

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4366/P	Martin Kingsley	K&M Property Management 63 Darlands Drive EN5 2DE	07/10/2017 16:33:51	OBJ	<p>I have been appointed as Manager of 64 Fitzjohn"s Avenue, by the First Tier Tribunal (Property). I have replace the Freeholder and assumed all of his duties and responsibilities. In this capacity I wish to lodge my objections to this proposed planning application.</p> <p>I assume from the change of reference number and from the pre-application advice, that we have not seen before, that this is a new application and that I can comment on all elements of the proposal. I am, however, confused that some of the drawings include the comment that elements of the proposal have already been approved.</p> <p>There were a number of detailed responses to application 2015/5847/P which remain relevant and I would be most grateful if you would review them along with the new submissions so that we do not need to repeat everything. I note that they are still on the web-site for that application.</p>

IMPACT ON THE CONSERVATION AREA

Nos. 54 to 64 Fitzjohns Avenue are deemed to make a positive contribution to the Fitzjohn's Netherhall conservation area. Apparently, no.66 does not. However no.66 does have the merit of being small scale and unobtrusive. It is subordinate to the surrounding properties and its simplicity is disarming. To my mind there would be significant environmental gain in preserving this property instead of replacing it. It offers two small homes that are ideal for single or dual occupancy. In its whole history the level of occupancy for both houses has been two to four adults.

The new proposal is wholly inappropriate in terms of style and scale even without the inclusion of a third storey; which we were assured had been withdrawn. This would appear to be unacceptable in terms of Camden's planning policies. By comparison with what currently exists, the proposed building is blockish, characterless and oppressive. There are no concessions to the surroundings and street views and no consideration for neighbours.

I had understood that objections to the style of the building were met with the claim that this building would be an appropriate part of a mix of styles that included Medresco House. Despite recent refurbishment Medresco House remains an example of poor quality post-war infill. Given the history of that site and the need to build this can perhaps be forgiven, but there can be no excuse to replicate it today. I believe that this comparison shows a lack of respect for the local context and does nothing to demonstrate the importance of conservation and the enhancement of the historic environment. I had understood that these elements were to be key to planning decisions.

As the current pre-planning application advice notes, "At two storeys tall, and due to its relatively simple design, the existing building at the site appears subordinate to the main building and the scale of the building is in keeping with what you might expect at the rear of a larger building." So why not retain the existing building?

If the new development is approved it will have an extremely negative influence on the environment as it will be clearly seen from Fitzjohn's Avenue and Akenside Road. The residents of no.12 Akenside will have an unnecessarily high and overbearing blank wall abutting their back garden, whilst their neighbours in 64 will suffer loss of light during the day and be faced with extremely intrusive and unacceptably large windows and light wells raising issues of light pollution at night.

DENSITY ISSUES

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

It seems to be accepted that the existing properties - two one bedroom houses - already lack amenity space. So what are the implications for two three (possibly four) bedroom houses? Especially as the amenity spaces will be further reduced by the light wells that have been enlarged in this new application? Please also remember that 50% of the amenity space referred to in the application is notional, as it consists of the access driveway which is on the other side of locked gates and therefore outside the courtyard.

I recognise that the application indicates three bedrooms, but I am also aware that at the pre-planning meeting an additional bedroom was discussed and the officer noted that this could be accommodated on the ground floor. So, I assume that we have to consider such a possibility.

As Manager of no. 64, I am particularly concerned about drainage. The freeholder allowed the former owner of no.66 to cut into the drains of no. 64. This has caused problems over the years and can only get worse with excessively increased occupancy. There have been no discussions about this with the current owners and certainly no proposals that I have seen for new drainage.

Car parking is a significant concern. I understand from residents at 64 that the existing two bays are in constant use and I cannot believe that there will not be additional demand from extra residents. The drive is already used for visitor parking for no.66. Currently cars back out onto a busy road with a large school on its doorstep and other schools close by. I would certainly support the pre-application advice for the removal of parking from the proposal. This would offer at least a minor gain in amenity space.

WASTE AND RECYCLING

As Manager of no. 64, I have replaced the Freeholder following his acceptance that he could not manage the building. In this capacity I have previously alerted you to a significant problem. There is no provision for waste and recycling in the scheme for no. 66. There is a waste and recycling facility within the freehold of no. 64 for the exclusive use of its residents. As part of the current refurbishment of 64, this has been extended and one of the lessees has given up part of his garden so that we can meet Camden's requirements. The lessees of no.64 have paid for the provision. I am sure the residents of no. 66 know that this facility is not available to them. They have never asked to use it or offered to contribute towards it. However, I suspect they do use it. To my mind this resource is of an appropriate size for the 5 flats of no. 64 but, with the best will in the world, we could not accommodate the proposed new development.

