

Dike, Darlene

From: Jacob Levy [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 June 2015 15:04
To: Freeney, Fergus
Cc: Planning
Subject: Planning Application - 2015/2301/P

Hello Fergus,

My name is Jake and I am resident of Maygrove Road in Camden.

As you may be aware the owners of 73 and 73a Maygrove road have submitted two planning applications, one for a proposed roof extension to 73a Maygrove road (2015/239/P) and another for two side extensions to 73 Maygrove road (2015/2301/P).

While I have no serious objection to the proposed roof extension to the rear building, I do object to the proposed side extensions to the front building at 73 Maygrove.

-My key issue is with the the quality of the design. Granada developments built both 73, 73A and 75 Maygrove Road which I think most people would agree are not of a high quality of design (photo of buildings attached to remind you of the buildings). It cannot be denied that they are good businessmen, and Rooms& Studios are a well run profitable company but this does not translate in our opinion into good architecture. Many would consider 75 Maygrove, with the entire forecourt filled with off street parking and no landscaping, an eyesore, and we consider that if planning permission is granted for the extensions to 73 Maygrove road , with cheap looking aluminium windows and clad in vertical slate tiles, it will also be an eyesore. There is an opportunity here to build extensions to 73 Maygrove which are well designed and use robust materials– but to do so costs more money and I do not think that Rooms and studios will put the time and money into building quality buildings unless encouraged to do so by Camden.

-Basically the developer, Rooms&Studios, could do better , a whole lot better. I think the residents of Maygrove Road deserve better. It is more expensive to build good quality buildings but why should we settle for less? I do not think that we should be accepting these cheap looking slate clad extensions tacked crudely onto the end of the existing building at 73 maygorve road.

-There is not adequate provision for waste bins and it is inevitable that unless adequate waste storage is designed into the scheme at planning stage the bins will end up in the front of the building in an ugly shed (as is the case at both 75 Maygrove road and the new building at 59 Maygrove road) I do not want our street littered with large recycling bins.

-There is not adequate provision for secure off street integrated cycle storage. The plans simply show cycle racks lined up along the front of the building. These will never be used and will simply clutter the front of the building . I think that If the developer (who owns 20 units on this site and around 4000 elsewhere in London) wants planning permission to build the extensions , the least they can do is to build waste storage and Cycle storage in the new extension. Of course they will not want to do this as it will take up valuable rentable space and so will only do so if Camden insist on this .

-The proposal does not include any landscaping to the front of the existing building.

Please can you take my objections into account when reviewing this application.

Thanks,
Jake