					Printed on:	03/10/2019	09:10:05
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Received:	<b>Comment:</b>	Response:			
2019/1697/P	Dilys Ward	01/10/2019 22:11:40	OBJ	I OBJECT to this Application. It would be an overdevelopment in a Conservation Area which, if approved, would create a dangerous precedent. Gardens will be destroyed to provide expensive homes.  Loss of Green Space is damaging to well established Flora and Fauna and removes the environmental benefits of ground water absorption. In particular, further destruction of mature trees is unacceptable in an area already known to have poor air quality.			

					Printed on:	03/10/2019	09:10:05
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:			
2019/1697/P	Ken Howard	02/10/2019 12:01:56	OBJ	From: Ken Howard, Flat 3, 27 Arkwright Road, NW3			
				Dear Mr Diver,			

2019/1697/P: 29-33 Arkwright Road Construction of 2 detached 2 storey houses

The previous Application 2015/6218/P to build 3 luxury houses on these adjoining back garden sites, was withdrawn in the face of massive opposition from neighbours and local organisations.

I have already sent in my Objection to this Second Application 2019/1697/P, as did some 80 other concerned neighbours and parties. You have now assured me that all these Objections will be re-presented when considering the recent batch of Amendments.

I therefore wish to add the following Objections:

- 1) The Amendments provide very little, and largely cosmetic, difference to the Second Application.
- 2) The updated Design and Access statement (Design Statement\_Rev A) on page 11 states: "A statement by JMS Planning Consultants analysing the Planning and Heritage issues that affect the proposals is attached separately. This updates the previous versions that were submitted during the earlier consultations." We cannot find this statement online and therefore find it troubling to finalise any objection without it.
- 3) The Conservation Area's rear gardens are valuable amenities, and of vital importance to the character of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area (a designated heritage asset) and that development at this site would be contrary to NPPF paras 118, point b) and 122 d):
- 118. Planning policies and decisions should:
- b) recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production;
- 122. Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:
- d) the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change.
- 4) These two adjoining gardens are not 'backland' as stated or 'brownfield' but most obviously verdant greenfield garden sites. The 2016 High Court decision clearly reinforces the importance of private gardens in built-up areas:

The Deputy Judge found that only residential gardens within the "built-up area" were exempt from the definition of previously developed land whereas, residential gardens outside "built up areas" were "brownfield".

- 5) The Updated Tree Report states that 12 trees are to be felled. This is in addition to the trees in the garden of 29 Arkwright Road already reported to the Council as having been illegally felled by the developers.
- 6) The developers have not addressed the following points raised by our arboricultural consultant's Report included in Mr. Yoyng Yang's current objections:

**Application No: Consultees Name:** Received: Comment: Response: (a) Future impact that proposed development may have upon existing trees by way of pressure to remove of prune TPO and/or CA protected trees. (b) Impact upon the Root Protection Area RPA of T22 resulting from development; floor slab pile locations and the methodology of installing a tiled surfacing within the RPA of a TPO status tree. (c) Potential for the proposed tile surfacing within the RPA of T22 Pear to suffer from distortion as a result of direct tree root action that may result in pressure to remove the considered tree at fault and/or in root damage/pruning occurring in order to mitigate and relay the surfacing. (d) Considering the impact of light restriction and the perceived dominant presence of trees in close proximity to a north facing rear aspect, and the pressure that may result to have trees removed or pruned. (e) A visual tree assessment (VTA) of T22 Pear may be of use to ascertain a third-party opinion of BS5837:2012 Category rating (currently rated C). 7) Despite the Council stating in its Application CMP (p14) that it "expects meaningful consultation with local residents prior to submission of the first draft CMP" this never happened. Also stated "A letter notifying the occupiers about the potential development and offering to either post or email a copy of the document was sent to all units within the listed properties on 23rd November 2018" and then appends 'some 200 approx. 200 addresses.' No owner in our property or Bill Frankel and many more in Frognal ever received this letter or email. Requests for an explanation have remained unanswered. 8) The CMP states that in addition to the access to the building sites from the tiny lane off Frognal, the supply of heavy materials and equipment would be made from Arkwright Road, via a ramp and a mechanical conveyor belt in No 29 that would run the entire length of our adjoining garden, doubtless removing more trees. This would involve the boarding and destruction of the two front gardens of 29/33, cause immense disruption to the gridlocked Arkwright Road (the most polluted in the Redington/Frognal area) and cause us a year of noise and dust, preventing us from using and enjoying the amenity of our beautiful garden. (See garden photo sent to Camden Planning) I wish these objections to be added to my previous objections and fervently hope that the Council will reject the Application and its Amendments. Yours sincerely Ken Howard

Printed on:

03/10/2019

09:10:05

Flat 3, 27 Arkwright Road, London NW3 6BJ