
From: McClue, Jonathan
Sent: 05 June 2020 08:17
To: Planning
Subject: [REDACTED] 12 Oakhill Avenue: boundary treatment.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please upload to M3 and HPE.

[REDACTED]
Sent: 04 June 2020 22:19
To: McClue, Jonathan <Jonathan.McClue@camden.gov.uk>

[REDACTED]
Subject: 2020/0924/PP: 12 Oakhill Avenue: boundary treatment.

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Mr. McClue,
HCAAC Objects to the proposed rebuilding of the boundary wall.
We consider the proposal to be arguably unnecessary carbon-loaded building work.
There are clearly precedents for the proposed transformation,
However, the open character of the property appears different from its immediate neighbours and the generality of Oakhill Avenue and should be retained if possible.
It is an exemplar of the sustainable character of the neighbourhood.
Is such a well-maintained and attractively-frontaged property to be penalised for seeking greater security ?
In the context of the need to reduce carbon use and increase its absorption, we hope planning can look to the future rather than defensively to precedent.

The present walling is not under stress.
It may be in the future, but a 'french drain' in conjunction with the existing good weeps should prevent over-stressing.

Regrettably neighbourhoods are put to defence of high-value cars apparently requiring such sometimes heavy-handed railings and gates.
All that is needed to deter car thieves is a common steering bar lock.
That may be a slight inconvenience but better than adverse effect on the green area character into which people bought.
The proposed metal fencing and the height of the assembly seems innocuous on elevation and apparently in scale with the house.
However, it is a major change to this part of the neighbourhood.

A more detrimental scheme at Redington Road was allowed on appeal, so there may seem to be a need to consent to this scheme.

However, the areas and character are different, just as this house's setting offers diversity and example to its neighbourhood.

Should consent here be unavoidable we would ask for the metalwork to be as light as at no. 14 for maximum visibility of planting which is paramount.

The character-contribution of the existing front boundary and visible planting speaks for itself, but should not be regarded as of a bygone era.

Best regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]