Application No: 2020/1636/P	Consultees Name:	Received: 26/06/2020 09:08:26	Comment: COMMNT	Response:    Printed on: 07/07/2020 09:10:12
2020/1636/P		28/06/2020 21:17:41	OBJ	The extension is ugly and not in keeping with the architecture of Hilgrove estate.
				The extension would be unsightly for neighbours.
				The extension is too big, going three and a half metres into the garden and right up to neighbouring properties.
				The extension would be a loss of green space, which is bad for everyone.
				Dobson Close was built with kitchens at the front to allow easy access by emergency services in case of a kitchen fire. Moving the kitchen to the back reduces the safety of the whole block.
				The way that Dobson Close was built means noise and vibrations travel through the blocks causing excessive disturbance for residents. Construction of a similar extension at 55 Dobson close produced noise that proved intolerable to all the adjacent neighbours.
				The proposed extension would damage the communal satellite, tv, internet and phone cabling supply to the block.
				The construction of the extension at 55 Dobson Close caused a great deal of damage to the block it is in. Similar damage is more than likely to be caused by this extension. This damage would effect the whole community. Should permission be granted, Camden Council becomes responsible for the future repairs of the new structure as landords of the building. Any repairs required as a result of such an extension being built and subsequently charged to leaseholders as part of their service charge will be challenged in court by all the leaseholders in the block.
				The extension at 55 Dobson Close has caused lasting resentment and anger amongst the local community. This extension would cause further lasting harm to the local community.

					Printed on:	07/07/2020	09:10:12		
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:					
2020/1636/P		28/06/2020 21:35:25	OBJ	I wish to strongly object to this application on the following grounds:					
		<b>-</b> .		1. The extension is not in keeping with the distinctive and highly regarded architectural style of Dobson Close					
				2. It is excessively large, obtrusive and unsightly.	is excessively large, obtrusive and unsightly.				
				<ol><li>It will result in a very significant loss of visual amenity. The green/open spaces are highly valued by the existing residents of Dobson Close.</li></ol>					
				4. Construction in a garden appears to be contrary to the Mayor of London $\!$	curtail such				
			<ol><li>Approval by the Planning Committee would establish an unwelcome precedent. Further similar applications by other residents would of course result in further loss of amenity and compromise the work of the original architects.</li></ol>						
				<ol><li>This application fuels the continued disquiet felt by the present residents at a similal Dobson Close. I would add that that property appears to have remained vacant since 2016.</li></ol>					
				7. There is limited and certainly no vehicular access to the rear of the gardens on the Close. In an emergency, access to the kitchen (the most common seat of house fires) proposed extension by the Fire Brigade may well be compromised.					

24 AUG 34 AUG	10 10 ADOSEC	20 a a	260	Printed on	07/07/2020	09:10:12
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:		
2020/1636/P		28/06/2020 21:35:28	OBJ	I wish to strongly object to this application on the following grounds:		
				1. The extension is not in keeping with the distinctive and highly regarded architectural style of D	obson Close	
				2. It is excessively large, obtrusive and unsightly.		
				<ol><li>It will result in a very significant loss of visual amenity. The green/open spaces are highly valued by the existing residents of Dobson Close.</li></ol>		
				<ol> <li>Construction in a garden appears to be contrary to the Mayor of London¿s Plan to curtail such development.</li> </ol>		
				<ol><li>Approval by the Planning Committee would establish an unwelcome precedent. Further simila by other residents would of course result in further loss of amenity and compromise the work of translated.</li></ol>		
				<ol><li>This application fuels the continued disquiet felt by the present residents at a similar extension Dobson Close. I would add that that property appears to have remained vacant since it was pure 2018.</li></ol>		
				7. There is limited and certainly no vehicular access to the rear of the gardens on the West side Close. In an emergency, access to the kitchen (the most common seat of house fires) at the rear proposed extension by the Fire Brigade may well be compromised.		

					Printed on:	07/07/2020	09:10:12
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:			
2020/1636/P		28/06/2020 21:35:32	OBJ	I wish to strongly object to this application on the following grounds:			
		•		1. The extension is not in keeping with the distinctive and highly regarded architectu	ral style of Do	bson Close	
				2. It is excessively large, obtrusive and unsightly.			
				<ol><li>It will result in a very significant loss of visual amenity. The green/open spaces are highly valued by the existing residents of Dobson Close.</li></ol>			
				4. Construction in a garden appears to be contrary to the Mayor of London $\!$	o curtail such		
				<ol><li>Approval by the Planning Committee would establish an unwelcome precedent. F by other residents would of course result in further loss of amenity and compromise architects.</li></ol>			
				<ol> <li>This application fuels the continued disquiet felt by the present residents at a simi Dobson Close. I would add that that property appears to have remained vacant sino 2018.</li> </ol>			
				7. There is limited and certainly no vehicular access to the rear of the gardens on th Close. In an emergency, access to the kitchen (the most common seat of house fire proposed extension by the Fire Brigade may well be compromised.			