

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4862/P	Clare Barber	5 Hampstead Lane London N6 4RT	16/09/2016 18:50:41	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to this application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This proposal should not be considered as a “change of use” application. The proposal involves the “filling in” of the roof valleys, a material change to the roof design, the incorporation of a second floor and increase to bulk and height. It is a clear circumvention of planning regulation as the proposal goes far beyond the intent of the dispensation for Change of Use. The Council should sanction this attempt to circumvent planning regulation. Unless the proposal is scrutinised through the planning approval process the residents affected will not be afforded the proper protections to safeguard their interests. 2. The increase in height and bulk will affect the light to many of the residents at no’s 1 to 5 Highgate Road. 3. The plans which have been provided are totally inadequate to allow those who have a right to be consulted to form a proper view of the impact they will have. The developer should be required to present proper 3 D drawings which allow us to adequately visualise the proposals. The proposed roof elevation visuals are incomprehensible. There should be elevations showing the new and proposed roof from the perspective of the houses at 1-7 Highgate Road. 4. There are no plans showing the proposed second floor of the units. Again this must be a clear circumvention of planning regulation. 5. No consideration has been given to the amenity of the development and how the required new services will impact on existing residents. The placing of bins have not been addressed, and the only possible place is presumably the alleyway or the forecourt. This will cause significant disturbance to the rear bedrooms at 1-7 Highgate Road. 6. The incorporation of a bike storage structure raises similar concerns to 5. Above. 7. The incorporation of a patio area has also been referred to without adequate detailing. This also will give rise to noise disturbance to the adjacent bedrooms at No. 1. 8. There is insufficient detailing of the materials to be used. These are historic buildings and the style and aesthetic should be preserved. The cobbles in the courtyard should be retained. 9. I am concerned about access to the site in terms of emergency services. 10. The installation of a gate reinforces my concerns in 9 above 11. The proposal to incorporate 11 units is clear over development of a challenged site in terms of space and access. <p>I hope that the Council blocks this attempt to circumvent the proper process of planning approval which would afford residents the proper protections. I believe that this application is merely being used to establish consent to an 11 unit development of double height. Should this be passed I suspect the</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					developer will submit a new application to demolish the buildings and reinstate a yet more bulky 2 storey structure. I hope that the Council does not countenance the dressing up of what should be a planning application as a Change of Use.