I was, quite frankly, shocked to find that this issue, which I brought to your attention in my previous submission, was simply discounted. It seems to me to be a matter of some importance and I would ask that you raise this as a matter to be addressed.

The applicants need to be aware that I am the only person empowered to give permission for others to use this waste and recycling provision and if any informal permissions have previously been given, I also have the power to revoke them.

I have no wish to be confrontational. My role is simply to manage the building to the best of my ability and to look after the interests of the lessees and the freehold.

POTENTIAL DAMAGE TO THE FABRIC OR NO. 64

No 64 has undergone conversion over the years, but probably far less than most properties

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

Comment: **Response:**

in the neighbourhood. It retains original lath and plaster ceilings in three of the flats with decorative cornices and plaster work to the ceilings. There are original floors and main staircase, original handrails and marble fireplaces. During the recent refurbishment the surveyor noted that the building was structurally sound and under normal circumstances there would be no cause for alarm. Nonetheless, I am concerned that excavation for such a large basement so close to the house will cause unnecessary stress to the fabric of the building and its historic interior features.

INACCURACIES IN THE PLANNING APPLICATION

The owner of flat A has pointed out a number of inaccuracies in the planning application that would lead to the impression that the impact of the building would be less than is actually the case. The lessee concerned is, of course, significantly affected by the development, but he is also a well respected civil engineer and a stickler for accuracy. I would ask you to take his concerns into account. I am certainly persuaded by his comments.

PRE APPLICATION ADVICE

I was very impressed by the Pre-Application Advice which was thoughtful and well considered. Clearly there is a sense of tension between the need to protect and enhance the conservation area and the demands of the developers. In this case it seems to me that the planning officer has made every attempt to satisfy the applicants demands but has been rebuffed.

I am pleased to see that the officer was clear about the problems of close proximity and of being overlooked and overshadowed. I consider that the case for an additional storey has already been explored and dismissed. It should not be re-opened.

Clearly, my preference would be for you to reject the proposal and I believe there are good reasons for doing so. Certainly, I do not think there should be further compromises, but I do wish that your advice had been heeded so as to avoid this lengthy planning blight.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4366/P	sally margaret	22 Romney Court Haverstock Hill London NW3 4RX	06/10/2017 13:18:19	OBJ	<p>Dear Mr Diver,</p> <p>I would like to strongly object to this application. I have become aware of this application from the notice posted in the street. This small property can in no way support a three storey building. The existing low level buildings are clearly visible from the street and they are unobtrusive when compared to the magnificent red brick Victorian house in front of it. To build a large three storey house would detract significantly from the conservation area and should be refused.</p> <p>This is clearly a case of significant over development and must be resisted.</p> <p>Instead of building unsuitably large three bedroom houses I would have thought reducing the scale of the houses so as to provide a more measured mix of living space vs amenity space would be preferred. These over large houses have no amenity space at all.</p> <p>On occasion witnessing the cars reversing from the property onto the very busy main road is frightening, especially at school drop off and pick up times. An improvement would be to reduce the size of the houses to allow cars to turn around at the house. If not then cars should be banned from paring at the property.</p> <p>The lovely protected tree that is directly adjacent to the existing houses will be interfered with in order to construct an unsuitably large house. We cannot continue to allow unnecessary and inappropriate developments like this to be built to the detriment of heritage and nature. London is lucky to have green roads and large trees lets not put this at risk.</p> <p>Please reject this terrible application.</p> <p>Yours Faithfully,</p> <p>Sally Margaret</p>
2017/4366/P	B Jones	Flat 6 62 Fitzjohns Avenue	05/10/2017 19:16:49	COMMNT	<p>We live at 62 Fitzjohns Avenue and are concerned about the scale of the proposed development. It is out of character for such a large development in a small space resulting in loss of natural light and adversely affecting the quiet calm of the area. We are also concerned about the impact on drainage and the tree roots in no 62.</p> <p>In addition, we own a car parking space immediately adjacent to the proposed development and are concerned that the development work would interfere with our parking space. Clearly, no access could be granted to builders from no 62.</p>