

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4989/P	Graham Earley	14 Eton Villas	30/11/2016 23:26:09	OBJ	I object to this variation of conditions. It seems to me an attempt to regain height that was conceded from earlier plans. That the height of the whole front elevation needs to come up for a "lift overrun" is questionable. Those of my neighbours considered, by the proposers of the development, as the most cynical warned that the architects would pull this kind of trick. It looks like they were right !
2016/4989/P	Carlton Davidson	17 Eton Villas London NW3 4SG	01/12/2016 00:27:21	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to the above application..</p> <p>In the consultation meetings the synagogue agreed very begrudgingly to reduce the height of building by 65 cms, only to find that they have gone back on their word, whilst failing, after several attempts to give the neighbours a set of clear and precise drawings.</p> <p>There was never any proposed intention to use the second floor balcony for events or for outside breaks for the Sunday school children. The balcony was called an exterior amenity area on the planning permission plans, which deliberately did not imply such future usage</p> <p>It is not unreasonable for the residents to insist on usage hours of between 12.00 am and 19.00 pm seven day a week, as this will avoid there being lots of noise complaints to the council in this strictly residential area.</p> <p>Up to 100 children or guests on a balcony can cause a serious degree of noise pollution .</p> <p>Also in these days of possible terrorist threat to religious buildings, an open space on an upper level is very vulnerable to possible drone attack, especially when the security only patrols the ground levels at the front of the building.</p> <p>Overall there has been a great lack of openness and clarity in the pre-planning meetings and the CWG meetings with the local council members and the residents.</p> <p>A lot of things that could have been made clear to everybody in the beginning are now being asked for in subsequent planning applications..... And this in a building that is tripling in size with 32 fewer seats in the prayer area of the synagogue</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4989/P	Pam Millard	18 Provost Court	30/11/2016 11:19:15	OBJ	<p>The General Proposal makes no mention of the residents in Provost Court. Variation of approved plans - condition 4.</p> <p>I object to Increase of the height of the building above the lift. No indication of affect on light or noise to the Provost Court balconies and windows. This continuing application for more growth, development creep, is not backed up backed up by daylight, sunlight, noise calculations or consideration for the residents in Provost Court. More information should be supplied.</p> <p>2nd FLOOR to the rear of the building. Proposed Increase in height to the proposed parapet next to Provost Court, NW and SW elevations. I object to having an open area at this height on the rear of the building located in a quiet solely residential area. See NW and SW elevations. The fact that there is a proposed Increase in height of the proposed parapet shows that use of this area is a significant issue. It is part of the exit from the off the Children's area, classrooms and youth services room.</p> <p>The proposed alterations to 3rd floor and any other window locations on the Provost Court elevation do not show any comparisons with the original approved drawings so it is not possible to see what change is being requested and therefore I object.</p> <p>The SW elevation plan does not show the greenery which is present at the moment. The synagogue boundary with Provost Court's garden is covered in ivy and is a 3-4m high "green wall" on that side. This is an important feature of Provost Court garden which provides the neighbouring residents with soft outlook and reflected light. The height and width of the new synagogue wall will darken both the garden and the light to the side and the studio flat residents and the greenery should be retained or replaced.</p> <p>The position of the 3rd floor plant room is now nearer to Provost Court. The flues or extraction fans from the plant room are not labelled and they are now nearer to Provost Court. They are shown also on the roof, still not identified or labelled. Noise or other calculations, such as emissions, should be provided on how this will affect these neighbours.</p> <p>On the SW elevation plan it is not shown whether there is an intention to have an outside door or window in the plant room. This has a direct affect of overseeing and noise on the neighbours living in Provost Court. It is not clear from the drawings whether there is a parapet around the Tank Room which could lead to overlooking and noise. More detail is requested.</p> <p>Extra uses for which planning application has not been given yet, such as the use of the forecourt as playground should be refused. This use will prevent the area being used to mediate the pressure on parking spaces and cause extra noise in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>For these reasons I ask the Council to reject this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4989/P	Ray Bryant	Flat 11 Provost Court Eton Road London	30/11/2016 19:34:22	COMMNT	<p>PLANNING APPLICATION 2016/4989/P</p> <p>I object to the following aspects of the revised proposals:</p> <p>BUILDING HEIGHT</p> <p>The building height on the building elevation closest to Eton Road is shown on the planning consent drawings as 12.250 metres above pavement level on Eton Road. The proposed increase brings the building to 13.335 metres, the same height as a previous proposal which was reduced in order to gain planning consent. So, having conceded the applicant is now clawing it back.