

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/5847/P	Susan Oldroyd	Flat D 64 Fitzjohn's Avenue London NW35LT	01/08/2016 19:42:26	INT	<p>REVISED PLANNING APPLICATION 2015/5847/P ADDRESS: 66 FITZJOHN'S AVENUE NW3 5LT</p> <p>I wish to lodge my objection to the proposed application.</p> <p>I have looked carefully at the revisions, but find that they fail to address the concerns raised in my original comments sent to you in my letter of 25th January 2016 and my supporting appendix of reference and comment dated 29th January 2016.</p> <p>Despite the revision to remove an additional storey, the proposal still seeks to raise the height of the entire roof line substantially above the existing flat roof. This unsympathetic design creates an overbearing block, clearly visible from Fitzjohn's Avenue to the front and Akenside Road to the rear. It is visually disturbing, of a scale and design out of keeping with the conservation area and has negative impact on both the conservation area and the amenity of the residents of 64 Fitzjohn's Avenue.</p> <p>Please refer to comments in my letters and appendix of references as dated above and lodged on your website which explain further the reasons for my objection to raising the height of the building, my objection to evening light pollution from the proposed glazing panels facing the rear of 64 Fitzjohn's Avenue and my concerns over proposed materials for cladding the building.</p> <p>The proposed basement development still fails to take account of Camden's own guidelines. It does not address questions raised in my comments lodged on your website. Surprisingly, it now seems to imply that the tarmac access drive external to the gated courtyard be included as a part of garden when making calculations regarding the percentage of the site to be dedicated to basement accommodation. This cannot be seen as acceptable.</p> <p>I note, too that there is still no provision for waste and recycling included in the design. It is inappropriate and unacceptable to suggest that the neighbours at 64 should accommodate this on the freehold of 64. I also see that the original proposal for two bicycle stands has been dropped. The architects themselves note that the site is tight. It certainly is. I am at a loss to see how waste and recycling, at the appropriate distance from doors and windows, adequate lighting and ventilation of the basement accommodation, hardstanding for parking a minimum of two cars, whilst retaining something of the current garden amenity, can all be achieved. The revised proposal is unrealistic.</p> <p>The developers argue that competent construction can overcome the many problems associated with working in sites with limited access, and in very close proximity to neighbouring buildings and significant trees. The claim is made that site management will deal with problems as they arise and attempts will be made to mitigate the environmental impact.</p> <p>My earlier comments have highlighted problems associated with very limited access to this tiny site that would need to contend with major excavation, removal of spoil and the heavy vehicle movements onto Fitzjohn's Avenue. The high water table in this area, the proximity of underground water courses,</p>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

the inability of any developer to predict accurately immediate or future risk to existing Victorian buildings and drainage infrastructure has also been noted. The existing building already cuts into the main drains for 64. Any development of 66 would also need to address this issue of overload.

I also note that my neighbour, Mr. McGregor, has alerted you to the fact that there is a tunnel along the narrow access drive flanking the north side elevation of 64. The revised proposal represents inappropriate over-development of a site in such close proximity to at 64.

The basic, bottom line question seems to be this:

Although this new build may be possible, is it sensible, reasonable, or acceptable?

Moreover, if allowed, is the precedent for future over-development of tiny back land sites one which Camden Planning wishes to support?

I would argue that there may well be opportunities to include sensitive modern development within a conservation area. But this proposal does not represent good design neither does it show any responsible consideration for the amenity of neighbours it immediately affects nor the conservation environment into which it intrudes. It presents as over-development for its own sake.

Finally, I note that again, no attempt has been made by the developer to consult the residents at 64 who are most directly affected by the proposal and that once again the notice to residents and the period allowed for comment coincides with a holiday period when many will be away and will be unable to comment. This is both disappointing and unhelpful.

Please reject this revised proposal outright.

---