


Printed on: 23/04/2019 09:10:03

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1697/P	Silvia Bueno	18/04/2019 12:22:00	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden,</p> <p>I strongly object to the application for 2019/1697/P in the gardens of 29 and 33 Arkwright Road</p> <p>This work would lead to the loss of wildlife and entail the destruction of mature trees and significant green area which acts as an oxygen providing 'lung' for all who live around the overly polluted Finchley Rd. Arkwright Rd itself is also polluted as there is a large amount of stop start traffic.</p> <p>Building on these green back gardens in a conservation area is contrary to council policy. These are back gardens with squirrels, herons, owls and various other birds.</p> <p>Were this application to go through it would set a terrible precedent and might mean the end of back gardens in an area which has already become an over-construction site. There are currently huge construction sites nearby (both Frognal and Frognal Rise) and the additional HGV traffic is polluting and dangerous. The children of a nearby school often hang around at what would be the exact entrance point for any construction vehicles during breaks.</p> <p>On a personal note, my bedroom looks out over the gardens in question and I spend much of my time at home. Was this construction to be permitted, the constant works would make my life a complete misery for at least a year and destroy the aspect and view of this green garden permanently. I would certainly have to consider moving and the development would almost certainly lower the value of my landlord's property and/or affect his ability to rent the flat out at the same rate, affecting his livelihood. Ditto all who rent and own properties overlooking the garden.</p> <p>Most important of all, if we do not protect our conservation areas, air quality will be poorer still as will the health of ourselves and our children and we will lose our green spaces forever.</p> <p>I therefore strongly object to this application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Silvia Bueno</p> 
2019/1697/P	Istvan Polayc	19/04/2019 20:07:46	OBJ	<p>This will cause unreasonable traffic for a project that reduces the already small green surface in the neighbourhood. I moved here with my children because of the green. This will negatively impact our living circumstances and the value of the property we live in. It should not be privided please!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1697/P	Sho Miuchi	18/04/2019 20:21:44	NOBJ	On the basis that there are already houses behind 29 Arkwright Road and 35 accessed from Frogna! and this lane it was only a matter of time before these plots were going to be developed. I would be concerned about disruption and would hope that any trees lost would be replaced but it looks like a well designed scheme and evidently the planners have scrutinised it.
2019/1697/P	PA Boulat	22/04/2019 18:12:26	OBJ	<p>Dear sir or madam</p> <p>I live in Hampstead and use frogna! to walk to work and back from work .  My son and daughter-in-law live at [REDACTED] with their young baby. [REDACTED] backs to the lane in question [REDACTED]</p> <p>I want to object to the planning application in reference for several reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the justification of adding housing stock to Camden is ludicrous as those houses are luxury homes for residents that will come from outside the Borough.</li> <li>2. there will be permanent destruction of wildlife habitats for foxes, bats ,mice, birds and feral cats</li> <li>3. the nuisance from a year-long noisy and dusty building works for the neighbourhood go well beyond what can be endured by family and residents</li> <li>4. the egress and entry of vehicles from Frogna! to the new property create risks for seniors and young pedestrians.</li> <li>5. The residence will have parking for several cars likely to be SUV or luxury cars and will worsen conditions of traffic in the neighbourhood.</li> <li>6. mature trees will be destroyed.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1697/P	Peter Ibsen	20/04/2019 21:02:17	OBJ	<p>To whom it may concern!</p> <p>I would like to express my deepest and sincerest objections to any additional construction at the suggested site for numerous reasons set out below.</p> <p>Firstly, I'd like to point out that these new and slightly adjusted plans for the site, seem to be submitted very regularly now and as often as they get submitted, they also get rejected. The truth of the matter is, these applications in themselves are becoming a nuisance to all residents around the site and in the area. Continuously having to object with the same and very obvious and much further reaching reasons every time, seem to become a yearly occurrence.</p> <p>The simple truth being that NONE of these applications really change any parameters nor (and more importantly) deal with the much further reaching damaging implications both short and long term for all other residence and the area itself. Nor do they adhere to Camden's own policy and for that matter, the much bigger political agenda for the area in any form. With that, not only a further rejection to this application but also any future development of this site should be made much more permanent.</p> <p>Once again, my obvious and very clear objections to the above application would be:</p> <p>The area in question is a conservation area. I refer to Camden's own Local Conservation Policy. A policy all other residents proudly adhere to and pride themselves in upholding at all times. Any build like this would violate all or most of Camden's Local Conservation Policy in itself. The fact that is even considered goes against Camden's own and very well respected policies in the area. As mentioned above, on this alone, these applications should be rejected without hesitation.</p> <p>Allowing this or ANY build like this could very quickly and easily set a precedence for any other future applications to destroy the entire area which has been so lovingly conserved and rightfully protected by law for a very long time.</p> <p>The above point also affe</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1697/P	Peter Ibsen	20/04/2019 21:06:35	OBJ	<p>To whom this may concern!</p> <p>I would like to express my deepest and sincerest objections to any additional construction at the suggested site for numerous reasons set out below.</p> <p>Firstly, I'd like to point out that these new and slightly adjusted plans for the site, seem to be submitted very regularly now and as often as they get submitted, they also get rejected. The truth of the matter is, these applications in themselves are becoming a nuisance to all residents around the site and in the area. Continuously having to object with the same and very obvious and much further reaching reasons every time, seem to become a yearly occurrence.