</p> <p>The reason given for this 10% height increase is to accommodate a lift over-run. Even if true, the area of lift over-run is very small in relation to the extent of roof increase. The roof is in fact raised over the whole length of the staircase and the glazed area which extends beyond the stair. This appears to be a ploy to revert to the previous design height which was successfully negotiated down to a more reasonable height. To accept it now will make a mockery of the planning system where a reasoned discussion resulted in a more moderate building in a sensitive area. The new proposal should not be allowed, any competent architect should be able to deal with the small area of lift over-run such that it does not necessitate raising the whole elevation.</p> <p>The whole building is over scaled, with three-storeys of the building rising to the height of five storeys of its neighbour; accommodating the lift over-run within the consented height should be perfectly possible.</p> <p>Similarly, the height at the rear where the architect has miss-calculated the stair headroom could also avoid being raised.</p> <p>SERVICING</p> <p>The building has no meaningful provision for vehicle servicing. It is now explained that the forecourt is to be used for parking 4 cars, 30 bicycles, an electric car charging point, a security building. There is also a proposal to use the courtyard for children's playground and unspecified events. So, there is little opportunity for the forecourt to be used for the purpose of access for service vehicles. These will have to park in the road in order to deliver and collect. For such a large building with large servicing requirements this will cause significant disruption to the adjoining residential neighbours.</p> <p>WINDOWS ON S.W. ELEVATION PROVOST COURT</p> <p>It is very unusual for planning permission to be granted for windows which are on a boundary wall. These present particular difficulties for neighbouring properties in terms of privacy/overlooking, acoustic separation, spread of fire. These windows are not essential to the performance of the building and should be omitted or reduced in size.</p> <p>The proposed provision of 'film' applied to clear glass is a very temporary and unsatisfactory method of ensuring privacy and preventing overlooking. The film can be easily removed, either on totality or in part to allow overlooking. The planning department will have no control if this is done in the future and it is the adjoining owners who will be left with the problem. The minimum provision should be obscured glass to all windows.</p> <p>There is no explanation of how the windows will provide the required acoustic separation, although this is condition 8 of the planning consent granted on 28 January 2016. The building is considerably larger than the existing building and therefore more noise is inevitable. Noise is one of the major causes of dispute between neighbours and extremely difficult to resolve. It is incumbent on Planning Departments to mitigate any cause for potential dispute and therefore would request that a full explanation of acoustic control is provided before any of these variants are accepted.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Unfortunately spread of fire is beyond the remit of the Planning Department and therefore can allow proposals which may not be able to meet technical criteria. An unfortunate deficiency in the system. In this case the proposal is unlikely to meet Part B4 section 9 of the Building Regulations.</p> <p>For the most part these windows could be eliminated or at very least significantly reduced in size and detailed so that they will not cause these potential problems</p> <p>ACCESS</p> <p>Condition 13 of the Planning Consent requires residential accommodation to be in compliance with Building Regulation Part M4 (2)</p> <p>Part M4 (2.10) states ‘‘The approach route should be step free, irrespective of the storey on which the dwelling is located’’ The previous scheme showed lift access to the third floor demonstrating that lift access to the residential units is possible. However, the current proposal eliminates lift access to the residential accommodation thus contravening Part M of the Building regulations and making it impossible to meet the Planning Condition 13 of the consent granted. Similarly, the revised internal layouts as shown make compliance with Part M4 (2) impossible</p> <p>The revised proposals should therefore be rejected.</p>
2016/4989/P	Dominic Harlow	6 Eton Villas	27/11/2016 17:45:25	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to the planning proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>The bulk of the building: the amendments make alterations to the perceived bulk of the originally approved development which, at about three times the size of the existing building, is already bulky enough and no further increases should be permitted. The drawings are unclear and a drawing should be provided which compares the permitted heights and details with those now proposed.</p> <p>Use of the Forecourt: I am concerned that the forecourt area will be used as an outside space for a children's play area or for social functions, which is not sympathetic to the quiet residential nature of the area. Permission in this respect would not protect the quality of life of the existing local residents.</p> <p>Use of the Terrace: Using external terraces as play areas of social spaces is also likely to create disturbance in the area.</p> <p>Parking: I am concerned about vehicles parking near to the junction of Eton Villas and Eton Road which makes emerging from Eton Villas onto the busier road extremely dangerous especially for oncoming motorcyclists or cyclists on Eton Road since sight lines are non-existent due to parked vehicles. Double Yellow lines as a should be applied and enforced at this junction.</p>
