

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2018/1872/P	Gillean Tinker	12/06/2018 21:34:25	OBJ	The roof is so much higher than anticipated (I can even see it when I'm sitting down at Gospel Oak station!) It completely dominates this square of oak village properties. The balconies at the back overlook the whole of this section of oak village. We and my neighbours have objected time & time again about the top terraces, and it was agreed that they would only be used for maintenance, is this still the case?

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1872/P	James Waite	13/06/2018 12:34:26	OBJ	<p>Objection to planning application 2018/1872/P 9-11 Mansfield Road.</p> <p>This is an objection from Elaine Grove and Oak Village Residents' Association which represents all who live in Oak Village, Elaine Grove and Julia Street. A block of Oak Village houses and gardens lie immediately to the south of this property.</p> <p>Oak Village is an area of picturesque two-storey cottages with small gardens. It is a non-designated heritage asset on Camden's local list. The effect of increasing yet further the size of this dominating building needs to be considered in that context.</p> <p>We ask that Camden visit the site to check the measurements and drawings provided by the developer are correct and to view this development from Oak Village gardens.</p> <p>The land falls away to the south of the building and the development is built on compacted bomb rubble and thus from the ground level is around a metre higher than it might appear on the map and the impact proportionately greater.</p> <p>Our objections can be summarized as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The increased size of what before the increase was planned as the biggest (in terms of both height and mass) building on south Mansfield Road produces an over bearing building which has a detrimental impact on the neighbourhood. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increase in height of the building, particularly of the parapet wall makes the building dominating and overbearing from both the north and the south. It is disingenuous to claim (as the developers do) that because this dominating wall largely hides the roof, it doesn't matter. The height of the west side extension has also been increased, reducing the gaps between buildings necessary to reduce the 'sense of enclosure' (see earlier decisions on this site),</li> <li>• We also object to the increase in the depth of the building. At first floor and second floor level, the south walls have been brought forward making the back of the building more dominating and bringing what is obviously planned as an unauthorized roof terrace forward – see below. The west 'recesses' designed to protect the outlook from the 13 Oak village balcony have been reduced.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Planning decisions produce precedents which subsequent developers can use. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the increased size of this development is allowed, the rest of the buildings along this stretch of Mansfield Road could be redeveloped to a similar height creating a dominating terrace of buildings. Nos 7 and 5 Mansfield Road are both undeveloped and largely unmodernised properties where redevelopment is likely, and the Old Oak Pub is owned by Enterprise Inns, known for preferring property development to the uncertain business of running pubs.</li> <li>• If the Council were to accept the argument that developers can increase the size of a building to meet Camden's sustainability requirements, this could be used all over Camden. These sustainability requirements were known before building started and should have been included in the plans. Even if they were overlooked, some years passed between the signing of the section 106 agreement and the start of construction, leaving</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

plenty of time for revising the plans and agreeing them with the planning authority. The planning permission itself is a legal agreement and the argument that it is OK to break one legal agreement (planning permission) in order to comply with another legal agreement (the section 106 agreement) cannot stand.

We also believe that there are other options to meet the section 106 requirements.

### 3. Planned unauthorized roof terrace

- Preparations are being made to use the flat roof at second floor level as a roof terrace despite these showing on the plans as access only, the developers having claimed to have amended their original plans to make the area a roof terrace and submitted plans showing access only. Low level glass screens have been installed, made easier through a sliding door and there appears to be no Juliet balcony.
- The terrace/roof is also closer to neighbours than permitted as the first floor building wall (as opposed to terrace wall ) has been increased in depth bringing the roof (which forms the second floor terrace) and its safety wall closer to neighbours
- The intrusion and noise of a large roof terrace at this level would be extremely detrimental to all neighbours in Oak Village and Mansfield Road who, because of the 'access only' notation on the plans, and unapproved increase in depth have not had the opportunity to object. We ask that planners and planning committee ensure that this roof is not used as a terrace.

Further issues:

Some of the requirement of the planning permission appear not to have been complied with. The planters at first floor level, designed to protect the privacy of neighbours in nearby Oak Village properties, appear not to be installed.

A door in the screening on the east side of the first floor balcony has been installed and we support Ed Reynolds objection to this and indeed his other objections.

Cost of rectifying breaches:

Costs of rectifying the breaches should not be an issue.

- The increase in mass of this building was noticed by neighbours during the build and Camden planning enforcement officers visited the site. The developers were warned at this stage that they continued building to a larger scale at their own risk.

- Further Mr and Mrs Hauser are directors of a property development company based in Winchester (indeed some of the specialist work for the multiple planning applications for this site was commissioned through their company). Both they and their professional advisers knew exactly what they were doing when they decided to build differently to approved plans.

The fact they have family members planning to live, or living in, the property is irrelevant.

Finally

The developers have taken a gamble that Camden Council in the days of austerity will not think Gospel Oak matters enough to justify the cost and trouble of enforcement action for deliberate breaches of planning controls which have a detrimental impact on neighbours and create dangerous precedents.

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

If such a gamble were to pay off, it would be open season in Gospel Oak and other less than fashionable areas of Camden.

Please notify me of the committee meeting date, and note the Association"s wish to have a representative speak.

James Waite  
Chair of Elaine Grove and Oak Village Residents' Association on behalf of the Association

---