

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/3330/P	Mike Peskin	3b Torriano Avenue NW5 2SN	22/07/2016 15:22:34	OBJ	<p>This retrospective planning application is misleading and is clearly not just for the retention of 'a garden shed', it's for the retention of yet another room to this already over developed property, which has been constructed without planning permission. An application for an even smaller extension to what the owner has now built without planning consent, was withdrawn by the same applicant in June 2015, after Planning officer Patrick Marfleet visited the site in May 2015. Patrick Marfleet considered the proposal to be a clear refusal on both design and amenity grounds, as it would create a bulky and over-dominant addition that would further reduce the small amount of rear garden space at the site. Furthermore, Patrick Marfleet said it was clear that the proposal was to be used as an additional bedroom, effectively creating a 7 bed House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) which would fail to comply with the councils minimum floor space standards. Once notified of the above issues with their proposal the applicant confirmed to Patrick Marfleet that they no longer wished to proceed with the application and it was subsequently withdrawn on 4th June 2015. Construction work without planning approval, still commenced for an even larger extension in late December 2015. On these grounds the retrospective application should clearly be refused, and the property owners instructed to remove the structure immediately. As already previously advised, the related docs on the planning portal do not even relate to this application? Please can you acknowledge safe receipt of this objection and also let me know by return the date for the planning committee meeting when this application will be determined, as I would like to personally attend to object. Thank you and I await to hear back from you.</p>
2016/3330/P	JM Headlam-Wells	1 Torriano Avenue LONDON NW5 2SN	24/07/2016 18:12:56	COMNOT	<p>I object to this application as the landlord is presenting an inaccurate and disingenuous case. It is well known in the development that this is a 'battery hen' operation to pack in as many students as possible for profit - reputedly 12 at the present time This is, in practice, a large HMO, but does the landlord have a licence?</p> <p>What is billed in the application as 'garden shed' is in fact an extension to house more students. I doubt whether the original building has planning permission as the landlord has converted what was designed to be a garden in a residential development to a warehouse for more students. Camden's Planning Dept needs to inspect the property. Does it meet Health & Safety standards? For example, even the loft has been converted into accommodation, with only a plastic dome roof for light and air. Today was the first time in 9 years that I have seen this roof opened - conditions for the students in summer must be intolerably hot.</p> <p>I am not in favour of retrospective planning applications, which show a complete disregard and lack of respect for Camden's planning regulations. This is the landlord's second such application in 2 years. In the summer a large crowd of students are frequently heard and observed partying until past midnight, with loud music and often noisy screaming and singing. The Concierge, who regularly patrols the development during the day, is not present at these times to urge restraint.</p> <p>This application must come to the Full Planning Committee on a Thursday evening, and not be passed under Chair's business on a Monday evening in order to ensure openness and transparency.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/3330/P	JM Headlam-Wells	1 Torriano Avenue LONDON NW5 2SN	24/07/2016 18:13:17	COMNOT	<p>I object to this application as the landlord is presenting an inaccurate and disingenuous case. It is well known in the development that this is a 'battery hen' operation to pack in as many students as possible for profit - reputedly 12 at the present time This is, in practice, a large HMO, but does the landlord have a licence?</p> <p>What is billed in the application as 'garden shed' is in fact an extension to house more students. I doubt whether the original building has planning permission as the landlord has converted what was designed to be a garden in a residential development to a warehouse for more students. Camden's Planning Dept needs to inspect the property. Does it meet Health & Safety standards? For example, even the loft has been converted into accommodation, with only a plastic dome roof for light and air. Today was the first time in 9 years that I have seen this roof opened - conditions for the students in summer must be intolerably hot.</p> <p>I am not in favour of retrospective planning applications, which show a complete disregard and lack of respect for Camden's planning regulations. This is the landlord's second such application in 2 years. In the summer a large crowd of students are frequently heard and observed partying until past midnight, with loud music and often noisy screaming and singing. The Concierge, who regularly patrols the development during the day, is not present at these times to urge restraint.</p> <p>This application must come to the Full Planning Committee on a Thursday evening, and not be passed under Chair's business on a Monday evening in order to ensure openness and transparency.</p>