2016/4989/P	Dr Diana Spencer	garden Flat 13 Steeles Road London NW34SE	29/11/2016 20:57:14	OBJ	<p>the extension of height to an already bulky building in a small space is a step too far.</p> <p>The blocking of the light, and trying to squeeze so much into a tiny area is unfriendly and insensitive to the surrounding residential area.</p> <p>I object strongly to the variation in the application</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4989/P	Bill Aldridge	Flat 5 Provost Court Eton Road London NW3 4SR	29/11/2016 16:20:32	OBJEMAIL	<p>Context elevation drawings have not been submitted for newly revised rooflines. It would appear from the initial and the revised visualisation that the new roofline is significantly increased in relation to Provost Court, and could have an impact on the rights to light for flats on the third, fourth and fifth floors. We need to see the context drawings to show the previously approved roof heights and the new roof heights against the outline of Provost Court to show how this has changed.</p> <p>A lot of time and effort from all sides has been put into ensuring that the impact of the bulk of the new building is minimised. We do not have the information in this submission to properly judge if these changes reverse previously negotiated reductions in the height of the building and its impact on its neighbours. We need to see an equivalent of the previously submitted North East Elevation Annotation of Changes (16/09/14) drawings to show the extent of these changes in relation to previous submissions.</p> <p>Secondly, the demolition cannot be begun nor the building built without the agreement of the Provost Court Right to Manage company which took over directorial responsibility for the management of the property in April 2016. So far, there has been little effort to make contact with the RTM to discuss any plans for the party wall. These are important discussions that will materially affect the quality of life for residents at Provost Court, both during and after the build process.</p> <p>In particular:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Work will require access to Provost Court garden for demolition and construction for a period of months, maybe years. This will have significant impact on the quiet solitude of our rear garden. 2 Access to the party wall will require scaffolding over the only viable access driveway into the garages beneath the building. This must remain accessible by vehicles at all times. 3 Build work on party wall will entail removal of the existing ivy clad wall, taking away part of the 'green amenity' of our garden. This must be restored in a way that retains this 'green amenity' as far as possible without impacting the new right of lights pertaining to the windows in the newly built party wall. <p>I ask Camden Planning</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) to request the Annotation of Changes drawings as described above, and allow additional time for these to be properly reviewed b) to put in place the necessary conditions to protect the interests of the residents of Provost Court during the process of demolition and rebuilding of the party wall c) to put in place the necessary conditions to protect the 'green amenity' that currently exists between the synagogue and Provost Court

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4989/P	Dorcas Cumming	12 Steeles Road London NW3 4SE	30/11/2016 08:19:08	COMMNT	These are substantial changes (not just a minor variation) which should require new planning consent, with clear plans and revised daylight/sunlight specifications. The planning changes substantially increase the height and bulk of the building, which, at 3 times the original size is already too big for the site in a residential area. The increased height will further shade the gardens of 11,12 and 13 Steele's Road and the houses on Eton Villas, and block the view. It is proposed to use the forecourt and terrace as a school playground, on Sundays. This will disturb the neighbours in a quiet residential area.
2016/4989/P	Mana Sarabhai Brearley	20 Provost Road NW3 4ST	28/11/2016 16:33:27	COMMEMP ER	<p>I have several concerns about the permission already given and these have been revived with the newly requested changes. The amendments include the use of the forecourt and terrace for several activities that seem to push the boundaries of what is appropriate in a quiet residential area.</p> <p>Parking is already an issue and we would request double yellow lines on the roads on both sides of the building.</p> <p>The existing permission is already increasing the building to three times its size. No further increase should be permitted.</p> <p>I would like to request further details on the implication of the proposed height changes to the daylight to surrounding buildings will get.</p> <p>On the whole the whole scheme seems greedy!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4989/P	Natalie Davidson	17 Eton Villas London NW3 4SG	30/11/2016 19:41:37	OBJ	<p>I am writing to add my objection to the above planning application</p> <p>As a member of the CWG, I have been waiting for detailed drawings which clearly show the proposed changes to the height and bulk of the building - these have been confused and still remain unclear despite numerous requests for simple comparative drawings. The proposed 'minor' amendments to the height and bulk are totally unacceptable.</p> <p>It has been brought to the attention of the CWG that the forecourt will be used as an outdoor play area despite the fact that this area is already too small for all the other uses that have been proposed ie. on-site servicing, cycle parking, refuse, disability parking spaces, security building, etc. The playground will be used on a Sunday morning which is a day of rest for the local residents. The 'outdoor amenity area', (overlooking Eton Villas) now known as an additional playground will also cause noise and disturbance on Sunday morning with 100+ children using the space at any one time. There should be restrictions on the time that the 'outdoor amenity area' is used ie after 12 noon and no access after 6pm (7 days)</p> <p>The fact that the latest application seeks to REDUCE the number of seats within the place of worship, further goes to prove that the new building will be used as a commercial building with NO benefits to the local residents. Restrictions on event closing hours etc must be considered at this stage and I am urging Camden Officers to do so. The list of proposed events expected to take place in the new building is currently being prepared in the EMP - these include religious events and other events that are clearly NOT religious eg Yoga and Mother and Toddler groups.</p>
