

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5052/P	jo hordern	Flat 4 97 Torriano Avenue	20/10/2016 16:17:09	OBJ	<p>I am a long term resident of 97 Torriano Avenue (since 1994). I object to the the erection of a rear 'Outbuilding' in the garden of 95A. A very similar proposal was made in 2014-15, application No 2014/6855/P. In that application the proposed building in the rear garden was described as a 'Writer's Cabin' but was essentially the same as the current proposal for an 'Outbuilding'. Due to objections from residents, the 'Writer's Cabin' was withdrawn from the application and the rest of the development - which included extending the basement of No 95 to the same building line as No 97 - was passed. It now seems that the applicant is simply trying again to get a guesthouse type annexe into the rear garden. Why else would it need a bathroom? My objections are as for the previous application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unacceptable increase in massing, given that permission has already been granted (in 2015) to extend the rear of 95 to the same building line as No 97 - hugely reducing the garden of 95 in the process. 2. Loss of privacy and amenity and increase in noise and light pollution in respect of neighbours' rear balconies and windows in Torriano Avenue. 3. The development, if passed, will set a precedent that others might seek to follow. This would be very much change the whole rear aspect of Torriano Avenue. At present the rear outlook over Torriano Mews is quiet and tranquil, composed of gardens, landscaped parking and low-level mews buildings. This is something that is very much valued by residents. If the ends of all the gardens were hacked off and developed it would irrevocably degrade the amenity of all residents. <p>For the above reasons I hope the planning authorities will not approve this application.</p> <p>As it is not possible to attach site photos to comments made via this website I will email them directly to the case officer, Darlene Dike.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5052/P	Susannah Clarke (also known as Susannah Czopor)	Flat 2 97 Torriano Avenue Kentish Town London NW5 2RX	20/10/2016 16:21:49	OBJ	<p>I am writing to register my objection to this application.</p> <p>My husband and I are the owners and permanent residents at Flat 2, 97 Torriano Avenue. The outlook to the rear of our house, over Torriano Mews and the gardens on the west side of Torriano Avenue (with our flat directly overlooking the garden at no. 95), is highly valued by myself and my husband, as it is very quiet and private. It is especially quiet and private in the evenings and at weekends thanks to the 'normal business hours' operated by the offices in Torriano Mews.</p> <p>The proposed plans in this application detail a habitable building with services, which could, and I strongly suspect will, be used as extra living space, an extra bedroom or guest accommodation. In any case, the proposed building will create traffic from the flat's inhabitants all year round as they travel between the existing and proposed building. This will adversely affect the peaceful outlook of our flat and other nearby properties. The proposed building would furthermore be highly visible from our flat, having an adverse affect on our outward view and, even more significantly, the privacy of our home.</p> <p>The size of the garden at 95 Torriano Avenue will be greatly reduced by the proposed building. I do not think any reduction in the garden space can be justified. It will significantly diminish the garden facility of no. 95, and may set a precedent that other owners in the street may want to follow – which, if followed, would seriously affect the overall landscape of Torriano Avenue. The outlook to the rear of all neighbouring houses is of gardens, and this should be preserved for the benefit of all residents.</p> <p>I would be happy to accommodate a site visit at my flat in the course of making a decision on this application, should you wish to do so.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Susannah Clarke Flat 2 97 Torriano Avenue NW5 2RX</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5052/P	Birgit Heyer	Flat 1 97 Torriano Avenue Kentish Town London NW52RX	20/10/2016 17:10:36	COMMNT	<p>This rear outbuilding being applied for, has previously appear in an application 2014/6855/P described as a "Writers cabin" together with an application for a rear extension to Flat A 95 Torriano Avenue. The writers cabin was withdrawn from this application, perhaps due to several objections. The extension was granted. A new separate application has now been submitted by the owners for an Erection of a rear building or Summer House. The details for this Summer House are the same as for the Writers Cabin which was originally withdraw. My concerns to the erection of a rear building or Summer House are therefore the same as they were for the Writers Cabin (as it was called in the previous application) namely:</p> <p>1) A Summer House/Writers Cabin or Outbuilding is to be build at the end of the garden of 95 Torriano - complete with services. At present there is no structure at the end of the garden - not even a garden shed. None of the adjoining properties have permanent structures in their rear garden.</p> <p>At present there are no buildings that have a window facing the rear of properties 93, 95, 97 and 99. The mews development at the rear of these properties does NOT have any windows facing these properties - only a very small opening with frosted glass. Building a summer house at the end of the garden will open a new window and therefore loss of privacy to certainly the above mentioned properties - if not others - which should be avoided under all circumstances.</p> <p>A summer house complete with services would indicate more permanent use - at the moment the rear gardens - of the properties in the vecinity are quiet green havens - building a permanent structure in the rear of 95 would take away from this effect.</p> <p>2) Adding a Summer House complete with services will increase the living space of Flat A 95 Torriano Avenue substantially, it will already be increased by the erection of the extension which was granted under application 2014/6855/P - erecting a further Summer house would substantially increase the traffic associated with this.</p> <p>3) Further it was noted that the Existing Section BB drawing attached to the planning Documents shows the garden wall between 95 and 97 Torriano Avenue to be 1930mm in high. This is not correct. Without being able to take exact measurements, at the moment, the wall can be estimated closer to 1050mm. The current wall as seen from 97 Torriano Avenue is 15 courses high - each course being approximately 7cm - which would give a hight of the wall to be close to 1050mm and not 1930mm. I attach a photograph of the garden wall between 97 and 95 Torriano Avenue which shows that the garden wall is approximately 15 courses high and therefore the drawings submitted with the application are incorrect.</p> <p>This incorrect statement regarding the fence/garden wall between 95 Torriano Avenue and the adjoining properties ie. 93 and 97 Torriano Avenue was already pointed out on the previous planning application ie. 2014/6855/P by Dr VGA Goss of 93a Torriano Avenue NW5 2RX in the comments section. There it states "We need to see both exisiting and proposed side elevations for 93/95 i.e., similar to Drawings No 604 and No 202 (the latter, incidentally, is incorrect because the existing fence is not 1930 mm high.)</p>

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

So clearly the new Summer House would project in excess of 1500mm above the garden wall thus clearly overlooking and shading the garden of Flat 1 97 Torriano Avenue.