</p> <p>The simple truth being that NONE of these applications really change any parameters nor (and more importantly) deal with the much further reaching damaging implications both short and long term for all other residence and the area itself. Nor do they adhere to Camden's own policy and for that matter, the much bigger political agenda for the area in any form. With that, not only a further rejection to this application but also any future development of this site should be made much more permanent.</p> <p>Once again, my obvious and very clear objections to the above application would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area in question is a conservation area. I refer to Camden's own Local Conservation Policy, A policy all other residents proudly adhere to and pride themselves in upholding at all times. Any build like this would violate all or most of Camden's Local Conservation Policy in itself. The fact that is even considered goes against Camden's own and very well respected policies in the area. As mentioned above, on this alone, these applications should be rejected without hesitation.</li> <li>2. Allowing this or ANY build like this could very quickly and easily set a precedence for any other future applications to destroy the entire area which has been so lovingly conserved and rightfully protected by law for a very long time.</li> <li>3. The above point</li> </ol>
2019/1697/P	C & J Paris	21/04/2019 11:26:04	OBJ	<p>We live across Arkwright from the proposed development. We object to the development on the grounds that it will add density and congestion to an already-overworked Arkwright Road. At critical times, around school and business hours, Arkwright Road is at a standstill -- it is now used as a major cross-street in this area, including for trucks and construction machinery. Among other things, construction equipment will be difficult to move and site in the area. Intersecting roads at Frognaal and Lindfield Gardens also become nearly impassible. At the same time, these streets are used by many children and mothers with small children and infants.</p> <p>Further we believe the back gardens of the closely set homes in the neighbourhood should be preserved as gardens, not built up in a totally urbanized way in order to make money.</p> <p>The precedential weight of this application must be considered. If it is approved, this beautiful preservation area will become just another overbuilt urban area, with all the consequences for plants, air quality, pedestrian safety, and congestion.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1697/P	Roula Harfouche	18/04/2019 11:00:52	OBJ	<p>This is another attempt at this outrageous application. See 2015/6218/P and comments thereon. This time again, I was informed by neighbours instead of by Camden council, which confirms that this council is utterly corrupt.</p> <p>Here are my comments, again:</p> <p>I strenuously object to this planning application. The back of 29 &amp; 33 Arkwright Road is the last bit of green that I can see from my windows, especially since the outrageous building was allowed at the adjacent 25B Frognal. The construction work itself will be a nuisance for a long time (noise, dust, congestion, and pollution, not to mention parking and traffic issues with trucks on Frognal). The resulting buildings will permanently remove essential remaining green space, and will result in additional traffic and overcrowding on Frognal, which is already impossible to park in or pass through in the mornings and evenings. Also, the small road that serves 25B Frognal and will serve the proposed new dwellings currently has a blind exit onto the pavement on Frognal and is dangerous for pedestrians as cars have to cross the pavement before they can see anything. This junction will only become more dangerous the more dwellings it serves. This must not be allowed. One of the main attractions of the area is that it is protected, and still has a bit of green breathing space between houses. Allowing unnecessary buildings in back gardens for commercial gain would be damaging for the area and all the neighbours. Just say no</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1697/P	Peter Ibsen	20/04/2019 21:04:34	OBJ	<p>To whom it may concern!</p> <p>I would like to express my deepest and sincerest objections to any additional construction at the suggested site for numerous reasons set out below.</p> <p>Firstly, I'd like to point out that these new and slightly adjusted plans for the site, seem to be submitted very regularly now and as often as they get submitted, they also get rejected. The truth of the matter is, these applications in themselves are becoming a nuisance to all residents around the site and in the area. Continuously having to object with the same and very obvious and much further reaching reasons every time, seem to become a yearly occurrence.</p> <p>The simple truth being that NONE of these applications really change any parameters nor (and more importantly) deal with the much further reaching damaging implications both short and long term for all other residence and the area itself. Nor do they adhere to Camden's own policy and for that matter, the much bigger political agenda for the area in any form. With that, not only a further rejection to this application but also any future development of this site should be made much more permanent.</p> <p>Once again, my obvious and very clear objections to the above application would be:</p> <p>The area in question is a conservation area. I refer to Camden's own Local Conservation Policy. A policy all other residents proudly adhere to and pride themselves in upholding at all times. Any build like this would violate all or most of Camden's Local Conservation Policy in itself. The fact that is even considered goes against Camden's own and very well respected policies in the area. As mentioned above, on this alone, these applications should be rejected without hesitation.</p> <p>Allowing this or ANY build like this could very quickly and easily set a precedence for any other future applications to destroy the entire area which has been so lovingly conserved and rightfully protected by law for a very long time.</p> <p>The above point also affe</p>
2019/1697/P	N. Sivanathan	22/04/2019 14:37:54	OBJ	<p>Drivers exiting this site have to negotiate a "blind" exit crossing which is heavily used by school children given the numerous schools on Arkwright and Frognal. At current levels there have already been several close calls of pedestrians being struck.</p> <p>In addition, the impact on the natural environment and green space to fellow residents of this historic area is non acceptable.</p> <p>It should be noted a similar planning permission was asked a couple years back and was rejected by local residents - it would be good if these are kept on record when advising builders who seek such new development.</p> <p>I strongly oppose this development in the interests of the environment, residents and safety of children.</p>