

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3745/P	James Hinchcliffe	Flat B Vale of Health London NW31AN	27/07/2017 18:23:07	COMMNT	<p>As the Leaseholder of Flat B within the building of Upfleet, the property that adjoins the Garden House, I object to the proposed temporary removal of the arch on the following grounds.</p> <p>The Garden House does not own the wall, arch or the right of way from the pavement through the passage to the boundary line of the Garden House. This is the property of Lea Steps and Upfleet. There has been no agreement by the Freeholder or any of the Leasholders of Lea Steps and Upfleet for the temporary removal of the archway or wall pier. The Garden House has not undertaken any structural survey to assess the capacity of the right of way and surrounding building to support the intended use of the passage during building works. Neither has there been any agreement signed by the owners of Lea Steps and Upfleet for the use of the right of way to be extended from current legal provisions to include the passage of traffic and materials to be used during the building period. Camden Council is requested to withhold permission for the temporary removal of the arch until appropriate surveys and signed legal agreements, including a limitation on the period within which any demolished structures have to be replaced, are on record.</p> <p>I understand the Freeholder of this building has raised objections but has indicated a willingness to aid the construction process by allowing the temporary removal of the arch (and wall pier), if certain conditions and protective measures are agreed to. Despite the considerable inconvenience and disruption that the building works will pose to me as an immediate neighbour I endorse the Freeholder's position i.e. resubmission of corrected plans by the Garden House; proof of legally binding agreements between the Garden House and Lea Steps and Upfleet Ltd relating to the use of our property during the time of construction; continuing the restriction of the long term use of the passageway for vehicles.</p> <p>To date the Garden House has shown no consideration for the loss of amenity of my, or any adjoining, property during or after the construction period. The overall CMP contains little analysis of the impact of construction traffic, goods and personnel using the Vale of Health and through the archway. As with other properties in the Vale of Health and in particular, our building, the decision to live there was predicated on the outlook and serenity of the area. I ask Camden Council to ensure the CMP contains specific measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. To address the noise, vibration and dust levels resulting from construction traffic and activities on the road, through the passage and on the construction site that as these issues have not been adequately addressed in the CMP. This will affect Flat B at both the back and front of the property. It is requested that the permitted hours of work are limited to the period of Monday to Friday thereby allowing residents of surrounding properties the relief of weekends clear of construction noise and dust. b. To limit the visual intrusion of construction activities, materials and vehicles during construction, including the potential breach of a clear view to the ponds for all residents of Upfleet and Lea steps. This view is protected by covenant and covers all obstructions including trees, building and other objects such as vehicles.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3745/P	M Nourse	Faircroft Vale of Health London	28/07/2017 02:09:40	OBJLETTE R	<p>I object to this application and ask for it to be refused planning permission.</p> <p>There are grave concerns that removal of the arch will undermine the structural strength of the two stories built on top of it and therefor the terraces on both sides of it. Any application made must guarantee that there will be no possibility of structural damage to either of the neighbouring terraces and that the entrance would be restored in its entirety to be EXACTLY as it is as now existing.</p> <p>This is a very old archway entrance built for pedestrian access only and forms an important part of the streetscape. It is in a most prominent location and removal of any of its existing parts especially only removing one pier would undermine the architectural integrity of the entrance and the neighbouring attached buildings as well as the symmetry which has existed for a very, very long time between the arch and both arch piers and the neighbouring properties. Any changes including the permanent removal of one pier will fail to preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP25 (Conserving Camden"s Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies and no doubt contrary to other Camden Local Development Framework policies as well.</p> <p>In any case there should be no possibility of the area being turned into a parking space with a yellow line reducing the number of parking places for the residents of the Vale of Health and visitors. Having a car engine running so very close to the neighbours bedrooms and other rooms will harm the health of the neighbours and therefor a car parking place under the arch will be untenable. The bedrooms have air vents into the archway which have existed for many more than 30 years. These vents will allow the poisonous fumes of a car parked right beside them to enter the rooms.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3745/P	D Burnett	Faircroft Vale of Health London	28/07/2017 02:23:06	OBJLETTE R	<p>My objections exactly match of those of Michael Nourse. I would like to object to the proposed development in the same terms as his. Please do not disregard or give lesser weight to my objections because of this, I have carefully considered every detail of his objections and they match my own objections exactly. Please do not count us as only one objection because we share the same views, we should be counted as two objectors.</p> <p>I object to this application and ask for it to be refused planning permission.</p> <p>There are grave concerns that removal of the arch will undermine the structural strength of the two stories built on top of it and therefor the terraces on both sides of it. Any application made must guarantee that there will be no possibility of structural damage to either of the neighbouring terraces and that the entrance would be restored in its entirety to be EXACTLY as it is as now existing.</p> <p>This is a very old archway entrance built for pedestrian access only and forms an important part of the streetscape. It is in a most prominent location and removal of any of its existing parts especially only removing one pier would undermine the architectural integrity of the entrance and the neighbouring attached buildings as well as the symmetry which has existed for a very, very long time between the arch and both arch piers and the neighbouring properties. Any changes including the permanent removal of one pier will fail to preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP25 (Conserving Camden"s Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies and no doubt contrary to other Camden Local Development Framework policies as well.