

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/4792/P	Susan Oldroyd	06/11/2018 18:03:18	COMMEMA IL	<p>This is clearly a challenging site. However, I will applaud any attempt to provide a creative response to this back-land site, which will work well for its owners and their immediate neighbours. It offers the opportunity to make an imaginative garden that can provide both privacy and an inviting space for two growing families to enjoy. With this in mind I should like to make two observations, which I hope Camden will support and the owners and their architects will consider.</p> <p>Landscaping Initially, the proposed landscaping included a field maple. I do not know why this has changed, but I do wonder if the owners have considered the allergy potential of a silver birch on young children?</p> <p>The owner's statement suggests the tree will be containerised. However, the architect's drawings present it in open ground. Both positions are close on the boundary wall of their neighbours and tight on the proposed basement structure for number 66.</p> <p>Given that Camden has recently granted permission for the felling and removal of trees close to 12 Akenside Road because their roots were causing damage to that property, it would seem to be a good idea to consider how the proposed tree might be safely contained to obviate future problems for all parties. (12 Akenside Road backs onto number 66).</p> <p>Similarly, bamboo, though a beautiful plant and useful in providing screening, is known to be very invasive as it matures. Even the less aggressive clump forming types can break through concrete and stone containers, becoming difficult to control despite constant maintenance. Immediate short-term solutions for privacy can lead to long-term headaches. The owners might want to consider other planting solutions. If not, perhaps Camden could ask that the landscape gardeners involved with the project take serious precautions to obviate this risk from roots and rhizomes to both 64 and 66. The proposed brick containers may need some very strong internal reinforcements.</p> <p>Waste and Recycling There appears to be no provision for waste and recycling included on the proposal. This is surprising given Camden Planning's position on the requirements for new build properties. It is even more worrying when the new build is intended to change the land usage from two modest one bedroom homes to two large three bedroom homes intended to accommodate the needs of growing families.</p> <p>I am pleased to note that Kate Henry, the planning officer in charge of this application, has indicated that: "there is ample space within the application site to provide their own bin store."</p> <p>This would be a fair and logical position to take, rather than seeking to impinge on the amenity of 64 and requesting neighbours accommodate their needs. More importantly, there is mutual interest in both parties going forward as neighbours in the most positive spirit. I should be grateful, therefore, if Camden could encourage the owners and architects to include appropriate provision on this proposed plan.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/4792/P	martin kingsley	09/11/2018 10:37:06	WREP	<p>write to you in the role of Tribunal appointed Manager for 64 Fitzjohn's Avenue.</p> <p>My role is to protect the freehold interests of this property, replacing the freeholder in these matters.</p> <p>I recognise that the application relates only to landscaping and bicycle sheds. Whilst I have no problems with these elements, I cannot understand why the application omits the waste and recycling facilities on the domain of 66.</p> <p>In my previous submission I was keen to foreground this as a major issue. Accordingly, I am very disappointed to find that my comments have been disregarded.</p> <p>The owner of 66 is aware that the bin area adjacent to the access drive is on the freehold land of 64 as shown in all leases. He does not dispute this.</p> <p>He has been made aware (I do not know if he knew before) that the residents of 64 have rights of access to their bin area, which is also enshrined in a clause in each lease.</p> <p>I am, therefore, puzzled that the architects have not addressed this issue.</p> <p>The owner has since been in contact with me to explain that his children have been using the bins intended for the residents of 64. I am happy for this to continue as an informal arrangement until the building works commence. But since future usage of this site will change two modest one bedroom homes into two large, three bedroom family homes it seems only fair and reasonable that these homes should have private facilities on their own domain which will both meet their own needs and respect the amenity of their neighbours at 64.</p> <p>I believe this is in the mutual interest of both parties and in the interests of neighbourly relations. I would ask that Camden planning use its best endeavours to resolve an issue that is not of our making.</p>
