28 Agamemnon Road

London NW6 1EN

**FAO Camden Planning Department – Tessa Craig**

**Application 2016/6669/P – 26 Agamemnon Road London NW6 1DY**

I would like to register our opposition to the proposed application for 26 Agamemnon road with the following:

We have been friendly with Mr Nicholas Trebino (the applicant who occupies the upper floors of number 26) for many years. This information is given to underline how we have always tried to support Mr Trebino, but to emphasise how vehemently we oppose the planning application as currently presented.

My husband, Mr Christopher Rogal, and I have lived in no 28 for 18 years. Whilst we are currently and recently living separately my husband will testify to the following:

1. For 18 years we have been tormented by the iterant, low grade of tenant that occupies the ground floor of Mr Trebino’shouse, which is managed by Anna Trebino, his mother.
2. The property is, according to Andrew Woolmer of Camden Council, not registered as an HMO. However there have consistently been three or more unrelated occupants in the 18 years that we have lived next door. The tenants are generally young and the turnover of tenants is high. They are often arguing, noisy and spill out into the yard in the late hours. Mrs Trebino is made aware when this happens, but she continues to take on the same calibre of tenant. Mr Woolmer is investigating potential breaches of relevant HMO legislation.
3. My son has been unwell (doctors letters available) and is in the last year of his A-levels. For him and us to have the expected 6 months of work would deleteriously impact on his well-being.
4. I am a Psychologist working from home and my business is suffering from the noise from 26.
5. Our house would be diminished in price if the planning goes through.
6. We are a community in Agamemnon Road of professional and personable people: no 26 is quite out of keeping with the quiet residential occupants of adjoining houses.
7. The extension would diminish the light to our garden.
8. There is potential damage to the structure of our building and the side-fencing.
9. We do not trust that the aim of extending is to get better class tenants. We believe that Mrs Trebino will simply increase the numbers of low-grade, mostly foreign tenants who rent there. Excessive noise will continue and the tenants will spill out into the yard day and night, especially in the summer months. This application will bring the footprint of number 26 to the boundary of number 28, extending to most of the length of our garden.
10. We assume that the new side wall would have to be constructed of harmonious ‘London Stock’ brick. However, a large expanse of flat fibreglass roof would not be in keeping with the surrounding architecture. We also assume that the intended skylights would be non-opening, because a lot of noise would otherwise travel out through them in the summer months.
11. We believe that, were Anna Trebino to want a better class of tenant, she would simply renovate the existing footprint and take, for example, a business let with decent people.
12. Of all the houses in this road, ours would be most affected by the application and we fervently wish for it to be disallowed. In addition, almost all neighbours would be affected by the noise since we are a series of terraced houses.
13. We object to the building of a roof terrace for many of the same reasons: noise, loss of privacy, out of keeping with the houses in the road.
14. We understand that the applicant has also applied to convert the loft space at number 26. While we would not object to this (subject to proper party wall considerations) we believe that the two developments together will involve a lot of noise and disruption.
15. During the last four weeks we have made a large number of calls to Mrs Trebino to stop the noise and there is no change. Last night, the tenants were up until 5 am, we could not sleep and my son could not therefore go to school. The flat with its historical and current tenants is detrimental to our well-being and, to reiterate, we have no confidence that this will change; rather it will severely inflate the problem.

In summary, we would reluctantly support the re-construction of the rear extension to modern standards and using materials sympathetic to the surroundings. This would suffice to achieve the upscaling of the ground floor flat at number 26. However, we are opposed to a sizeable expansion of the flat (essentially the in-fill of the side passage) to run down most of our shared boundary.

Dr Nicola Kimber-Rogal