

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1991/P	Stefano Baioni	10/06/2019 14:13:37	OBJ	This application would have a negative impact on neighbouring amenity and privacy. In particular in the proposal there is a new gate toward Langland Mansions private garden that would be considered a privacy and trespassing violation.
2019/1991/P	D Leon	10/06/2019 20:40:27	OBJ	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incomplete and inaccurate details provided so far; missing sunlight and daylight assessment and analysis on loss of garden space (Camden Planning Guidance on Amenity (March 2018)).</li> <li>2. Loss of light and overshadowing</li> <li>3. Loss of so much of the garden (more than 50%) in an area that has little garden space to begin with.</li> <li>4. Would cause harm to the character of the conservation area, contrary to Redington Froggnal Guidelines RF1 and RF 23 to RF 24.</li> <li>5. Consent of freeholders of 226 Finchley Road was not obtained and concerns raised by freeholders regarding impact of extension on communal area and drainage.</li> </ol>
2019/1991/P	Mimi Handaja	10/06/2019 11:18:57	OBJLETTE R	<p>I have the following grounds for objection:</p> <p>Inaccurate block plan and insufficient details. The submitted block plan for this application is inaccurate and misleading. I have also been similarly informed by the owner of 2 Langland Gardens whose rear garden backs onto 226 Finchley Road that the aerial block plan submitted is wholly inaccurate - the rear garden boundary line should stop where the Langland Mansions garden boundary is. I have marked the correct boundary and have also taken photos showing where the fence and therefore boundary line is for the Property. I understand from you that you have asked the applicants to provide you with the corrected block plan which should also show accurately the proposed extension. This is important and should be provided so that proper assessment can be made.</p> <p><b>Negative Impact on Conservation Area</b> The 226 Property is situated in the conservation area of Redington Froggnal. Therefore, increase in scale, impact, outlook, character of the area etc considerations will need to be taken into account.</p> <p>The loss of so much of the garden would cause harm to the character of the conservation area, contrary to Redington Froggnal Guidelines RF1 and RF 23 to RF 24 (see page 28 onwards from the attached Redington Froggnal Conservation Area Statement and Guidelines). Additionally, this would be contrary to Local Plan Policy D2 which seeks to preserve garden spaces which contribute to the character and appearance of a conservation area. Paragraph 7.55 further provides that “development will not be permitted which causes the loss of trees or garden space where this is important to the character and appearance of a conservation area”. I also note that there is a letter of objection submitted on 6 June 2019 by Redington Froggnal conservation group.</p> <p><b>Negative impact on garden amenity space</b> Camden’s ‘Altering and extending your home’ SPD states that “The front, side and rear gardens of Camden’s urban townscape provide an extremely im</p>
2019/1991/P	Monir Alinia	06/06/2019 16:23:35	INT	No approval for license for alterations was sought from the freeholders. The freeholders are particularly concerned about the impact of the extension on communal areas and drainage.