013 planning refusal.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Peter Lewis</p>

Total: 9