



Dear Mr Diver,

Further to our telephone conversation yesterday, please find attached our response to the planning consultation in relation to 12 Ainger Road, NW3 3AR.

We are not comfortable with having a double, eye-level bin store immediately adjacent to our front entrance. The reasons for our objection are outlined in the attached document, which I have also provided in text format below.

I would be grateful if you could keep me informed as to whether this aspect of the planning application is approved, or not.

With kind regards,

Siobhan Frost (Mrs)


**Stephen & Siobhan Frost
13 Ainger Road
London
NW3 3AR**

John Diver
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND

Monday 1st February, 2016

Application Reference: 2016/0114/P

Dear Mr Diver,

Planning Application Consultation – Basement Flat, 12 Ainger Road

Many thanks for your letter dated 14 January 2016, informing us of our neighbour's proposed building work.

1. Single storey side infill and rear extension and associated alterations

We do not have any issues with the proposed single storey side infill.

2. Alterations to front bin store

We object to the proposed bin store on the following grounds:

(i) **The location of the proposed bin store is conspicuous**

The existing the bin store is discreetly located within the boundary of our neighbour's property. It is not obtrusive in this position and does not dominate, nor impact, the front façade of the property.

However, the proposed bin store faces directly onto the public pavement and extends upwards to a level higher than that of the existing brick work and railings. As the bin store would be at eye level, we feel that this makes it

particularly conspicuous, which does not sit well with the character and ambience of the street.

This is further exacerbated by the design and aesthetic of the bin store. The materials proposed for the construction are mesh metal, of functional, industrial appearance, painted black. We feel that this aesthetic will contrast starkly against the existing white wall and the original, period iron railings. The overall effect will be to make the bin store a prominent, incongruous and unappealing feature of the front facade.

(As a footnote, we were informed that the iron gate and railings at number 12 are the only surviving original examples in the street. It would, in our view, be a great loss if they were cannibalised for the sake of a bin store).

(ii) **Bin stores integrated into the front wall are not the norm in Ainger Road**

The majority of residents in Ainger Road rely on the Council's green wheelie bins for their refuse disposal. There are a few properties with integrated bin stores. However, with two exceptions, (one being that of number 11), the stores are situated behind the front railings and within the front area of the properties concerned.

It is not the norm to integrate bin stores into the front, wall of properties in Ainger Road where they are prominently visible. To do so has an impact on the character and ambience of the road as a whole.

(iii) **Number 11 Ainger Road is a single unit dwelling, requiring less refuse storage capacity than a multi unit dwelling**

You have received pictures of the bin store at number 11 Ainger Road, by way of precedent. The bin store at number 11 is exceptional in that it is integrated into the front boundary wall and, as the property doesn't have a basement, there is no front area and no railings.

We would point out that 11 Ainger Road is a single unit dwelling and is occupied by one resident only. Consequently, the bin store has sufficient capacity to contain the refuse generated by the property. Furthermore, the bin store is low level, not at eye level and is constructed of traditional materials.

Number 12 Ainger Road will contain four separate flats,

two of which are two-bedroomed units. The total amount of refuse generated by the property overall will be considerably more than that produced by number 11. We feel that the proposed bin store will be too small to contain the refuse generated by the property as a whole. We are concerned that excess refuse will be placed on, or beside, the proposed bin store, and on the pavement adjacent to our boundary, causing an unsightly and unhygienic nuisance.

(iii) The proposed location prejudices the main entrance to our property

The proposed location of the new bin store would site it immediately next to our front gate. We object in principle to such an unsavoury feature being situated in such close proximity to our main entrance.

Owing to the capacity constraints outlined in (iii) above, we do not want the sight, or smell of our neighbour's refuse to greet us as we enter and leave our property.

In conclusion, we feel that the proposed bin store is unnecessary, unneighbourly and unappealing.

- (iv) For the reasons explained above, our preference would be for the bin store to remain in its existing location.

If our neighbour's are determined to integrate a bin store into the front wall, we would suggest that they do so next to their front gateway, so that they receive both the benefit and the burden of the installation.

3. Replacement of rear boundary treatment

Despite our best efforts, and having checked the documents provided on the planning portal, we cannot identify what the rear boundary treatment consists of. Therefore, we are unable to give a view on this matter.

We hope that this letter satisfies your consultation requirements. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can provide any further assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Siobhan & Stephen Frost

