

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/3010/P	Lisa boher	02/08/2018 11:00:20	COMMNT	<p>I am astounded that I am having to write in to object for the FIFTH TIME regarding the application for a parking space to be erected in the middle of a mature garden, following four previous attempts under 2016/2614/P, 2016/4977/P, 2017/0896/P and its subsequent dismissed appeal with the Planning Inspectorate under APP/X5210/D/17/3186971.</p> <p>Indeed, this is the EIGHTH planning application (not including the appeal to the Planning Inspectorate) in two years, all of which were submitted AFTER work had already started or, in most cases, been completed. Even after Camden Council stated that planning should be submitted before any work commenced, the owner continued to carry out extensive alterations without any planning permission. Why should all other Camden residents have to follow due process when this property continually makes major changes only to apply after the fact time and again without consequence? Planning laws are in place for a reason!</p> <p>We had all hoped that after the Planning Inspectorate dismissed the appeal that we would finally be left to the peace and tranquillity we have all enjoyed in Mansion Gardens, and that the parking space would be removed and the garden restored to its former state. Sadly, that is not the case – the parking space remains in situ – and we are now, once again, faced with an application for a car parking space in the centre of the garden, this time with an additional sliding fence. The application, as previous, shows “existing” and “proposed” plans, however the “proposed” plan has been the reality for well over a year, with the parking space built and used on a number of occasions over the past year. This is pushing everyone to their limit, not least of all Camden Council who have to waste valuable time and resources going over the same ground repeatedly. Can these applications continue ad infinitum??</p> <p>Regarding this latest version of the same application (2018/3010/P), we can see the same untruths repeated – the Design and Access statement continues to refer to the property as being part of a “new estate” when in fact it was built in 1982 and is well established. This time though, it refers to the Appeal having been refused “for reasons to do with the design of the fence used”, which again is untrue. In fact, planning application 2016/4977/P (September 2016) was approved on the condition of the fence being altered from the garish colour and oppressive design originally erected. This was then altered under 2017/5514/P (October 2017) so to imply the fence condition from a previous application as being the cause is merely to disguise the same application once again. Additionally, the same Arboricultural Report from 2016 has been added, which notes that although they required a tree to be removed to accommodate the parking, that is no longer required due to a healthy, mature tree having “an accident with a skip lorry and had to be removed”, and another being badly damaged. A number of neighbours have previously submitted photographic evidence of the trees in this garden being poorly treated with large concrete slabs propped against them and vans parked up touching the trunks. Camden Council have issued two enforcement notices for precisely this – EN16/0774 and EN16/0775 – but so far, the damaged/felled trees have not been replaced.</p> <p>The same Design and Access Statement also asserts, as it has previously, that the “parking arrangement in the garage was poorly located with a very tight access from the shared driveway”. This is simply not true! The existing double garage that was added by the current owner in 1985 (8500392) and used with ease by a 4-door saloon for 30 years without any issue, was removed and converted into further living space under retrospective planning application 2016/4977/P. To repeat, the owner CHOSE to remove two safe and secure garaged parking spaces accessible via a driveway, and is now planning on driving directly into the middle of his garden which will mean access and egress is made onto the driveway of no.3, and all fumes and pollutants will be directed that way.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

It is also important to note that the top of the shared driveway of 10/11MG provides the only 'neutral' space for any temporary parking on this road. The placing of the parking space centrally means that this right will be removed for all other neighbours as they would be blocking his access, yet the owner of 11MG will double his parking as he will be able to park in this 'neutral' space without blocking anyone other than himself.

The fencing, whilst now compliant as stated above, is extremely high and prominent and affects all neighbours in how intrusive and oppressive it is to the streetscape and the open views of the Heath enjoyed by residents for over 30 years, which are now blocked. Also, whereas the approved fencing condition refers to a single fence running along the length of the garden wall, in actual fact the brick wall has a section removed for the parking, and the original fencing which was supposed to be replaced, is still visible behind the new fencing, meaning that visibility is severely reduced for me when reversing up my driveway, and would be further impaired when reversing out of the 'proposed' parking space with much of the original high fencing still standing behind the new. This is a danger to any pedestrian or pets passing by, as they would not be visible until it was too late. As it stands now, entering via the gates at the entrance to the road gives the feeling of driving into a tunnel where before it was open, light and airy. The only change to this application is that the space that has been built would have a fence concealing it, making it more unsafe.

In summary, this application is anything but "a discreet alteration", and the owner has use of a permit bay immediately outside the gates to Mansion Gardens, which he has been using for well over a year a matter of yards from his house. The property at no.11 has doubled in size to the detriment of the surrounding area – we've lost soft landscaping, a beautiful garden with mature trees, views to the Heath and more; instead have endured years of continuous building work, damage to the environment, noise, multiple work vans blocking access to the road, and the loss of a mature and healthy tree unnecessarily without any replacement. The work has already been done, and the parking space is still present despite previous decisions from Camden Council dating back to 2016 – all because the owner made a conscious choice to remove a double garage to further increase the footprint of his property, and decided he would instead cut out a large chunk of garden (and trees) and replace it with high walls, a gravel floor, and a car. This after he had removed the garden at the rear of his property and replaced it with decking and a large Jacuzzi and three large air conditioning units at 1st floor level overhanging the road!

Granting this application would be hazardous to say the least, as the position of the parking is on a narrow single-lane road, meaning it can only ever be accessed via no.3's property, and therefore I implore Camden Council to REFUSE this application, and put an end to the fiasco and enforcement notices once and for all. The whole experience has been extremely stressful to all involved and the cause of endless misery and distress since January 2015, when all this work started. Please take action to end this brazen and continued disregard for planning laws.