</p> <p>In any case there should be no possibility of the area being turned into a parking space with a yellow line reducing the number of parking places for the residents of the Vale of Health and visitors. Having a car engine running so very close to the neighbours bedrooms and other rooms will harm the health of the neighbours and therefor a car parking place under the arch will be untenable. The bedrooms have air vents into the archway which have existed for many more than 30 years. These vents will allow the poisonous fumes of a car parked right beside them to enter the rooms.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3745/P	Ruth Grosvenor-Alsop	Cockthorpe Hall Cockthorpe Wells next the Sea NR231QS	31/07/2017 11:11:51	OBJ	<p>Interest</p> <p>Freeholder of the property of which the arch, land and all other structures between the pavement and Garden House boundary is part.</p> <p>The archway, the passageway, the driveway between the entrance to the passage and the pavement and the wall adjoining the street (See Land Registry Title Number 302683) do not belong to the Garden House ("the Applicant"). They belong to the Freehold ("the Freeholder") of Lea Steps and Upfleet Limited. The Garden House has a right of way only across this property.</p> <p>The Current Status</p> <p>The Freehold has not given the Applicant permission for the removal and reinstatement of the arch, the removal of the pier of the wall adjoining the road or the use of the driveway and passage for the movement of building materials or machinery/plant. The Applicant has been informed that any attempt to dismantle any part of our property or use the right of way for transport of building materials or machinery/plant without Freeholder agreement will result in legal action.</p> <p>The Freeholder has offered a mediated meeting to discuss an agreement for the temporary removal and reinstatement of the archway and the pier on the wall adjoining the pavement. To date the Applicant has not accepted to this offer.</p> <p>The Freeholder has indicated to the Applicant that it will not agree to the removal, use of and reinstatement of any part of its property until certain conditions are met. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. A survey of the passage (floor, walls, ceiling) to assess the structural capacity and limits of the passageway. The Freeholder, in an effort to facilitate the temporary use of the drive and passageways for construction purposes, has on multiple occasions requested the Applicant to undertake this survey. To date there has been no response II. A legally binding time-bound agreement, based on the findings of the above structural survey, between the Applicant and Freeholder of the use of the passage and driveway during the construction period III. Agreement on the timeframe for reinstatement of the arch and pavement wall pier along with remedial works to repair any damage to our property incurred during the construction process IV. Party Wall Agreements in place for all properties adjoining the passageway and the driveway leading to the passage V. Agreement on traffic management, safety plan and hours of work <p>Objections</p> <p>The Freeholder objects to the application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The drawings submitted to Camden Council (the Council") are incorrect. Currently they do not show (a) the vents for the basement of Lea Steps and Upfleet, (b) the structural piers,

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>or (c) the pipework/trunking, all extant within the passageway. The Freeholder requests that Camden Council asks for resubmission of the plans with correct features and measurements</p> <p>2. The plan incorrectly identifies the pier adjacent to the road as "unoriginal". This pier is shown on the Grant plan of 31st December 1952 and in the final planning documents approved by the Council in 1952 for the construction of the Garden House. This oversight should be corrected on the current proposal's plan and the planning submission amended to show that this pier will be reconstructed should the Applicant require its temporary removal during the works to the Garden House</p> <p>3. No permission is yet granted by the Freeholder for any works associated with removal and reinstatement of the archway or wall pier. The Freeholder requests the Council makes such permission a condition of planning approval</p> <p>4. Removal of the archway and wall pier cannot be disassociated from the purpose of their removal i.e. the passage of building equipment/plant and materials to the Garden House during the construction process. The Applicant's right to cross the Freeholder's land is limited by legal agreements (dated 1925) as well as by the structural form and capacity of the passageway. This is specified in the Council's Outline Planning Approval of the 1951 application to build the Garden House (Ref. 60632/SH.51/3395). This document states that the approach to the site is not suitable for vehicular traffic. The Freeholder requests the Council to uphold this ruling for the long term and, should a structural survey of the passage and driveway indicate the need, also during the construction process</p> <p>5. The draft CMP fails to address, in concrete terms, the problems that will be caused by the movement of machinery, materials and building personnel during the construction period or the noise, dust and visual disruption to normal life for those living in the Vale of Health and, in particular, the inhabitants of Lea Steps and Upfleet which is immediately adjacent to the building site. The Freeholder requests the Council make neighbours' agreement on the final draft of the CMP a condition of its approval</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3745/P	Julie Kleeman	12 Heath Villas Vale of Health NW3 1AW NW3 1AW	28/07/2017 11:23:14	OBJ	<p>I am most concerned about this application and wish to object to it, as it involves major structural work immediately adjoining my house.</p> <p>I am resident at 12 Heath Villas, Vale of Health, which is attached to the brick archway leading to the Garden House.</p> <p>Although some parts of the application say that things will be restored afterwards, where possible, it states that one pier is not to be restored.</p> <p>Visually it is in keeping with the existing pillars along the road, but I am more concerned that there could be potential other use of the space if it is not restored, for example used as a car parking area.</p> <p>On the Application for Planning Permission form, point no.8 asks whether the proposed works will affect existing car parking arrangements. Although this is not highlighted – I am worried that there is future intention to do so.</p> <p>There is ventilation for my son's bedroom into the area under the arch, very close to the gate, and exhaust fumes will be a danger to his health.</p> <p>Noise will of course be another problem. Currently we are set back from the road, but a vehicle parked next to our home would be highly intrusive. Anyone opening the gate & walking through the passageway can be heard clearly in the room. c</p> <p>In addition to the above, an essential parking space would be lost.</p> <p>Parking spaces close to the houses are in high demand, especially in the dark winter evenings when returning home alone - it is safer to park there, rather than by the heath.</p> <p>There is also a need when one has infirm or elderly relatives visiting, or when one has heavy items to unload.</p> <p>The planning application provides no structural analysis or survey. Unless there is a clear analysis that it will not damage other houses, I trust that Camden will reject it. Thank you.</p>
