

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/4370/P	B. Bennett	26/10/2019 18:04:32	OBJ	Dear Thomas Sild

I am writing to object to this proposal.

Information presented in the application form is misleading and not accurate.

It describes the roof as a Flat Roof but it is not. The existing roof is the traditional, suitable, attractive and functional 19th century style of roof used in the buildings alongside and widely used in this Camden conservation area surviving in this long row of Agar Grove historic buildings. It certainly would not, as misleadingly stated, "allow the flow" as the original roofs have been protected in this area.

It is stated in the Design and Access Statement "The design of the mansard is set back from the front of the building with no windows so the line of the terrace is effectively unaltered." This is not true as the proposed alteration to a high level would be visible both from front and back of the building. Such damage would set a terrible precedent.

The proposed flat roof is described as "A lead roof with the roof structure being timber supported by the existing party walls on either side of the property in exactly the same way as all the floors". This type of roof is completely inappropriate in appearance and function and is a style of roof highly likely to have leakage and hence potentially causing damp or rot problems which could spread to floors below and surrounding properties.

The proposed large heavy structure "supported by the existing party walls" would also put pressure on neighbouring adjoining walls which could lead to structural damage.

The proposed loft area would further overdevelop this already crowded, intensively occupied 19th century area and would put pressure on amenities. There is a history of major problems with unauthorised and repeated multiple occupancy use of nearby buildings defying Camden planning decisions.

There is already mass development and a huge amount of newly built housing nearby yet it is stated "the proposed project will contribute to the housing crisis in this area, as the property will be rented out." Traditional buildings in this area are already let out in intense concentration causing tension and issues with overcrowding, noise and overuse and pressure on council services.

In the application form "Description of existing materials and finishes" is described as "Double Glazed Sash Windows" yet this is a completely new proposal and there are no sash windows in the roof.

The other windows in the front of the building have unfortunately, years ago been changed to two-paned thick plastic framed swing opening windows, not sash windows as stated. The windows in the back of the building have also unfortunately been changed to plastic framed windows, on the top floor three-paned and on other floors again swing opening plastic frames. These are already incongruous, do not match and damage this traditional 19th century conservation building appearance. Proposed "Double Glazed sash windows" and this proposed major destruction of the traditional roof would be further extreme damage to this conservation area building.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

There is a planned open terrace area which would be another space likely to cause further and disturbance problems. There is already a problem with noise at the back of Agar Grove and a roof terrace would lead to extra noise and loss of privacy of the surrounding residents as it would overlook properties.

It is not clear in the application form that there is a proposal also for a large enclosed structure, described as a "garbage storage area" built over the open balcony at the back of the building.

This is not even mentioned in the main title description of the proposal.

That major proposed change is described in the application form as "There will also be a garbage storage area on the second floor." It is vaguely described in the "Design and access statement" and is only obvious in the drawings.

It is stated "The design will be in keeping with the original features and materials of the property and the residential area", yet there is no mention of materials used for the proposed building work. The design and proposed plastic windows etc are by their very nature not in keeping with the original features of the residential area. It is stated "All new external windows and doors will match the existing ones on the house." Yet the existing plastic windows clearly do not match the traditional historic building.

This would take away a small open balcony access for residents, remove the timber framed glazed door, surely important as emergency /fire exit, apparently proposed to be replaced with a small upright panelled window and extremely change the appearance of the back of the building.

This proposed structure would dramatically block light to neighbouring buildings especially 156 Agar Grove.

It is stated "The proposed works will solve the garbage issue at the property". This seems a highly inappropriate use to enclose waste inside and an excuse to build over the traditional balcony which can already easily be used for storing household waste bins.

It is also stated "The application relates to the upper maisonette, which doesn't have the benefit of any outside area or anywhere to store garbage, which is only collected every two weeks by the council. At present the garbage is stored outside on a flat roof, which is neither healthy nor desirable." This is highly misleading as what appears to be referred to as "a flat roof" is the small traditional balcony at the back which is an "outside area" and presumably is somewhere to "store garbage".

There is an attempt to link this with a complicated planning application related to the former pub Murray Arms, years ago, a great distance away, corner building with Murray Street which was extremely different circumstances, being joined to a property already with an altered roof. I believe that damaged the appearance of that historic landmark corner.

Agar Grove, very important in Camden's history, name changed from St Paul's Road, site of the infamous Camden Town Murder 1907 has unfortunately suffered some gradual damage to buildings, mainly further down but fortunately this part has retained a large amount of buildings in beautiful original condition.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
-----------------	------------------	-----------	----------	-----------

2019/4370/P	Akeva K Avery	27/10/2019 01:12:22	OBJ	
-------------	---------------	---------------------	-----	--

I am writing to object to this planning application.

The changes would not be in keeping with the historic traditional features and style of the neighbouring and surrounding conservation area buildings. It would destroy the integrity of the street, clearly visible from front and back.

The alteration to the roof would be completely unsuited as the existing style of roof is structurally designed as an integral and original part of the building and functions well. Interference and altering of the original roof structure would not only damage the appearance but it is likely to lead to leakages and damage to neighbouring properties. It would also lead to more loss of privacy for neighbours from overlooking and potential noise problems.

The proposed large structure building over and enclosing the old balcony at the rear would extremely block light from neighbouring properties, most seriously affecting 156 Agar Grove and would alter the quality of our environment.

This proposed walling in of the balcony would also damage the traditional appearance of the rear of the conservation area visible to the back and would encourage further destruction of original features. Proposed double glazed windows are not suited at all for this 19th century property.
