
From: Benjamin Shorten [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 October 2019 14:30
To: Diver, John
Cc: Planning
Subject: Application 2019/1697/P and amendments

Ben Shorten
Flat 4
27 Arkwright Road
London NW3 6BJ

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

4 October 2019

Dear Mr. Diver,

I have already objected to the above Application on May 1st, and understand that the multitude of previous objections will now be brought forward and presented in opposition to the new hearing of this Application and its amendments.

Therefore I wish to add these further objections to the amendments.

- A) There seems to be very little significant changes in the amendments from the main Application.
- B) The density proposed is now twice that of the density of the nearby houses in the lane. Our garden and house will be overlooked and our amenities greatly affected.
- C) The new drawings show more trees removed than in the initial application, now more than a dozen. This is in addition to the trees already felled without permission on 24/07/17 when a Council official was called to photograph the evidence and report back. Nothing more was heard.
- D) Many of the remaining trees will be prone to damage by the proposed building works as detailed in our PBA Consulting Report, which has been submitted to you.
- E) 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"*.
- F) The Conservation Area's rear gardens leading down to the heavily congested and polluted Finchley Road are valuable amenities, and of vital importance to the character of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area (a designated heritage asset). Any 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.

G) In the extremely hot weather of this summer we have seen a huge variety of wildlife taking refuge in the gardens - foxes, herons, squirrels, bats, owls, frogs and a multitude of birds nesting and bathing in our garden ponds and birdbaths. These will be driven out by any construction and the proposed paving over of the grass.

H) I, and other neighbours, never received the letter about the first draft CMP which promised 'meaningful consultation with local residents'. I am shocked by the discovery that not only would access to the proposed building site be made from the tiny lane off Frognal, already objected to, but all heavy materials and equipment would be transferred from 29/33 Arkwright Road. This would involve a Ramp and mechanical conveyor belt through No 29 that would run the entire length of the fence between our adjoining garden, doubtless removing more trees. This would also entail 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 a year of unbearable noise and dust. Our garden would be unusable.

This is effectively the third set of proposals for this dreadful Application. At a time when the whole world attention and media are focused on the preservation of our vanishing greenery and natural resources in the fight against pollution, it is extraordinary that this Application, contrary to law and Camden's own policies and purely for developer's profit, should even be put forward. I trust the Council will have no hesitation in summarily rejecting it.

Yours truly,

Ben Shorten