From: Peter Ibsen [redacted]
Sent: 20 April 2019 21:28
To: Diver, John [redacted]
Cc: Planning [redacted]
Subject: My personal objection to Planning Application 2019/1697/P - Building of 2 houses in rear gardens of 29 and 33 Arkwright Road

Dear Mr Diver,

I have tried to submit the below on the Camden website but unfortunately got error messages, so thought it would be relevant to also submit directly here instead.

I would like to express my deepest and sincerest objections to any additional construction at the suggested site for numerous reasons set out below.

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.

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.

Once again, my obvious and very clear objections to the above application would be:

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.
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.
3. The above point also affecting the thriving and protected wildlife in the immediate area significantly. It would without doubt have a lasting and very damaging effect too. I include permanent destruction of greenery and mature trees.
4. The increased noise and disturbance in an already very busy and crowed area would simply be unbearable for the build period. Including traffic on both Frognal and Arkwright Road which at times is beyond feverish because of the countless schools in the area and Arkwright Road already being a very busy through-road.
5. The increase of prolusion in the area during the build would simply be unacceptable as well. Arkwright Road already having the highest air prolusion in the area.

6. To point 4-5: These implications would without doubt also be lasting implications after the build has been finished. For the area and current levels of noise, traffic, prolusion and erosion being where they are at; any further would simply be unacceptable on any level. Especially, when every political campaign now centres around minimising all substantially. Lasting implications would also include invasion of privacy and space (including parking) even harder to come by.
7. Once again, the buildings themselves seem to very intruding and completely contrary to most other buildings in the area, again, lovingly being kept within the boundaries of the strict local Conservation Policy.

I hope the above sets out my points of view on this ongoing saga and truly hope this application, like all the previous ones, will be rejected again or all and very similar reasons to the last as well.

However, and again, I do also hope that the council will take a much longer-term view on the situation as a whole this time and shut down the ability for similar applications to simply keep appearing over and over again. Clearly, a much more permanent rejection once and for all, would be the only just and right solution to this, going forward.

Thank you and your's sincerely
Peter Ibsen
[redacted]