

Comments on Planning Application No: 2015/5847/P revised

We do not find that, for the most part, the minor changes in the revised plans address our concerns:

These are as follows:

DAMAGE TO AND LOSS OF TREES IN THE FITZJOHNS NETHERALL CONSERVATION AREA

In proposing to cut down the healthy, mature birch tree, that supports many small birds in the breeding season, the developer has shown scant regard for the local environment. Nor is there anything in this revised proposal that

allays our concern that there will be irrevocable damage to the root system of the nearby, magnificent plane tree in the grounds of Perrins Lodge from the proposed deep excavations. This tree is a contender for the most beautiful tree of its type in the area and is already the subject of a TPO. A development that threatens healthy, mature trees in the conservation area cannot be acceptable. We urge the Council to protect our trees and reject the plans outright.

BUILDING HEIGHT AND LIGHT POLUTION

We note in the revised plans an attempt to reduce the height of the proposed building by one storey but the revised plans still raise the height of the existing building, which is unacceptable. We also note that no attempt has been made to mitigate the inevitable, increased light pollution to the lower floors of no. 64, which together with the removal of screening vegetation, would be intrusive for the occupants of those flats. However, on a positive note, of a green roof is proposed.

BASEMENT EXCAVATION RISKS

We are grateful to Robert McGregor of flat A no 64, who is a structural engineer, for his expert comments regarding the unacceptable risks to no 64 from the proposed deep basement excavation in close proximity to existing buildings. He has also commented upon the potential negative effects of loading on the access driveway, underneath which lies the main sewer for no 64.

THE ACCESS DRIVEWAY

The Developer now claims that his "garden" includes the access drive leading to the rear of no 64. Existing property plans (not submitted by the developer) clearly mark the driveway as an "access drive" and so the inclusion of the drive as "garden" would seem to be an attempt to justify excavation of the entire garden area of no 66. On these grounds alone, Camden should reject this proposal, as it is in breach of their existing development policy.

Recently, cars are being parked on the driveway which together with the high, locked, metal gate spanning the driveway (attached to no 64 – without planning permission) prevents access to the rear of no 64 in the case of emergency.

PUBLIC SAFETY RISKS

We remain concerned for the safety of the public, especially local children, the elderly and the disabled. The access drive lies in close proximity to a bus stop that serves many local schools. A bus shelter on the pavement further reduces visibility of the driveway exit. The site is unsuitable for large vehicles entering and exiting some of which will of necessity be reversing.

WASTE & RECYCLING FACILITIES, BICYCLE STORAGE

Waste and recycling facilities at no.66 are absent from the revised plans, once again in breach of Camden Policy. The Council cannot presume that neighbouring facilities can substitute - the development should fail on these grounds alone. And whilst we are in favour of the proposal to make the development a car-free zone, we also note that housing for two bicycles has been omitted.

Professor & Mrs Green 64E Fitzjohn's Avenue NW3 5LT

18.08.2016